



Standardized Proposal Format (D4 Pilot) Collaborative Working Team Recommendations/Report

Background:

In March of 2012, MnDOT conducted a standardized proposal selection process pilot for three preliminary and final design projects in MnDOT District 4. The projects were advertised under one Request for Proposal (RFP), and responders were required to submit one standardized proposal for all three projects. [See Appendix A for RFP.](#)

The key differences in this pilot from MnDOT's typical solicitation were:

- Three projects bundled into one solicitation
- Required interested responders to propose on all three projects
- Provided responders with a standardized format for proposals
- MnDOT selection committee was provided expanded criteria for evaluation of proposals

MnDOT's original intent/goals for the pilot:

- Streamline Proposal Review for MnDOT Selection Committee
- Working toward electronic proposal submittals
- Alleviate consultant time and expense
- In the future, cut down on MnDOT administrative resources
- Reduce subjectivity

Feedback Sessions:

After the contracts were awarded and executed with three separate consultants, feedback sessions with the consultant and MnDOT stakeholders were conducted. One feedback session was held with the consultant stakeholders in June 2012 and one with the MnDOT stakeholders in July 2012. Feedback from either group was not shared until both sessions were completed. [See Appendix B for feedback session notes.](#)

Collaborative Working Team:

A collaborative working team consisting of ACEC/MN and MnDOT members was convened in August 2012 to review the feedback and make recommendations regarding the pilot and the use of standardized proposal format in future MnDOT solicitations and selections.

Working Team:

Brad Hamilton, MnDOT
Thomas Parker, ACEC/MN
Jody Martinson, MnDOT
Avo Toghradjian, ACEC/MN
Jim Cownie, MnDOT

Mark Benson, ACEC/MN
Seth Yliniemi, MnDOT
Don Demers, ACEC/MN
Shiloh Wahl, MnDOT



This working team has proposed the following recommendations based on the discussions and review of the feedback.

Recommendations from Collaborative Working Team

Use of the Standardized Proposal Format

The new Standard Format should be used only for projects with the following characteristics:

- Very defined scopes – projects with fixed and known scopes of work (usually final design)
- Minimal or no teaming is required

Revisions/Recommendations to the Standardized Proposal Format:

Note that these revisions are intended to be applied to a solicitation for a single project. If multiple projects are bundled in a solicitation, see additional comments below.

- The standardized proposal format should be a “tool” in MnDOT’s toolbox as an option to be integrated into current selection processes. It should not replace current processes.
- The standardized proposal format must be scalable to match the requirements of the solicitation. For example, if a project is more complex, the project understanding section would be increased (more pages) to allow consultants to properly explain their approach. If a project required many disciplines, the resume and org chart sections would increase to allow the consultants to adequately identify their staff and document their appropriate capabilities.
- The Project Understanding Section must match the selection process. This is especially important if costs are part of selection. The Project Understanding Section should require: Understanding, Goals & Objectives, Approach, Work Plan and Schedule (these are normal parts of solicitations).
- For a standardized proposal format, MnDOT should specify the required key personnel on the project by clearly naming these positions.
- Allow flexibility to use the space on each page of the proposal. In other words, have the ability to stretch/expand specific boxes without changing the required number of pages of the proposal. Certain information boxes – Name, Years of Experience, etc. - could be locked to make it easy to find the basic data.
- Allow for editable format to ensure flexibility (specify constraints such as font size, etc.).
- If cost is part of the selection criteria, the solicitation should provide a comprehensive and detailed list of work tasks.
- Selection scoring criteria should be included, in detail, in the solicitation.
- Add a section to the proposal for “other ideas or information” where consultants could use this space at their discretion (creativity and innovation). The size of this section would also be scalable – the more complex the project, the larger the space for supplemental information. This section would not need to have points associated with it. The intended use would amplify other sections.
- The use of standardized proposal formats for projects that are less defined or have greater potential to have the scope evolve due to discovery during project work should be carefully



evaluated for use instead of the current solicitation processes (examples of such projects might include planning studies, environmental documentation, or preliminary design). If the standardized proposal format is chosen, then the proposal response forms and page limitations must be scalable to reflect the potential for uncertainty or discovery to allow responders to demonstrate their experience, qualifications, understanding and approach for such a project.

- Integrate expanded selection scoring criteria used in this pilot for other projects. The MnDOT selection committee for this pilot highly recommends the use of this tool including the use of benchmark scoring. [See Appendix C](#) for expanded criteria and rating sheets used in this pilot.
- Page limits should be utilized to avoid wordy proposals.
- Recommend and support the currently utilized language in solicitations which states that an interview may be a part of the evaluation process. If scoring is extremely close and/or selection committee needs further clarification to recommend a selection, an interview is strongly encouraged. Recommend that selection committee establish interview questions during selection meeting. Do not see value in an interview if there is a big gap in scoring.

Revisions to the Standardized Proposal Format for use with Multiple Projects

In addition to the format recommendations listed above, the following are specific recommendations that would also be applied when multiple similar projects are bundled into one solicitation:

- The proposal forms must be scalable to match the solicitation requirements. For example, the project understanding section would be scalable to accommodate the number of projects included in the solicitation.
- Allow the flexibility to structure the design team differently for each project in the solicitation.
- Allow consultant to pick and choose to submit on one or more of the bundled projects.
- Revise the scoring of Understanding, Key Personnel, etc. to reflect a firm's/team's choice to propose on one or some (but not all) of the projects in the solicitation.
- Revise the scoring of the costs to account for firms/teams which are proposing on only some of the projects.
- Bundling projects: for the selection committee – would recommend that rating sheets be separated for each project.

Improvements to the Process Noted in the Cayuga Bridge Solicitation/Process

This solicitation format was modified and used in the Cayuga Bridge selection process. Several modifications were made to the format which resulted in an improved product. Format improvements included:

- The document was in WORD format which allowed for easier and more flexible editing options
- The fill-in boxes were expandable allowing the consultant to place emphasis on areas they chose
- The form specified which key personnel positions were required



- Workload section was simplified
- Included “additional information” section

Other Proposal Issues (to be addressed by a different task force/working team)

- Working Team Consultant members would like to eliminate the “Availability” section. Standard contract language requires written permission to remove key personnel from a project.
- Working Team Consultant members’ recommendation: Do not include costs in selection process. Including a cost promotes a low pricing approach by proposers. However, often a small investment in engineering fees can translate into a large cost saving during construction – thus providing the true value to State (return on investment).

