

# **VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**



**ALTERNATIVE PROJECT DELIVERY  
DIVISION**

**PROGRESSIVE DESIGN-BUILD  
EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**Revised March 2022**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Key Terms.....	2
Introduction and Purpose of the Procedures .....	5
1.0 Security of Documents.....	5
2.0 Attendees at Evaluation Team Meetings .....	6
3.0 Evaluation Procedures .....	6
4.0 Scoring .....	9

## Key Terms

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

**Evaluation Documents** means the Score Sheet developed during the Sequestering and Scoring Meetings.

**Evaluation Team** means the team approved 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 to ensure conformance with current policies, procedures, and 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 Qualifications and/or Technical 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.

**Progressive Design-Build (PDB)** means a best value design-build procurement, followed by a process whereby the owner then “progresses” towards a design and lump sum contract price with the Design-Builder. The Design-Builder’s firm lump sum price cannot exceed the Guaranteed Maximum Price approved for the design-build contract.

**Project Manager - Alternative Project Delivery Division (PM-APD)** means VDOT’s designee for supervising procurement of 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.

**Proposal** 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 will include a Technical Proposal and Price Proposal as 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 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 Technical Proposals are scored and ranked.

**Sequestering Meeting** means the meeting at which Evaluation Team Members collectively discuss strengths and weaknesses of each SOQ or Technical 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 Offerors will be invited to submit a Technical Proposal in response to an RFP.

**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.

**Summary Notes** means an abridged narrative describing the qualitative review and analysis of the submittal with respect to each evaluation criteria.

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

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

**Technical Proposal** means the documents submitted by an Offeror in response to a Request for Proposal (RFP). Technical Proposals are valid only when properly signed and guaranteed. The Technical Presentation/Interview is a component of the Technical Proposal.

**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 Technical Proposals received by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) in response to Solicitations for Progressive Design-Build projects.

The purpose of the Guidelines is to ensure impartial and equitable evaluation for the purposes of Short-listing and/or final selection.

### 1.0 Security of Documents

The security of documents begins when the Department receives an Offeror's SOQ or Proposal. Documents received electronically via BidExpress.com will have an electronic date and time stamp. VDOT will date and time stamp hard copies of SOQs or Proposals at the time they are received and will insure timely receipt and compliance with delivery requirements as described in each solicitation.

Each member of the Evaluation Team and Technical Advisors will be issued a hard copy or electronic copy of each SOQ or Technical Proposal. Hard copies will be individually numbered so its custody can be tracked throughout the evaluation process. The PM-APD will use a distribution tracking log to monitor distribution and custody of hard copy or electronic documents. Each Evaluation Team Member and Technical Advisor will be responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of SOQs and Technical Proposals.

When working with the SOQs or Technical Proposals, Evaluation Team members and Technical Advisors will keep them under their direct control, and always secure their copy from others not associated with the Evaluation Team. Hard copies of SOQs or Technical Proposals shall be stored in a safe and secure location.

Anyone possessing copies of SOQs or Technical Proposals will:

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

All SOQs and Technical Proposals submitted by Offerors and Evaluation Documents developed by the Evaluation Team shall be kept confidential and stored in accordance with the above procedures. All SOQs, Technical Proposals and Evaluation Documents 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 hard copies of SOQs or Technical Proposals to the PM-APD.

## 2.0 Attendees at Evaluation Team Meetings

The Evaluation Team and PM-APD will attend all meetings pertaining to the evaluation of SOQs and Technical Proposals. Any information discussed during Evaluation Team meetings shall be kept confidential, including the Sequestering Meeting and the Scoring/Ranking Meeting.

An Administrative Services Division (ASD) representative will attend the Scoring/Ranking Meetings. The State Engineer APD or the Assistant State Engineer APD may attend the Sequestering Meetings and will attend the Scoring/ Ranking Meetings to provide programmatic oversight. All meetings pertaining to the evaluation and scoring of SOQs and Technical Proposals, including the Technical Presentations/Interviews, are closed to the public.

Due to extenuating circumstance, if a member of the Evaluation Team is absent for a Sequestering or Scoring/ Ranking Meeting, the following options will be considered:

- Delay the start of the meeting while attempting to contact the absent member.
- Allow the meeting to continue with only two members of the Evaluation Team. For a Scoring Meeting, no more than one member of the Evaluation Team may be absent.
- At the discretion of the State Engineer APD, in consultation with the PM-APD, cancel the meeting(s) and reschedule.

## 3.0 Evaluation Procedures

The evaluation criteria for a project will be published in the Solicitation. For an RFQ, the criteria should be consistent with the qualifications requested and may include the Offeror's team and organizational structure; demonstration of applicable experience, and identification of critical project risks. Technical Proposals should address the technical elements of the design and construction of the project. The Evaluation Team will review and evaluate Offeror's SOQs and Technical Proposals based on the evaluation criteria stipulated in the Solicitation.

### 3.1 Responsiveness Review

Verbal or written information exchanges may be desirable at different points after the release of the Solicitation. The Code of Federal Regulation allows information exchanges in the form of clarifications, communications, and discussion. VDOT will conduct information exchanges in accordance with the 23 CFR Parts 636 – Subpart D.

Upon receipt of SOQs or Technical Proposals, the PM-APD or designee will perform responsiveness review to ensure the SOQ or Technical Proposal was completed in accordance with the submittal requirements identified in the Solicitation. This will include verifying compliance with applicable governmental registrations and licensing requirements as outlined in the Solicitation. This review will focus on whether each SOQ or Technical Proposal meets administrative responsiveness requirements, for example, containing all necessary pages and mandatory forms and answers all necessary parts. This review may not identify other non-

responsive issues that may arise during the review of submittals by the Evaluation Team and/or Technical Advisors.

