

# CITY OF *Beachwood*

25325 FAIRMOUNT BLVD • BEACHWOOD • OHIO 44122 • (216) 292-1901 • FAX (292) 292-1984

MAYOR  
MERLE S. GORDEN

May 10, 2016

Mr. Lou Hazapis, P.E.  
Planning & Engineering Administrator  
Ohio Department of Transportation D-12  
5500 Transportation Blvd.  
Garfield Heights, OH 44125

Re: Chagrin Blvd. /I-271 Interchange  
PID-102011

Dear Mr. Hazapis,

The City of Beachwood received proposals from four different consultants regarding the above referenced project. The Beachwood Service Department Staff reviewed the four proposals and selected GPD Group as the number one firm to provide the services that were advertised.

The City used ODOT evaluation criteria and the evaluation forms are included with this letter.

Please provide our Service Department at 216-292-1922 with some tentative dates so they can coordinate a Scope Meeting between ODOT, GPD Group and the Beachwood Service Department Staff to discuss the scope prior to their Fee Proposal Submittal.

Thank you and we look forward to working with you on this important project.

Sincerely,



Merle S. Gorden, Mayor

Enclosure

Cc: Brian Blayney, D-12  
Dale Pekarek, Service Director

# CITY OF *Beachwood*

25325 FAIRMOUNT BLVD • BEACHWOOD • OHIO 44122 • (216) 292-1901 • FAX (292) 292-1984

MAYOR  
MERLE S. GORDEN

May 10, 2016

Mr. Mo Darwish, P.E., Principal  
GPD Group  
5595 Transportation Blvd., Suite 100  
Cleveland, OH 44125

Re: Chagrin Blvd. /I-271 Interchange  
PID-102011

Dear Mr. Darwish,

The City of Beachwood received proposals from four different consultants regarding the above referenced project. The Beachwood Service Department Staff reviewed the four proposals and I am pleased to notify you that your firm was selected as the number one firm to provide the services that were advertised.

The City will be notifying ODOT of our selection and we will schedule a Scope Meeting between ODOT, your firm and the Beachwood Service Department Staff to discuss the scope prior to your Fee Proposal Submittal.

Thank you and expect to be contacted in the next few days to schedule the Scope Meeting.

Sincerely,



Merle S. Gorden, Mayor

Cc: Brian Blayney, D-12  
Dale Pekarek, Service Director

# Summary Sheet - CUY\_CHAGRIN BLVD.

	GPD Group	EL Robinson	JMT	McCormick Taylor
Service Director Dale Pekarek	98	72	79	76
Assistant Service Director Chris Arrietta	91	74	78	80
Assistant Superintendent LPA Chris Vild	95	78	82	79
Total Score	284	224	239	235

4/26/2016

Dale,

We need these letters  
sent to GPR and ODOT  
with your score sheets.

Ohio Department of Transportation  
D-12  
5500 Transportation Blvd.  
Garfield Heights, OH 44125

Attn.: Mr. Lou Hazapis, P.E.  
Planning and Engineering Administrator

Re: Chagrin Blvd. /I-271 Interchange  
PID-102011

Dear Mr. Hazapis,

The City of Beachwood received proposals from four different consultants regarding the above referenced project. City staff reviewed the four proposals and our staff selected GPD Group as the number one firm to provide the services that was advertised for.

The City used ODOT evaluation criteria and the evaluation forms are included with this letter.

Please provide us with some tentative dates so we can schedule a Scope Meeting between ODOT, GPD Group and City staff to discuss the Scope prior to their Fee Proposal Submittal.

Thank you and we look forward to work <sup>with</sup> you on this important project.

Respectfully,

Merle S. Gorden,  
Mayor

Cc: Brian Blayney, D-12

Ohio Department of Transportation  
D-12  
5500 Transportation Blvd.  
Garfield Heights, OH 44125

Attn.: Mr. Lou Hazapis, P.E.  
Planning and Engineering Administrator

Re: Chagrin Blvd. /I-271 Interchange  
PID-102011

Dear Mr. Hazapis,

The City of Beachwood received proposals from four different consultants regarding the above referenced project. City staff reviewed the four proposals and our staff selected GPD Group as the number one firm to provide the services that was advertised for.

The City used ODOT evaluation criteria and the evaluation forms are included with this letter.