APPENDIX A



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT)
US 10 and frontage road in Detroit Lakes; US 75 interchange on I94 in Moorhead; and MN
29 Interchange on I94 and MN 29 four lane expansion in Alexandria**

Note: This document is available in alternative formats for persons with disabilities by calling Melissa McGinnis at 651-366-4644 or for persons who are hearing or speech impaired by calling the Minnesota Relay Service at 1-800-627-3529.

This RFP does not obligate MnDOT to award a Contract or complete the project, and MnDOT reserves the right to cancel the solicitation if it is considered to be in its best interest.

SPECIAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS	
Please note that the submission requirements of this RFP have been altered. This RFP has special submission requirements that will require Responder's to complete and submit their proposals in a format that is laid out by MnDOT. Please review this RFP carefully prior to developing a proposal.	
Non-conforming proposals will be considered non-responsive.	

Project Specific Information

Project Overview

The objective is to conduct preliminary and detailed design activities for the following projects:

	DESCRIPTION	STATE PROJECT NO.
Project 1	United States Highway (US) 10 and frontage road in Detroit Lakes	0301-60
Project 2	US 75 interchange on Interstate (I) 94 in Moorhead	1406-66
Project 3	Minnesota State Highway (MN) 29 Interchange on I94 and MN 29 four lane expansion in Alexandria	2102-58

PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING
MnDOT will hold a pre-proposal meeting. This meeting will provide potential responders with information regarding the three projects and will discuss the proposal format that is required for submittal. There will be time in the meeting to ask questions. <i>This meeting is not mandatory and is for informational purposes only.</i> Due to limited space, each responder may only bring two attendees.
The meeting is scheduled as follows:
January 12, 2012 10AM – 12PM Best Western PLUS Kelly Inn St. Paul Hotel (Meeting Room on Ground Floor) 161 St. Anthony Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota 55103

The work under this RFP will be divided (by project) into three separate contracts. Responders' submission of a proposal is acknowledgement that Responder may be



assigned, at the discretion of MnDOT, any one or more of the projects identified above.

Scope of Work and Deliverables

The Selected Responder’s tasks may include, but are not limited to, the following tasks:

- 1.0 Project Management
- 2.0 Public and Agency Involvement
- 3.0 Data Collection
- 4.0 Project Scoping
- 5.0 Categorical Exclusion Determination
- 6.0 Design Surveys and Base Mapping
- 7.0 Preliminary Roadways Design
- 8.0 Design Memorandum
- 9.0 Detail Roadways Design
- 10.0 Permits
- 11.0 Consultation During Construction

See Exhibit A for details on the Scope of Work and Deliverables to be performed for each project.

Proposal Content

SPECIAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Responses to this RFP must be submitted in the format requested in the table below and organized in the order listed. **Responders will submit one proposal that includes all information requested on the three projects.** Responders will either be provided an Adobe Acrobat fillable form to complete and print out or the “Format” column will indicate that Responders can submit the document that is requested in any format (i.e. MnDOT does not have a fillable form for Responder’s to complete). In this instance MnDOT is looking for a print out of what the Responder has created (such as the Organizational Chart or Quality Management Plan).

Responders may not exceed the page limits identified in each section. Additional information above and beyond what is identified will not be accepted. MnDOT reserves the right to reject responses that do not adhere to this requirement.

Proposal must **NOT** include a binding, cover letter or additional documentation. Technical proposal should be a single sided print out of Sections A through F, stapled in the upper left hand corner. Forms and Cost proposals should be provided in separate sealed envelopes.

PROPOSAL CONTENT INFORMATION

Criteria	Description	Format	Points
General Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RFP Information • Responder Point of Contact • Identification of Responder and subcontractor relationship(s) 	Section A ADOBE ACROBAT FILLABLE FORM [1 PAGE]	N/A
Project Understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statement of the objectives, goals and 	Section	10



	<p>tasks to show or demonstrate the responder's view of the nature of the Contract</p> <p>NOTE: THIS SECTION SHOULD SHOW PROJECT UNDERSTANDING OF ALL THREE PROJECTS WITHIN THE TWO PAGE LIMIT.</p>	<p>B</p> <p>ADOBE ACROBAT FILLABLE FORM</p> <p>[2 PAGES]</p>	
Key Personnel Qualifications / Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizational chart of proposed team A list of personnel who will work on the project, detailing their training and work experience <p><i>No change in personnel assigned to the project will be permitted without the written approval of MnDOT's Project Manager.</i></p>	<p>Section C</p> <p>ORG CHART: ANY FORMAT [1 PAGE] + ADOBE ACROBAT FILLABLE FORM [1 PAGE PER KEY PERSONNEL]</p>	30
Criteria	Description	Format	Points
Experience with Similar Project(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Example projects which best illustrate proposed teams qualifications for this project Identification of which firm(s) and/or personnel performed work on each project <p><i>*Provide 3 sample projects.</i></p> <p>NOTE: THIS IS <u>NOT</u> PER PROJECT. 3 SAMPLES TOTAL.</p>	<p>Section D</p> <p>ADOBE ACROBAT FILLABLE FORM</p> <p>[6 PAGES]</p>	30
Availability of Qualified Personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify the current projects/workload for the proposed key personnel and the expected completion dates of those projects. For each key personnel, indicate the percentage of their time allocated to those current projects and the percentage of their time available to work on this project. <p>NOTE: PROPOSE ONE TEAM THAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE TO WORK ON ANY OF THE THREE PROJECTS. MNDOT ACKNOWLEDGES THAT BASED ON PROJECT AWARD, NEGOTIATIONS RELATED TO KEY PERSONNEL MAY BE NECESSARY (IE. IF AWARDED THE SMALLEST OF THE THREE PROJECTS, PROPOSED TEAM MAY NEED TO BE SCALED BACK).</p>	<p>Section E</p> <p>MICROSOFT EXCEL SPREAD SHEET</p> <p>[2 PAGES]</p>	10
Quality Management Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A project specific Quality Management Plan (QMP) that will be used on the project. The QMP must specify how Responder will perform Quality 	<p>Section F</p> <p>QMP: ANY</p>	10