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

### **3.2 Distribution of SOQs and Technical Proposals**

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

- Attend all required evaluation meetings.
- Read and review each SOQ or Technical Proposal.
- Establish a consensus score for each SOQ or Technical 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 or their team members.
- Keep all documents secure.

Prior to the distribution of the SOQs or Technical Proposals, each Evaluation Team member and Technical Advisor will sign the applicable non-conflict of interest form, confidentiality agreement form, and certification they have read the Progressive Design-Build Evaluation Guidelines, comprehend these procedures, and agree to abide by the procedures set forth with regard to the evaluation of SOQs and Technical Proposals.

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

### **3.3 Evaluation**

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

### **3.4 Sequestering Meeting**

Prior to attending the Sequestering Meeting, each Evaluation Team member will individually review each SOQ or Technical Proposal in accordance with these Evaluation Guidelines. The Evaluation Team is expected to come to the Sequestering Meeting prepared to discuss the merits

of each SOQ or Technical Proposal. Unless extenuating circumstances warrant virtual meetings, the Sequestering Meetings will occur in-person at the VDOT Central Office. This stage of the evaluation process may take three (3) or more days to complete.

At the Sequestering Meetings the findings of the Technical Advisors will be presented and discussed related to each SOQ or Technical Proposal. The Evaluation Team will collectively discuss each Offeror's SOQ or Technical Proposal and prepare consensus Summary Notes for each evaluation criteria on a Score Sheet.

Prior to the conclusion of the Sequestering Meeting, a Score Sheet must be completed for each SOQ or Technical Proposal. The Evaluation Team will not assign scores to the SOQs or Technical Proposals at the Sequestering Meeting.

After each Technical Presentation/Interview, the Evaluation Team members will meet to collectively discuss the short-listed teams' response to questions and the overall interview relative to the evaluation criteria. Summary Notes with respect to the Technical Presentations/Interviews will be recorded on the Score Sheet.

### **3.6 Scoring/Ranking Meeting**

#### **3.6.1 Scoring Meeting - General**

The use of a consensus approach will be utilized to assign scores for each SOQ or Technical Proposal. Members of the Evaluation Team will not score SOQs or Technical Proposals individually. The Evaluation Team will arrive at a consensus as to assignment of points for each evaluation criterion. The consensus scores will be based on the evaluation criteria and the Summary Notes contained on each Score Sheet.

The consensus score for each criteria will be reached through a holistic approach by considering the entire body of the Summary Notes. Consensus scores and final tabulated results will be documented by the PM-APD. The Short-listing and/or final selection will be determined in accordance with the evaluation process established in the Solicitation. The Evaluation Team will not assign scores to any SOQ or Proposal relative to another SOQ or Proposal and shall consider each SOQ or Proposal on its own merits. The 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 State Engineer APD for approval by the Deputy Chief Engineer.

#### **3.6.2 RFQ Phase**

During the RFQ phase of the procurement, the Scoring/Ranking Meeting will typically be scheduled the day after the conclusion of the Sequestering Meeting unless additional time is needed due to schedule conflicts. At the Scoring/Ranking Meeting, the Evaluation Team will score and rank each SOQ based on the Summary Notes completed during the Sequestering Meeting in accordance with the rating guidance provided in Section 4.0 of this guide.

#### **3.6.3 RFP Phase – Initial Scoring Meeting**

During the RFP phase, the Initial Scoring Meeting will typically be scheduled the day after the conclusion of the Sequestering Meeting unless additional time is needed due to schedule conflicts.

At the Initial Scoring Meeting, the Evaluation Team will score each Technical Proposal, with the exception of the Technical Presentations/Interviews, based on Summary Notes completed during the Sequestering Meeting in accordance with the rating guidance provided in Section 4.0 of this guide.

### **3.6.4 RFP Phase – Final Scoring Meeting**

After the conclusion of the last interview, the Technical Presentations/Interviews will be scored based on the Summary Notes developed for each presentation/interview in accordance with the rating guidance provided in Section 4.0 of this guide. At this stage, any adjustments to the evaluation notes and scores from the Initial Scoring Meeting are permitted based on the Technical Presentations/Interviews. If a change is made to the initial score as a result of discussion during the Final Scoring Meeting, the Score Sheet will be modified using a strikethrough and a comment will be made to the Summary Notes to reflect the change.

## **4.0 Scoring**

The score of each SOQ or Proposal evaluation criterion is based on a rating scale of 1-10 as listed below. Scores can be recorded to the nearest half-point for the entire scoring range of 1-10.

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

### **Rating Guidance**

**9-10:** The Offeror has demonstrated an exceptional level of qualifications and/or experience needed to provide the scope of services. The Offeror has significantly exceeded the stated criteria in a way that is beneficial to the Department.

**6-8:** The Offeror has demonstrated an above average level of qualifications and/or experience needed to provide the scope of services. The Offeror has exceeded the stated criteria.

**4-5:** The Offeror has demonstrated a minimal to average level of qualifications and/or experience needed to provide the scope of services. The Offeror has met the stated criteria.

**1-3:** The Offeror has failed to demonstrate qualifications and/or experience needed to provide the scope of services. The Offeror has failed to meet the stated criteria and/or the Proposal lacks essential information, and is conflicting.