Please provide us with some tentative dates so we can schedule a Scope Meeting between ODOT, GPD Group and City staff to discuss the Scope prior to their Fee Proposal Submittal.

Thank you and we look forward to work<sup>ing</sup> with you on this important project.

Respectfully,

Merle S. Gorden,  
Mayor

Cc: Brian Blayney, D-12

Chris,  
Send this letter to ODOT  
with the summary sheet and  
with all the evaluation sheets.



GPD Group  
5595 Transportation Blvd.  
Suite 100  
Cleveland, OH 44125

Attn.: Mr. Mo Darwish, P.E.  
Principal

Re: Chagrin Blvd. /I-271 Interchange  
PID-102011

Dear Mr. Darwish,

The City of Beachwood received proposals from four different consultants regarding the above referenced project. City staff reviewed the four proposals and we are pleased to notify you that our staff selected your firm as the number one firm to provide the services that ~~was~~ advertised for.

The City will be notifying ODOT of our selection and we will schedule a Scope Meeting between ODOT, your firm and City staff to discuss the ~~S~~cope prior to your Fee Proposal Submittal.

Thank you and we will contact you in the next few days to schedule the ~~S~~cope Meeting.

Respectfully,

Merle S. Gorden,  
Mayor

Cc: Brian Blayney, D-12

Chris,

Send this letter  
to GPD.



# Summary Sheet – CUY\_CHAGRIN BLVD.

	GPD Group	EL Robinson	JMT	McCormick Taylor
Service Director Dale	Scores = 98	72	79	76
Assistant Service Director CHRIS A.	91	74	78	80
ASST SUPERVISOR/CHIEF Building Commissioner CHRIS V.	95	78	82	79
Total Score	284	224	239	235

DP

Consultant Selection Rating Form  
for  
Programmatic Selections

Project: CUY\_CHAGRIN BLVD  
PID: TBD  
Project Type: Roadway Improvement  
District: 12  
Selection Committee Members: 3

Firm Name: EL Robinson

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	6
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	15
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	6
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	20
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		25
<b>Total</b>	100		72

If Applicable: Adequate good faith efforts made to meet DBE goal Y/N

**Exhibit 1 - Consultant Selection Rating Form Notes**

- The proposed project manager for each consultant shall be ranked, with the highest ranked project manager receiving the greatest number of points, and lower ranked project managers receiving commensurately lower scores. The rankings and scores should be based on each project manager's experience on similar projects and past performance for the LPA and other agencies. The selection committee may contact ODOT and outside agencies if necessary. Any subfactors identified should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

Differential scoring should consider the relative importance of the project manager's role in the success of a given project. The project manager's role in a simple project may be less important than for a complex project, and differential scoring should reflect this, with higher differentials assigned to projects that require a larger role for the project manager.

2. The experience and strength of the assigned staff, including subconsultant staff, should be ranked and scored as noted for Number 1 above, with higher differential scores assigned on more difficult projects. Any subfactors identified in the project notification should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

As above, other agencies may be contacted.

3. The consultants' past performance on similar projects shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis, with the highest ranked consultant receiving a commensurately greater number of points. The selection team should consider ODOT CES performance ratings if available, and consult other agencies as appropriate. The use of CES ratings shall place emphasis on the specific type of services requested.

The differential scoring should consider the complexity of the project and any subfactors identified in the project notification.

4. The consultant's workload and availability of qualified personnel, equipment and facilities shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis. The scoring shall consider quantifiable concerns regarding the ability of a firm (or firms) rated higher in other categories to complete the work with staff members named in the letter of interest.

Criteria A

Consultant Selection Rating Form  
for  
Programmatic Selections

Project: CUY\_CHAGRIN BLVD  
PID: TBD  
Project Type: Roadway Improvement  
District: 12  
Selection Committee Members: 3

Firm Name: EL Robinson

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	7
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	15
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	7
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	30
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		25
<b>Total</b>	100		74

If Applicable: Adequate good faith efforts made to meet DBE goal Y/N

**Exhibit 1 - Consultant Selection Rating Form Notes**

- The proposed project manager for each consultant shall be ranked, with the highest ranked project manager receiving the greatest number of points, and lower ranked project managers receiving commensurately lower scores. The rankings and scores should be based on each project manager's experience on similar projects and past performance for the LPA and other agencies. The selection committee may contact ODOT and outside agencies if necessary. Any subfactors identified should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

Differential scoring should consider the relative importance of the project manager's role in the success of a given project. The project manager's role in a simple project may be less important than for a complex project, and differential scoring should reflect this, with higher differentials assigned to projects that require a larger role for the project manager.