	<p>Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) activities throughout the duration of the project to ensure delivery of a quality product in a timely manner that conforms to established contract requirements.</p> <p>The project specific QMP must be developed in accordance with MnDOT's current QMP Manual located at: www.dot.state.mn.us/design/gmp/index.html</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify items that exceed the minimum requirements of the MnDOT QMP. 	<p>FORMAT [UP TO 10 PAGES]</p>	
--	---	------------------------------------	--

REQUIRED FORMS INFORMATION

Criteria	Description	Format	Points
Forms and Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affidavit of Noncollusion Conflict of Interest Checklist and Disclosure Veteran-Owned Preference Affirmative Action Data Page 	<p>Section G</p> <p>ADOBE ACROBAT FILLABLE FORMS (links to documents are in the Description Column to the left)</p> <p><i>NOT INCLUDED IN PAGE LIMIT</i></p>	N/A

COST PROPOSAL INFORMATION

Criteria	Description	Format	Points
<p>Cost Proposal</p> <p>Submit a separate cost proposal for each project. You will have three separate envelopes labeled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost Proposal Project 1 - Cost Proposal Project 2 - Cost Proposal Project 3 	<p>For purposes of completing the cost proposal, MnDOT does not make regular payments based upon the passage of time; it only pays for services performed or work delivered after it is accomplished. Terms of the proposal as stated must be valid for the length of the project. If proposing an hourly rate, unit rate or lump sum, include a breakdown (labor, overhead, profit & expenses) showing how the rate was derived. If proposing a cost plus fixed fee (profit) budget, the responder's Overhead Rate must not exceed 160%. The responder must utilize their current MnDOT approved Overhead rate, not to exceed 160%. For the</p>	<p>Section H</p> <p>ANY FORMAT</p> <p>Provide, in a separate envelope, one copy of the cost proposal, clearly marked on the outside "Cost Proposal", along with the</p>	10



<p>MnDOT reserves the right to utilize any of the three projects in relation to the cost allocation.</p> <p>Final rates will be negotiated. In no event will the negotiated hourly rates exceed the hourly rates presented in the cost proposals.</p>	<p>purposes of this Cost Proposal, responders should utilize a fixed fee (profit) of 10%. Actual fixed fee (profit) will be determined/calculated by MnDOT upon selection. The responder must include a total project cost along with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A breakout of the hours by task for each employee. • Identification of anticipated direct expenses. • Identification of any assumption made while developing this cost proposal. • Identification of any cost information related to additional services or tasks, include this in the cost proposal but identify it as additional costs and do not make it part of the total project cost. • Responder must have the cost proposal signed in ink by authorized member of the firm. The responder must not include any cost information within the body of the RFP technical proposal response. 	<p>responder's official business name and address.</p> <p><i>NOT INCLUDED IN PAGE LIMIT</i></p>	
---	--	---	--

Responders must limit their proposal to the page limits as identified above. Excess pages will not be reviewed and evaluated.

Questions

Responders who have any questions regarding this RFP must submit questions by e-mail only to:

Melissa McGinnis, Contract Administrator
melissa.mcginis@state.mn.us

All questions and answers will be posted on MnDOT's Consultant Services Web Page at www.dot.state.mn.us/consult under the "P/T Notices" section. All prospective responders will be responsible for checking the web page for any addendums to this RFP and any questions that have been answered. **Note that questions will be posted verbatim as submitted.**

Questions regarding this RFP must be received by MnDOT no later than 2:00 p.m. Central Standard Time on January 17, 2012.

MnDOT anticipates posting answers to such questions no later than 2:00 p.m. Central Standard Time on January 19, 2012.

No other MnDOT personnel are allowed to discuss the RFP before the proposal submission deadline. Contact regarding this RFP with any personnel not listed above may result in disqualification.

Proposal Submittal

All proposals must be mailed (United States Postal Service), expressed (UPS, FedEx or other



similar express carrier) or dropped off to the attention of:

Melissa McGinnis, Contract Administrator
Minnesota Department of Transportation
395 John Ireland Boulevard
Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

All proposals must be received no later 2:00 p.m. Central Standard Time on January 26, 2012. Please note that MnDOT procedures do not allow non-MnDOT employees to have access to the elevators or the stairs. You should plan enough time and follow these instructions for drop-off:

- Enter through the Rice Street side of the Central Office building (1st Floor).
- Once you enter through the doors, you should walk straight ahead to the Information Desk.
- **Proposals are accepted at the Information Desk only.** The receptionist will call the Contract Administrator to come down and to time stamp the proposal.

SPECIAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS		
Submit 7 copies of the proposal as follows:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal must NOT include a binding, cover letter or additional documentation. • Proposal should be a single sided print out of the following documents (filled out as identified in the Proposal Content Section and stapled in the upper left hand corner): 		
Section	Description	Format and Number of Pages
A	General Information	ADOBE ACROBAT FILLABLE FORM [1 PAGE]
B	Project Understanding	ADOBE ACROBAT FILLABLE FORM [2 PAGES]
C	Key Personnel Qualifications / Experience	ORG CHART: ANY FORMAT [1 PAGE] + ADOBE ACROBAT FILLABLE FORM [1 PAGE PER KEY PERSONNEL]
D	Experience with Similar Project(s) <i>*Provide 3 sample projects.</i>	ADOBE ACROBAT FILLABLE FORM [6 PAGES]
E	Availability of Qualified Personnel	MICROSOFT EXCEL SPREAD SHEET [6 PAGES] 11x17
F	Quality Management Plan	ANY FORMAT [UP TO 10 PAGES]
INCLUDE IN SEPARATE ENVELOPE		
G	<i>Forms and Documents</i>	ADOBE ACROBAT FILLABLE FORMS NOT INCLUDED IN PAGE LIMIT
H	<i>Cost Proposal</i>	ANY FORMAT NOT INCLUDED IN PAGE LIMIT
Proposals are to be submitted in a sealed mailing envelope or package, clearly marked		



“Proposal” on the outside. An authorized member of the firm must sign each copy of the proposal in ink. **A signature line is provided in Section A General Requirements.**

Proposal Evaluation

Representatives of MnDOT will evaluate all responses received by the deadline. In some instances, an interview may be part of the evaluation process. A 100-point scale will be used to create the final evaluation recommendation.

