

## LPA Consultant Selection Scoring Guidelines

Scorers must be agency representatives who are knowledgeable of the project and scoring process. Scorers must use their best judgment in reviewing and scoring consultant Letters of Interest and evaluating qualifications with the intent to identify the highest qualified firm. The default “at-standard” or “neutral” score for all situations in this process is “0” so that above and below standard qualifications will be clearly indicated. For example, the scoring system was designed based on the expectation that an average firm would generally receive a zero score.

- Those requested to score who believe they are not qualified should request to be replaced.
- Any person with a conflict of interest with any submitting firm cannot participate in the scoring process.
- Scorers should understand that they are participating in a federally approved consultant selection process titled “INDOT Architectural-Engineering Firm Selection Process for LPAs” (hereafter “LPA consultant manual”). Participating LPA’s should have an individual scoring team leader who is knowledgeable of this process.
- Scorers must thoroughly review and evaluate the letters of interest from all responsive firms. Interviews may be appropriate to help differentiate the qualifications and any other issues that may affect project delivery, such as the firm’s capacity. These should be carried out as outlined in the LPA consultant manual.
- Scorers must give equal consideration to all submitting firms and assign scores based on the letters of interest and other relevant information. Scorers may not base scores on anecdotal, unfounded or second hand information.
- The scoresheets used for scoring must match the one advertised in the RFP.
- Scorers may only assign whole number scores as listed with the criteria on the scoresheet.
- Scorers may not give preferential treatment based on past relationships or on location (other than as evaluated for location factor).
- When multiple scorers are involved it is preferable that scoring be performed independently. If multiple scorers do not score independently then a notation regarding this should be included on the scoring tabulation form.

Specific guidelines related to the evaluation criteria are as noted below.

### Past Performance

INDOT maintains a consultant performance database containing four years of INDOT and LPA project performance evaluation history for most types of consultant design services. When relevant INDOT data is available for a particular type of service it must be applied. LPA’s should contact INDOT to obtain performance averages upon receipt of consultant responses to an RFP. When there is no INDOT data available for a type of service then the scores for all firms will be “0” unless the LPA proposes use of data from other data sources which must be approved in advance by INDOT.

### Capacity of Team to do Work

Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time. Above standard scoring is to only be given for more than adequate capacity when the additional capacity will result in added value. This is not to be an evaluation based on the size of the firm. If a small firm has resource to deliver a project just as well as a large firm the firms should be evaluated equally. For example, *if you recognize, based on the consultant submittal, the*

## LPA Consultant Selection Scoring Guidelines

*identified project manager or project team is heavily booked with other ongoing projects you may want to evaluate a firm low. If you are aware that a consulting firm is not meeting project delivery schedules for other projects you may want to rate them low. If, based on the submission, you see that the consultant team is just finishing a significant project and has significant availability which will expedite a project in a beneficial way then you would rate the firm high. Lists of ongoing projects by the identified consultant team should typically a submittal requirement.*

### Team's Demonstrated Qualifications

Technical expertise: Unique Resources that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable. Above standard scoring shall only occur when unique expertise or resources will result in added value. Another example would be a firm's documented examples of cost saving designs where they had actually saved the owner cost and/or time, or had improved the design quality or constructability.

### Project Manager

Predicted ability of the project manager to manage the project, based on evaluation of the manager's prior experience as highlighted in the letter of interest, on information gathered from documented references and on any first hand experience with the manager's performance on prior work.

### Approach to Project

Project Understanding and Innovation that provides cost and/or time savings. This evaluation is to be based on the project understanding demonstrated in the letter of interest.

### Location

This evaluation is to be based on the distance between the firm's assigned responsible office location and the project.