- 
2. The experience and strength of the assigned staff, including subconsultant staff, should be ranked and scored as noted for Number 1 above, with higher differential scores assigned on more difficult projects. Any subfactors identified in the project notification should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

As above, other agencies may be contacted.

- 
- 
3. The consultants' past performance on similar projects shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis, with the highest ranked consultant receiving a commensurately greater number of points. The selection team should consider ODOT CES performance ratings if available, and consult other agencies as appropriate. The use of CES ratings shall place emphasis on the specific type of services requested.

The differential scoring should consider the complexity of the project and any subfactors identified in the project notification.

- 
- 
- 
4. The consultant's workload and availability of qualified personnel, equipment and facilities shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis. The scoring shall consider quantifiable concerns regarding the ability of a firm (or firms) rated higher in other categories to complete the work with staff members named in the letter of interest.

CV

Consultant Selection Rating Form  
for  
Programmatic Selections

Project: CUY\_CHAGRIN BLVD  
PID: TBD  
Project Type: Roadway Improvement  
District: 12  
Selection Committee Members: 3

Firm Name: EL Robinson

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	8
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	17
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	8
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	20
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		25
<b>Total</b>	100		78

If Applicable: Adequate good faith efforts made to meet DBE goal Y/N

**Exhibit 1 - Consultant Selection Rating Form Notes**

- The proposed project manager for each consultant shall be ranked, with the highest ranked project manager receiving the greatest number of points, and lower ranked project managers receiving commensurately lower scores. The rankings and scores should be based on each project manager's experience on similar projects and past performance for the LPA and other agencies. The selection committee may contact ODOT and outside agencies if necessary. Any subfactors identified should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

Differential scoring should consider the relative importance of the project manager's role in the success of a given project. The project manager's role in a simple project may be less important than for a complex project, and differential scoring should reflect this, with higher differentials assigned to projects that require a larger role for the project manager.

2. The experience and strength of the assigned staff, including subconsultant staff, should be ranked and scored as noted for Number 1 above, with higher differential scores assigned on more difficult projects. Any subfactors identified in the project notification should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

As above, other agencies may be contacted.

3. The consultants' past performance on similar projects shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis, with the highest ranked consultant receiving a commensurately greater number of points. The selection team should consider ODOT CES performance ratings if available, and consult other agencies as appropriate. The use of CES ratings shall place emphasis on the specific type of services requested.

The differential scoring should consider the complexity of the project and any subfactors identified in the project notification.

4. The consultant's workload and availability of qualified personnel, equipment and facilities shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis. The scoring shall consider quantifiable concerns regarding the ability of a firm (or firms) rated higher in other categories to complete the work with staff members named in the letter of interest.

Consultant Selection Rating Form  
for  
Programmatic Selections

Project: CUY\_CHAGRIN BLVD  
PID: TBD  
Project Type: Roadway Improvement  
District: 12  
Selection Committee Members: 3

Firm Name: GPD Group

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	10
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	25
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	10
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	28
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		25
<b>Total</b>	100		98

If Applicable: Adequate good faith efforts made to meet DBE goal Y/N

**Exhibit 1 - Consultant Selection Rating Form Notes**

- The proposed project manager for each consultant shall be ranked, with the highest ranked project manager receiving the greatest number of points, and lower ranked project managers receiving commensurately lower scores. The rankings and scores should be based on each project manager's experience on similar projects and past performance for the LPA and other agencies. The selection committee may contact ODOT and outside agencies if necessary. Any subfactors identified should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

Differential scoring should consider the relative importance of the project manager's role in the success of a given project. The project manager's role in a simple project may be less important than for a complex project, and differential scoring should reflect this, with higher differentials assigned to projects that require a larger role for the project manager.

2. The experience and strength of the assigned staff, including subconsultant staff, should be ranked and scored as noted for Number 1 above, with higher differential scores assigned on more difficult projects. Any subfactors identified in the project notification should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

As above, other agencies may be contacted.