The Factors and Weighting on Which Proposals Will Be Judged

Criteria	Points
Project Understanding	10
Key Personnel Qualifications / Experience	30
Experience with Similar Project(s)	30
Availability of Qualified Personnel	10
Quality Management Plan	10
Cost Proposal	10

Proposals will be evaluated on a “best value” basis with 90% qualifications and 10% cost considerations. The review committee will not open the cost proposal until after the qualifications points are awarded.

**General Information
(THIS SECTION WAS THE SAME AS ALL RFPS)**

PROPOSAL CONTENT INFORMATION FORMS (FOLLOWING PAGES):



PROPOSAL CONTENT INFORMATION

SECTION A. GENERAL INFORMATION **ONE PAGE LIMIT**

1. REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL INFORMATION

RFP TITLE _____

2. RESPONDER POINT OF CONTACT

NAME AND TITLE _____

NAME OF FIRM _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER _____ FAX NUMBER _____ E-MAIL ADDRESS _____

3. IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDER AND SUBCONTRACTOR RELATIONSHIP(S)

(Complete this section for the prime contractor and all key subcontractors proposed for this project.)

a.	(Check)		FIRM NAME	ADDRESS	ROLE IN THIS CONTRACT
	PRIME	SUBCONTRACTOR			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF BRANCH OFFICE		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF BRANCH OFFICE		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF BRANCH OFFICE		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF BRANCH OFFICE		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF BRANCH OFFICE		

AUTHORIZED MEMBER OF THE FIRM (PRINT NAME) _____ SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____



PROPOSAL CONTENT INFORMATION

SECTION B. PROJECT UNDERSTANDING [REVISED]

SIX PAGE LIMIT (2 PAGES PER PROJECT)

PROJECT UNDERSTANDING

Provide a statement of the objectives, goals, and tasks to show or demonstrate the Responder's view of the nature of each project.

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin white border, intended for the responder to provide a statement of objectives, goals, and tasks for the project.



PROPOSAL CONTENT SECTION

SECTION C. KEY PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS / EXPERIENCE **1 PAGE LIMIT PER PERSON**

Complete a separate Section C for each team member proposed to work on the project.

1. KEY PERSONNEL

NAME	ROLE IN THIS CONTRACT	YEARS EXPERIENCE	
		TOTAL	WITH CURRENT FIRM
FIRM NAME AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>			
EDUCATION <i>(DEGREE AND SPECIALIZATION)</i>		CURRENT PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION <i>(STATE AND DISCIPLINE)</i>	
OTHER PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS <i>(Publications, Organizations, Training, Awards, etc.)</i>			

2. RELEVANT PROJECTS

	TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	YEARS COMPLETED	
		START DATE <i>mm/dd/yyyy</i>	END DATE <i>mm/dd/yyyy</i>
a.	BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.) AND SPECIFIC ROLE</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Check if project performed with current firm	
	TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	YEARS COMPLETED	
		START DATE <i>mm/dd/yyyy</i>	END DATE <i>mm/dd/yyyy</i>
b.	BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.) AND SPECIFIC ROLE</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Check if project performed with current firm	
	TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	YEARS COMPLETED	
		START DATE <i>mm/dd/yyyy</i>	END DATE <i>mm/dd/yyyy</i>
c.	BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.) AND SPECIFIC ROLE</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Check if project performed with current firm	
	TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	YEARS COMPLETED	
		START DATE <i>mm/dd/yyyy</i>	END DATE <i>mm/dd/yyyy</i>
d.	BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.) AND SPECIFIC ROLE</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Check if project performed with current firm	



PROPOSAL CONTENT SECTION

SECTION D. EXPERIENCE WITH SIMILAR PROJECTS **SIX PAGE LIMIT**

Present 3 similar projects.

TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	START DATE	END DATE
--	------------	----------

1. PROJECT OWNER'S INFORMATION

PROJECT OWNER	POINT OF CONTACT NAME	POINT OF CONTACT TELEPHONE NUMBER
---------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND RELEVANCE TO THIS CONTRACT *(include scope, size, and cost)*



PROPOSAL CONTENT SECTION

SECTION D. EXPERIENCE WITH SIMILAR PROJECTS

2. KEY PERSONNEL (FROM PROPOSED TEAM) INVOLVED WITH THIS PROJECT

a. NAME CLASSIFICATION FIRM

ROLE

b. NAME CLASSIFICATION FIRM

ROLE

c. NAME CLASSIFICATION FIRM

ROLE

d. NAME CLASSIFICATION FIRM

ROLE

e. NAME CLASSIFICATION FIRM

ROLE

f. NAME CLASSIFICATION FIRM

ROLE

g. NAME CLASSIFICATION FIRM

ROLE



APPENDIX B

Feedback Session for D4 Pilot June 7, 2012

A feedback session for the D4 Pilot was held on June 7, 2012. The following attended the session:

Dawn Thompson	MnDOT (ACEC – MnDOT Collaboration Team Co-Chair & Facilitator)
Randy Geerdes	SRF (ACEC – MnDOT Collaboration Team Co-Chair)
Brad Hamilton	MnDOT (Facilitator)
Dave Sonnenberg	Stanley Consultants (Participant)
Ryan Allers	HR Green (Participant)
Pat McGraw	Stantec (Participant)
Tom Parker	Jacobs (Participant)
Don Demers	SRF (Participant)
Mark Benson	S.E.H. (Participant)
Kevin Cullen	TKDA (Participant)
Tim Chalupnik	TKDA (Participant)
Bob Green	Alliant (Participant)
Jack Broz	HR Green (Participant)
Bob Busch	WSN (Participant)
Ashley Duran	MnDOT (Feedback Recorder)
Debbie Anderson	MnDOT (Feedback Recorder)
Melissa McGinnis	MnDOT (Feedback Recorder)
Kelly Arneson	MnDOT (Feedback Recorder)

The following was the agenda for the session:

- ❖ Welcome
- ❖ Introductions
- ❖ Review Original Intent of Pilot
 - Streamline Proposal Review for MnDOT Selection Committee
 - Working toward electronic proposal submittals
 - Alleviate consultant time and expense
 - In the future, cut down on MnDOT administrative resources
 - Reduce subjectivity
- ❖ Facilitated Feedback Session
 1. What questions arose as you were developing your proposal?
 2. What sections of the RFP or submission requirements did you find challenging?
 3. What about the RFP or submission requirements worked well?
 4. What are some issues regarding this RFP format that need further discussion?



5. In the future, what could MnDOT do to improve the standardized proposal format process?
 6. What situations/projects would be best suited for this type of RFP?
 7. What are your general comments regarding this pilot?
- ❖ Wrap up – What happens next?

The following is simply a recording of the feedback gathered at the session (participants were divided into two groups). Numbers correspond to the seven questions above. These questions were utilized to initiate and focus the discussion. There are some gaps in delineating which responses were from what question because the group jumped around a great deal.

Feedback Group 1:

1. What questions arose as you were developing your proposal?
 - How do we put together a focused proposal for 3 projects?
 - Do we put together a team for one or a team for all?
 - Team approach for 3 projects difficult for costs
 - Do we present a team for all three projects or focus on our strongest project and present that team?
 - Teams would be slightly different for each project. We would propose differently if projects were separated.
 - Project understanding for three projects – 2 pages is not enough room
 - Clash between standardized proposal format and three projects – maybe one or the other? ALL projects were different.
 - Don't have a generic PM/team that would fit all three projects
 - May be unfair to firms – might be very qualified for one project but not the others – may be short-sided.
 - Consultants would like to have choice of submitting on one or more projects.
 - Separating projects would bring value to MnDOT.
 - Standardizing proposals seems like a great idea if using it on ONE project OR very similar projects. Did not view these three as the same...
 - 3 proposals – unfair with costs proposals...
 - Streamlining good but not with three projects
 - With three projects firms might not want to go for all three
 - Concern/questions about how forms worked...not expandable boxes – limited to certain size boxes.
 - Resume section was limited. Questioned that graphics and photos could not be used.
 - Were able to cut and paste text...IF it fit...
 - Cost estimate for each project – score only on one...this was confusing. Did not get any value for this method. What reasoning behind this? What was the intent?
 - Maybe should rank proposals technically first then bring in costs for each project.
 - Would it have been a lot more work to open all three costs? One at a time would have been a better focus and value for MnDOT.



2. What sections of the RFP or submission requirements did you find challenging?

- Availability of personnel worksheet – have heard from a MnDOT staff member that this is extremely subjective...hi opinion is to remove availability from selection
- Hard to see value in this (availability portion)
- Availability is interpreted in so many different ways...Need bigger discussion on this.
- Availability is HIGHLY subjective...does not go toward MnDOT goal and intent...consultants tend to put what MnDOT wants to hear. They realize that MnDOT does not want a bait and switch.
- Calculation is based on 40 hours. This is unrealistic...they work much more than 40.
- Best people can be on more than one proposal at a time...they won't get all of them...
- Maybe should look at control over personnel changes like in DB language.
- Why are we doing availability of personnel? What value do we get out of this? Tehn maybe we can address this issue.
- Understanding/Approach – cannot separate your firm in 2 pages per project. Section should be larger.
- Get away from costs...look at qualifications.
- Just look at people – more QBS
- MnDOT needs to put very comprehensive scopes together if costs are included.
- How can you have ONE scope for THREE projects...these are different...
- More flexibility needed on resume section. One page per person is okay but should not take up half page with intro/basic info. Give page limit and let consultants decide what to put in. Ability to expand boxes gives more flexibility on HOW to use the pages while still keeping it standard.
- QMP – page limit was restrictive. MnDOT needs to be more specific on what they want for this. Does selection committee know consistently what MnDOT wants? Are they on board with approach? Make sure RFP states exactly what is expected from QMP so selection committee is on board. Maybe some education needs to take place on QMP
- Raters need a basis for ratings – a lot of things are subjective
- For example on QMP – if there are 10 points allocated, maybe you get 5 points for a basic required QMP and then you get more if you are project specific...need guidelines on this.
- RFP scoring criteria needs to be more specific ...to get 9-10 you need XXXX, to get 7-8 you need XXXX...so ratings are not so subjective
- Maybe consultants should have a QMP on file with MnDOT and then do project specific for each RFP
- A more standardized format means the less creativity.

3. What about the RFP or submission requirements worked well?

- Assumed it would be a format we used in the future if it is tweaked – it could involve more time and costs – need to come up with the form and teaks then it could be a cost and time savings



- Using a form maybe rubs some the wrong way because it does not provide for creativity and imagination
- It would be great to streamline something like this especially if it is straightforward project. This format definitely has a place...maybe not for every project.
- When there is a page limit – does it take more time to decide what goes into that space? It forces the consultant to prioritize
- Rally need to look at the projects – one size does not fit all.
- If standardized format is used, consultants would be able to bring over information from previous RFPs.
- If you are prequalified, why do you have to submit information that you already submitted?
- Maybe LOI could be standardized with a similar format...what becomes the differentiation? How does the committee choose?
- If using this form need a straightforward scope – well-defined.
- Not well-suited for pre-design
- Every project use resume format – why not? Everyone would be the same. Maybe standardize some...just not creativity parts.

7. What are your general comments regarding this pilot?

- What can we do to make life easier for MnDOT AND Consultants?
- Intent is good. Disappointed that ACEC was not given opportunity to look at this before and provide feedback before pilot.
- MnDOT needs to step back and see what they really want out of this.
- In general like the idea of standardized format – pieces of it. Do not limit creativity.
- Some projects can be easy to combine – 3 separate projects did not work. Streamlining good as long as creativity stays. QMP – make as a pre-qual and have on file.
- Large firm goes about things differently as far as submitting for projects. Standardized might be beneficial for smaller firms as they do not have the same marketing capabilities as larger firms.
- Like simplicity if it is done right.
- Need expandable boxes for personnel.
- Creativity is proposal is VERY important.
- Keep to one project only!
- Project approach/understanding needs to have a large place to respond
- Work plans and scopes need to be written better

Feedback Group 2:

1. What questions arose as you were developing your proposal?

2. What sections of the RFP or submission requirements did you find challenging?

- What are MnDOT/CS issues currently?
- Workload? Have consultants been hired and not staffed a project well?
- In reality a consultant can pick up a new project a month after being selected.