3. The consultants' past performance on similar projects shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis, with the highest ranked consultant receiving a commensurately greater number of points. The selection team should consider ODOT CES performance ratings if available, and consult other agencies as appropriate. The use of CES ratings shall place emphasis on the specific type of services requested.

The differential scoring should consider the complexity of the project and any subfactors identified in the project notification.

4. The consultant's workload and availability of qualified personnel, equipment and facilities shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis. The scoring shall consider quantifiable concerns regarding the ability of a firm (or firms) rated higher in other categories to complete the work with staff members named in the letter of interest.

CA

Consultant Selection Rating Form  
for  
Programmatic Selections

Project: CUY\_CHAGRIN BLVD  
PID: TBD  
Project Type: Roadway Improvement  
District: 12  
Selection Committee Members: 3

Firm Name: GPD Group

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	9
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	20
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	9
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	28
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		25
<b>Total</b>	100		91

If Applicable: Adequate good faith efforts made to meet DBE goal Y/N

**Exhibit 1 - Consultant Selection Rating Form Notes**

- The proposed project manager for each consultant shall be ranked, with the highest ranked project manager receiving the greatest number of points, and lower ranked project managers receiving commensurately lower scores. The rankings and scores should be based on each project manager's experience on similar projects and past performance for the LPA and other agencies. The selection committee may contact ODOT and outside agencies if necessary. Any subfactors identified should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

Differential scoring should consider the relative importance of the project manager's role in the success of a given project. The project manager's role in a simple project may be less important than for a complex project, and differential scoring should reflect this, with higher differentials assigned to projects that require a larger role for the project manager.

2. The experience and strength of the assigned staff, including subconsultant staff, should be ranked and scored as noted for Number 1 above, with higher differential scores assigned on more difficult projects. Any subfactors identified in the project notification should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

As above, other agencies may be contacted.

3. The consultants' past performance on similar projects shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis, with the highest ranked consultant receiving a commensurately greater number of points. The selection team should consider ODOT CES performance ratings if available, and consult other agencies as appropriate. The use of CES ratings shall place emphasis on the specific type of services requested.

The differential scoring should consider the complexity of the project and any subfactors identified in the project notification.

4. The consultant's workload and availability of qualified personnel, equipment and facilities shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis. The scoring shall consider quantifiable concerns regarding the ability of a firm (or firms) rated higher in other categories to complete the work with staff members named in the letter of interest.

C. v. 42

Consultant Selection Rating Form  
for  
Programmatic Selections

Project: CUY\_CHAGRIN BLVD  
PID: TBD  
Project Type: Roadway Improvement  
District: 12  
Selection Committee Members: 3

Firm Name: GPD Group

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	8
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	24
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	10
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	28
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		25
<b>Total</b>	100		95

If Applicable: Adequate good faith efforts made to meet DBE goal Y/N

**Exhibit 1 - Consultant Selection Rating Form Notes**

- The proposed project manager for each consultant shall be ranked, with the highest ranked project manager receiving the greatest number of points, and lower ranked project managers receiving commensurately lower scores. The rankings and scores should be based on each project manager's experience on similar projects and past performance for the LPA and other agencies. The selection committee may contact ODOT and outside agencies if necessary. Any subfactors identified should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

Differential scoring should consider the relative importance of the project manager's role in the success of a given project. The project manager's role in a simple project may be less important than for a complex project, and differential scoring should reflect this, with higher differentials assigned to projects that require a larger role for the project manager.

2. The experience and strength of the assigned staff, including subconsultant staff, should be ranked and scored as noted for Number 1 above, with higher differential scores assigned on more difficult projects. Any subfactors identified in the project notification should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

As above, other agencies may be contacted.

3. The consultants' past performance on similar projects shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis, with the highest ranked consultant receiving a commensurately greater number of points. The selection team should consider ODOT CES performance ratings if available, and consult other agencies as appropriate. The use of CES ratings shall place emphasis on the specific type of services requested.

The differential scoring should consider the complexity of the project and any subfactors identified in the project notification.

4. The consultant's workload and availability of qualified personnel, equipment and facilities shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis. The scoring shall consider quantifiable concerns regarding the ability of a firm (or firms) rated higher in other categories to complete the work with staff members named in the letter of interest.