- Consultant workload analysis piece – cumbersome, does it really matter? Seems irrelevant. What is the history of issues? Asked for 12 months but project was 30 months – does not add up.
 - Should be able to just state “we will staff project.”
 - Consultant community does not understand the benefit of this information
 - Some spreadsheet elements did not add up and match RFP from the pre-proposal meeting.
 - 1 project vs 3 – only interested in one but had to propose on all. Did not work and was confusing.
 - Why does MnDOT need another structure process? LOI, RFP have worked and worked well for years.
 - Why wasn’t there a project approach in the new format?
 - Very vague scope – how can you develop a cost proposal?
 - Seems like QBS but with a cost. Doesn’t seem appropriate. Was effort on the cost proposal worth it if we did not make past proposal stage?
 - We need a detailed scope if we have to submit a cost.
 - Can’t you formulize a rotation list?
2. What sections of the RFP or submission requirements did you find challenging?
- Individual resumes form was very limiting and frustrating
 - Workload analysis piece
 - No project approach just does not work
 - If you are going to bundle projects, we need the ability & flexibility to pick and choose what we want to submit on and have a clear indication of how we submit one one/two/all. Can we list preference? For example, bundling 3 mill and overlays seems appropriate. Bundling these was not.
 - Separate them so we can choose our strengths and weaknesses
 - Bridge office bundling is a good example. Those work well. Better criteria on when to bundle a good idea.
 - A firm not qualified on all projects has to team – which is even more difficult and it wouldn’t make sense when they really don’t want one of the projects.
 - Teaming added new issues and an added layer of difficulty
 - 11 submittals were surprising. Maybe because teaming was so necessary.
3. What about the RFP or submission requirements worked well?
- Lining copies and not having to bind was less expensive and good
 - Electronic proposition is beneficial – would be nice to get there.
 - Format only nice if we are going to do it again – can reuse a lot.
 - Sections where we can do our own thing is good (QMP, org chart)
 - MnDOT listened in pre-proposal meeting about page limits – thank you
 - Local pre-proposal meeting was good
 - Background info provided was good



- Response time was more than adequate
- Planning studies provided were outstanding

4. What are some issues regarding this RFP format that need further discussion?

- Reference past discussions...
- Limitations of expandable boxes – fillable forms issues – are these really necessary?
- Page limits is much preferred – limiting characters is cumbersome and frustrating

5. In the future, what could MnDOT do to improve the standardized proposal format process?

- Get rid of fillable forms – use page limits
- Allow graphics
- LOI is a much better model for a standardized format
- Workload analysis – does this really solve any issues?
- Spreadsheet just does not seem useful
- Are you trying to spread the work around? If so this does not seem to solve that. You are really never going to know a consultant's future work – so how does it help? Toss it out.
- Workload not necessary – we are all busy and we always will be. If we need to hire more staff, we will.
- Businesses do not work on 40 hour weeks.
- Form does not capture true business model – we do not think this can be fixed in this process
- Question of capacity? Spreading work? How are you even scoring this information?
- We need clear information on how bundled projects would be rated.
- Need a project approach section.
- How do you assign points? Who makes that decision? This structure seems like that would leave a gap. For example, only 6 months with firm but the past 30 years elsewhere did not matter. Does not seem fair.
- Challenging when people move around – scoring the team.
- Used to put more emphasis on people not team. Now it seems like more team/company than people. Does not seem fair or right.
- Being about the firm and the legacy in this new process is a clear difference from MnDOT history.
- Take a look at the requirement.
- Make sure you are not leaving any gray areas. Make it clear what you are proposing.
- Just having it worth 30 points did not tell everyone the importance – but others realized that being worth so much they needed to pay close attention their team.
- Seems like not teaming is key in this structure – but it does not seem like that was MnDOT's goal...
- Only allowing three project examples was not great



6. What situations/projects would be best suited for this type of RFP?

- Mill and overlays good for bundling
- Bridge or roadway good for bundling
- Final design of bridges
- When you do not need creativity or innovation – standard format okay
- Size, complexity, and type of design matters
- The real good fit for this are PQ type projects, so this seems redundant to the PQ
- Prefer to stick to original intent and process of PQ
- Really don't think there is a place for this process
- Seems good for on-call type work
- Was spreading work around part of intent?
- Is follow-on work something MnDOT is trying to deter? Will that no longer be allowed? There have been rumblings in the consultant world. It is not fair for the consultants not to know if this is the case.
- "Reduce subjectivity" initiative just does not make sense. That should be part of these processes.
- Bundling was overwhelming – required a lot of research and time.
- Rating criteria/benchmarks in the DB world are provided to potential responders – that helps a lot. Seems very secretive in this process.
- What do you do when you look at all raters and notice extreme differences or an outlier that makes a big impact on end results?
- Raters seem to be all over the place – no consistency.

7. What are your general comments regarding this pilot?

- Was pilot intent communicated to consultant community before pilot went out? That would have made a big difference.
- This caused a lot of work – way more than expected – probably more than MnDOT knows.
- Just "trying" stuff like this is not okay. We need consistency and this is a lot of work if it is not continued.
- I vote we stay with the processes we have
- Keep reasonable, consistent page limits
- Work toward electronic submittals
- A New 20 page LOI was put out. WHY???? That is proposal size and does not make sense.
- Not saving time and expense on a process like this. Trying to stuff 10lbs in a 5lb bag.
- Can't we just continue down road already on and make tweaks where necessary?
- It would have been nice to have face to face with MnDOT on this process to hear their opinions
- Concept of streamlining RFPs is good – but this process does not get us there.
- A streamlined process is only going to work for a more standardized type of work.



- Let us pull resumes we already have.
- Why no shortlisting with 11 responders? That seems extreme?
- Interview process – would be nice for the RFP to actually state why and when that would be necessary or possible.

**Feedback Session for D4 Pilot (MnDOT)
July 18, 2012**

A feedback session for the D4 Pilot was held on July 18, 2012. The following MnDOT personnel involved in the selection committee for this project attended the session:

Jody Martinson	District 4
Shiloh Wahl	District 4
Seth Yliniemi	District 4
Mike Tardy	District 1
Cal Puttbrese	District 3
Jeff Brunner	Central Office
Dawn Thompson	ACEC – MnDOT Collaboration Team Co-Chair & Facilitator
Brad Hamilton	Facilitator
Kelly Arneson	Recorder

The following was the agenda for the session:

- ❖ Welcome
- ❖ Introductions
- ❖ Review Original Intent of Pilot
 - Streamline Proposal Review for MnDOT Selection Committee
 - Working toward electronic proposal submittals
 - Alleviate consultant time and expense
 - In the future, cut down on MnDOT administrative resources
 - Reduce subjectivity
- ❖ Feedback Session
 1. What questions arose as you were reviewing proposals?
 2. What worked well with the new rating sheets? What could be improved?
 3. Regarding the criteria listed on the rating sheets: Was this helpful? Was it comprehensive and useful? What could be done to improve rating sheets?
 4. What about the RFP or submission requirements worked well?
 5. What are some issues regarding this RFP format that need further discussion?
 6. In the future, what could MnDOT do to improve the standardized proposal format process?
 7. What situations/projects would be best suited for this type of RFP?
 8. What are your general comments regarding this pilot?



The following is simply a recording of the feedback gathered at the session. Numbers correspond to the 8 questions above. These questions were utilized to initiate and focus the discussion.

General comments:

Intent of this pilot

- Wanted to spread the work around and wanted to be up-front about this
- Standard proposal format to streamline the review of proposals

1. What questions arose as you were reviewing proposals?

- If they didn't want 1 of the 3 projects it was hard to rate, they didn't have a good project understanding, but may have done a nice job on the other 2. It really hurt their scores overall.
- It seemed difficult for consultants to apply for all 3 and do a good job on all 3. For MnDOT it was nice, only had to review 1 proposal instead of 3 proposals.
- Limiting pages and putting it in standard format streamlined the process well.
- Would like to see 3 separate scores for project understanding...would this be possible?
- Hurt small companies having to apply for all 3, do not have the capacity to apply and do a good job on all 3.
- 1 bad project understanding or proposal really hurt their overall score.
- In the future why would the consultants have to propose on all 3 projects if they are only interested in 1 project?
- Would like to see flexibility in the future on what they can propose on, it would further streamline the process.
- Toughest section to rate was the project understanding.
- Page limit for the project understanding (given 2 pages per project) was enough for the reviewers.

2. What worked well with the new rating sheets? What could be improved?

- Liked the fact you have to check a box that if it is a strength or weakness, so it is clearer to the consultants.
- Liked the range of the scores, allows reviewers to be more consistent.
- More room to write comments
- Normalizes the scores, what is very good, good, fair, etc. - more consistent scores from the reviewers.

- Hard to put comments for all 3 comments in one rating sheet, made copies to have them separate to keep it straight in their head when reviewing (mainly in the project understanding portion).



3. Regarding the criteria listed on the rating sheets; was this helpful? Was it comprehensive and useful? What would be done to improve the rating sheets?
 - It was helpful as a group to sit down before reviewing to all get on the same page. It helped to get a real idea for what we are looking for (developing the rating criteria).
 - Do not think that all pre-design needs to be the same criteria, it should be project specific but good to have the group sit down and talk about it first.
 - Criteria and rating sheet set-up helped normalize the group on what they are rating.
 - Helped reviewers see if the consultant hit on all of the things that were requested in the proposal.
 - Should this criteria been provided to the consultants ahead of time to know what we will be rating on. – yes. Others say no... let the good ones come to the top. It is given to them in a debriefing after the fact. So in time the good criteria would be used on several proposals and they would get a hang of what MnDOT is looking for. It would be a lot harder to rate them since they all would be writing all of the same responses...if MnDOT provided the detailed criteria.

4. What about the RFP submission requirements worked well? (focus on the format)
 - Everything
 - Page limits, if no limits they can be too wordy
 - Standardize format, knew where to look for the information, only rated for a specific category only on the response where it was supposed to be, not if they listed it in another place on the proposal.
 - MnDOT needs to identify who the key personnel (5-6 people not everyone who would work on it) we want to see the information/resumes on. Gets long looking at a huge teams' resumes and we do not need them.
 - Recommend an interview for the top 2-3 candidates; come up with questions when reviewing the proposal that could get the clarification you are looking for. Can really tell a lot by the interview, how the teams work together.
 - If within a few points spread, then would like to bring in the firms for an interview. Valuable to see the teams in the interview.
 - Interview helps choose the right consultant for the right project.
 - These were large \$ contracts...it was worth having the interviews.
 - Do not see the value of interview if 1 consultant is by far in the lead, then it is just a waste of time.

5. What are the some issues regarding this RFP format that need further discussion?
 - No major issues, knew where to find the things
 - Can imagine that the consultants had issues with the format.
 - Very well put together



6. In the future what could MnDOT do to improve the standardized proposal format process?
 - Identify which key people MnDOT wants to see, do not give them free range.
 - Think that 2 pages per project is enough for project understanding, if they are doing their job they should be able to do a good job with 2 pages per project.

 7. What situations/projects would be best suited for this type of RFP?
 - The 3 projects worked well together. Similar work that has been done to each.
 - Ones that have similar scopes of services, deliverables and complexity.
 - Think what was done with this one was good. Result was good and got good consultants to do the work.
 - Process seemed fair and level playing field.
 - Does not necessarily have to be from the same location as long as the projects are similar.

 8. What are your general comments regarding this pilot?
 - Good streamlining thing to have different folks from different districts to review.
 - Spent a great deal of time reviewing even though there was page limits, but would have done more time reviewing if they submitted individually
 - Have to think that it was time saved on both consultants and MnDOT.
 - Have the ability to cut and paste in the proposals saves the consultant time and money.
-



APPENDIX C

RATING SHEETS/CRITERIA USED IN PILOT

Responder Name: _____ Evaluator Name: _____

Project Understanding		
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent 9-10		<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good 7-8 points
<input type="checkbox"/> Good 5-6 points		<input type="checkbox"/> Fair 3-4 points
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor 1-2 points		Score: (max 10)
<u>Strength</u>	<u>Weak-ness</u>	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



Project Understanding Criteria to be considered:

- a) Responder provides clear evidence of understanding the project requirements.
- b) The responder's awareness of the relevant standards, procedures and guidance documents impacting the specific project.
- c) Any innovative ideas – when considering this factor in rating responders, the type of project and the relevance of this factor to the project must be considered.
- d) Did the responder demonstrate a clear understanding of the key elements of the project (see key element sheet from PM)?
- e) Did the responder adequately address through the response to the RFP that they were allocating appropriate and sufficient staff resources or qualified sub consultants to address the key elements as they perceived them?
- f) Does the responder provide explanation of the project including logical approach to project tasks and issues?
- g) Responder must demonstrate the comprehension of the project objectives and services required. Do not merely duplicate the goals and objectives stated in the RFP.
- h) Are expressed or implied schedules attainable/economically practical, etcetera?
- i) Are assumptions well thought out and defined?
- j) Responder demonstrates a clear understanding of the work required for each task.