Consultant Selection Rating Form  
for  
Programmatic Selections

Project: CUY\_CHAGRIN BLVD  
PID: TBD  
Project Type: Roadway Improvement  
District: 12  
Selection Committee Members: 3

Firm Name: JMT

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	7
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	20
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	7
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	20
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		25
<b>Total</b>	100		79

If Applicable: Adequate good faith efforts made to meet DBE goal Y/N

**Exhibit 1 - Consultant Selection Rating Form Notes**

- The proposed project manager for each consultant shall be ranked, with the highest ranked project manager receiving the greatest number of points, and lower ranked project managers receiving commensurately lower scores. The rankings and scores should be based on each project manager's experience on similar projects and past performance for the LPA and other agencies. The selection committee may contact ODOT and outside agencies if necessary. Any subfactors identified should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

Differential scoring should consider the relative importance of the project manager's role in the success of a given project. The project manager's role in a simple project may be less important than for a complex project, and differential scoring should reflect this, with higher differentials assigned to projects that require a larger role for the project manager.

2. The experience and strength of the assigned staff, including subconsultant staff, should be ranked and scored as noted for Number 1 above, with higher differential scores assigned on more difficult projects. Any subfactors identified in the project notification should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

As above, other agencies may be contacted.

3. The consultants' past performance on similar projects shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis, with the highest ranked consultant receiving a commensurately greater number of points. The selection team should consider ODOT CES performance ratings if available, and consult other agencies as appropriate. The use of CES ratings shall place emphasis on the specific type of services requested.

The differential scoring should consider the complexity of the project and any subfactors identified in the project notification.

4. The consultant's workload and availability of qualified personnel, equipment and facilities shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis. The scoring shall consider quantifiable concerns regarding the ability of a firm (or firms) rated higher in other categories to complete the work with staff members named in the letter of interest.

CA

Consultant Selection Rating Form  
for  
Programmatic Selections

Project: CUY\_CHAGRIN BLVD  
PID: TBD  
Project Type: Roadway Improvement  
District: 12  
Selection Committee Members: 3

Firm Name: JMT

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	7
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	20
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	6
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	20
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		25
<b>Total</b>	100		78

If Applicable: Adequate good faith efforts made to meet DBE goal Y/N

**Exhibit 1 - Consultant Selection Rating Form Notes**

- The proposed project manager for each consultant shall be ranked, with the highest ranked project manager receiving the greatest number of points, and lower ranked project managers receiving commensurately lower scores. The rankings and scores should be based on each project manager's experience on similar projects and past performance for the LPA and other agencies. The selection committee may contact ODOT and outside agencies if necessary. Any subfactors identified should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

Differential scoring should consider the relative importance of the project manager's role in the success of a given project. The project manager's role in a simple project may be less important than for a complex project, and differential scoring should reflect this, with higher differentials assigned to projects that require a larger role for the project manager.

2. The experience and strength of the assigned staff, including subconsultant staff, should be ranked and scored as noted for Number 1 above, with higher differential scores assigned on more difficult projects. Any subfactors identified in the project notification should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

As above, other agencies may be contacted.

3. The consultants' past performance on similar projects shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis, with the highest ranked consultant receiving a commensurately greater number of points. The selection team should consider ODOT CES performance ratings if available, and consult other agencies as appropriate. The use of CES ratings shall place emphasis on the specific type of services requested.

The differential scoring should consider the complexity of the project and any subfactors identified in the project notification.

4. The consultant's workload and availability of qualified personnel, equipment and facilities shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis. The scoring shall consider quantifiable concerns regarding the ability of a firm (or firms) rated higher in other categories to complete the work with staff members named in the letter of interest.

CV

Consultant Selection Rating Form  
for  
Programmatic Selections

Project: CUY\_CHAGRIN BLVD  
PID: TBD  
Project Type: Roadway Improvement  
District: 12  
Selection Committee Members: 3

Firm Name: JMT

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	8
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	22
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	7
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	20
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		25
<b>Total</b>	100		82

If Applicable: Adequate good faith efforts made to meet DBE goal Y/N

**Exhibit 1 - Consultant Selection Rating Form Notes**

- The proposed project manager for each consultant shall be ranked, with the highest ranked project manager receiving the greatest number of points, and lower ranked project managers receiving commensurately lower scores. The rankings and scores should be based on each project manager's experience on similar projects and past performance for the LPA and other agencies. The selection committee may contact ODOT and outside agencies if necessary. Any subfactors identified should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

Differential scoring should consider the relative importance of the project manager's role in the success of a given project. The project manager's role in a simple project may be less important than for a complex project, and differential scoring should reflect this, with higher differentials assigned to projects that require a larger role for the project manager.