Key Personnel Qualifications/Experience		
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent 25-30		<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good 19-24 points
<input type="checkbox"/> Good 13-18 points		<input type="checkbox"/> Fair 7-12 points
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor 1-6 points		Score: (max 30)
<u>Strength</u>	<u>Weak-ness</u>	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



Key Personnel Qualifications/Experience Criteria to Consider:

- a) Required Licensure or certifications
- b) Consider number of years' experience for PM and key staff
- c) Consider number of projects of a certain magnitude or complexity
- d) Consider quantity AND quality of experience of project manager and key staff proposed for the project.
- e) The education, training and experience of the responder's professional and technical staff with respect to the magnitude and the requirements of the project.
- f) Familiarity of the responder with applicable federal, state, and local regulations, criteria, standards and procedures with respect to planning, design and approval of the project.
- g) The proposed project manager for each responder must be evaluated based on each project manager's experience on similar projects, and past performance for the Department. Scoring should consider the relative importance of the project manager's role in the success of project.
- h) The project manager's role in simple projects may be less important than for a complex project, and scoring should reflect this, with higher differential scores assigned to projects that place more importance on the role of the project manager.
- i) The experience and strength of the proposed staff, including sub consultant staff, should be evaluated and based on the named individuals' specific expertise relative to the project requirements, experience on similar projects, and past performance for the Department.
- j) Project Manager and key team members are qualified to perform the work categories on the project.
- k) Consider teams knowledge of standards and procedures.
- l) Computer capability of the responder and team (GeoPak, Microstation drafting software, etc).
- m) Consider quantity AND quality of qualifications and capability of key sub consultants
- n) What is the knowledge and experience of the responder's team with these types of projects?
- o) Did the responder list comparable projects they have been involved with?
- p) All appropriate areas of expertise are clearly explained and covered by the proposed project team.
- q) Consider the quantity AND quality of experience of the responder's team in performing specific services related to this project.
- r) Consider the team organization, structure and previous experience working as a team on this type of project.
- s) Experienced in working with multi-disciplinary teams and diverse entities.



Experience with Similar Project (s)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent 25-30		<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good 19-24 points
<input type="checkbox"/> Good 13-18 points		<input type="checkbox"/> Fair 7-12 points
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor 1-6 points		Score: (max 30)
<u>Strength</u>	<u>Weak-ness</u>	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



Experience with Similar Projects Criteria to Consider:

- a) Knowledge and productivity in the technical area(s) relevant to the particular project. These skills should be derived both from formal education and training and from successful experience in applying the required technical skills on prior similar projects for similar clients.
- b) Responder shows evidence that the individuals have already produced solutions and results that are practical, realistic and useful to clients as they apply or relate to the specific needs of this project.
- c) The responder successfully demonstrates previous work performed to support achievement of the work required.
- d) Key staff of the prime and sub consultants clearly shows applicability and similarity to the proposed project.
- e) Previous experience demonstrates expertise in developing and providing advice, representation and assistance to government agencies.
- f) Previous experience demonstrates responder's ability to accomplish a similar project within budget and with high quality deliverables that exceed the client's expectations.
- g) Previous experience clearly shows how service, objectives and deliverables from previous performance of projects directly reflect on how work will be accomplished for this project.
- h) Previous experience clearly demonstrates responder's expertise in a similar project.
- i) Responder shows experience in dealing with challenging conditions
- j) Responder shows experience with timely completion of comparable projects
- k) Responder shows experience with coordinating with businesses and other entities.



Availability of Qualified Personnel

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	Score: (max 10)
9-10	7-8 points	5-6 points	3-4 points	1-2 points	

<u>Strength</u>	<u>Weakness</u>	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



Availability of Qualified Personnel Criteria to Consider:

- a) The responder's team is adequately staffed and qualified to perform the work under consideration.
 - i) Evaluation of the responder's current workload and availability of qualified personnel must consider: the responder's active agreements with the Department including consideration of the size of the projects, percent complete, specific staff commitments and work types.
 - ii) Current performance issues on MnDOT or local government projects that indicate failure to deliver projects on schedule should be considered.
 - iii) The responder's known commitments on local government or other projects that may impact the ability of the responder to appropriately staff the project under consideration.
 - iv) If previously selected for a project, the additional workload and staff commitments required by the previous selection should be considered in any further consideration of that responder for additional selections. Differing work types should be considered in determining the effects on a responder's workload – a prior selection may not impact the availability of qualified personnel if the work types are typically performed by staff members with differing skills.
 - v) The workload and staff commitments of significant sub consultants may be similarly considered if the work allocated to the sub consultant is vital to success of the project.
- b) Does the responder have adequate staff available to complete the project in an acceptable time frame?
- c) Are sub consultants available to complete the work in an acceptable time frame?
- d) Proposal clearly indicates that the proposed personnel will be available for the duration of the project.



Quality Management Plan

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	Score: (max 10)
9-10	7-8 points	5-6 points	3-4 points	1-2 points	

<u>Strength</u>	<u>Weakness</u>	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



QMP Criteria to Consider:

- a) A project specific Quality Management Plan (QMP) that will be used on the project must specify how Responder will perform Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) activities throughout the duration of the project to ensure delivery of a quality product in a timely manner that conforms to established contract requirements.
- b) The project specific QMP was correctly developed in accordance with MnDOT's current QMP Manual.
- c) Components of the QMP must include the following project specific items (as outlined in MnDOT's current QMP Manual) : A List of Requirements; Intent of the QMP; Philosophy of the QMP; Technical Document Review Process; Checking Procedures; Quality Control Verification; Definitions
- d) Approaches to quality
 - i) How will cost and quality control be implemented and how will disciplines/responders be coordinated on our project.
 - ii) Project controls are set forth in the QMP that ensure overall Project quality.
 - iii) Assurances are stated, defined and backed up with specific examples and details.
 - iv) The responder clearly spells out how non-conformance aspects of the Project be handled.
 - v) QMP has strength and clarity and details what value is added and the project specific scalable components of size, risk and complexity.
 - vi) Responder's indicates specifically how the QMP will be applied to this project.
- e) Consider what items provided exceed minimum requirements of MnDOT QMP