2. The experience and strength of the assigned staff, including subconsultant staff, should be ranked and scored as noted for Number 1 above, with higher differential scores assigned on more difficult projects. Any subfactors identified in the project notification should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

As above, other agencies may be contacted.

3. The consultants' past performance on similar projects shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis, with the highest ranked consultant receiving a commensurately greater number of points. The selection team should consider ODOT CES performance ratings if available, and consult other agencies as appropriate. The use of CES ratings shall place emphasis on the specific type of services requested.

The differential scoring should consider the complexity of the project and any subfactors identified in the project notification.

4. The consultant's workload and availability of qualified personnel, equipment and facilities shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis. The scoring shall consider quantifiable concerns regarding the ability of a firm (or firms) rated higher in other categories to complete the work with staff members named in the letter of interest.

Consultant Selection Rating Form  
for  
Programmatic Selections

Project: CUY\_CHAGRIN BLVD  
PID: TBD  
Project Type: Roadway Improvement  
District: 12  
Selection Committee Members: 3

Firm Name: McCormick Taylor

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	7
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	18
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	6
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	20
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		25
<b>Total</b>	100		76

If Applicable: Adequate good faith efforts made to meet DBE goal Y/N

**Exhibit 1 - Consultant Selection Rating Form Notes**

1. The proposed project manager for each consultant shall be ranked, with the highest ranked project manager receiving the greatest number of points, and lower ranked project managers receiving commensurately lower scores. The rankings and scores should be based on each project manager's experience on similar projects and past performance for the LPA and other agencies. The selection committee may contact ODOT and outside agencies if necessary. Any subfactors identified should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

Differential scoring should consider the relative importance of the project manager's role in the success of a given project. The project manager's role in a simple project may be less important than for a complex project, and differential scoring should reflect this, with higher differentials assigned to projects that require a larger role for the project manager.

2. The experience and strength of the assigned staff, including subconsultant staff, should be ranked and scored as noted for Number 1 above, with higher differential scores assigned on more difficult projects. Any subfactors identified in the project notification should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

As above, other agencies may be contacted.

3. The consultants' past performance on similar projects shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis, with the highest ranked consultant receiving a commensurately greater number of points. The selection team should consider ODOT CES performance ratings if available, and consult other agencies as appropriate. The use of CES ratings shall place emphasis on the specific type of services requested.

The differential scoring should consider the complexity of the project and any subfactors identified in the project notification.

4. The consultant's workload and availability of qualified personnel, equipment and facilities shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis. The scoring shall consider quantifiable concerns regarding the ability of a firm (or firms) rated higher in other categories to complete the work with staff members named in the letter of interest.

CA

Consultant Selection Rating Form  
for  
Programmatic Selections

Project: CUY\_CHAGRIN BLVD  
PID: TBD  
Project Type: Roadway Improvement  
District: 12  
Selection Committee Members: 3

Firm Name: McCormick Taylor

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	8
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	19
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	6
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	22
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		25
<b>Total</b>	100		80

If Applicable: Adequate good faith efforts made to meet DBE goal Y/N

**Exhibit 1 - Consultant Selection Rating Form Notes**

- The proposed project manager for each consultant shall be ranked, with the highest ranked project manager receiving the greatest number of points, and lower ranked project managers receiving commensurately lower scores. The rankings and scores should be based on each project manager's experience on similar projects and past performance for the LPA and other agencies. The selection committee may contact ODOT and outside agencies if necessary. Any subfactors identified should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

Differential scoring should consider the relative importance of the project manager's role in the success of a given project. The project manager's role in a simple project may be less important than for a complex project, and differential scoring should reflect this, with higher differentials assigned to projects that require a larger role for the project manager.

2. The experience and strength of the assigned staff, including subconsultant staff, should be ranked and scored as noted for Number 1 above, with higher differential scores assigned on more difficult projects. Any subfactors identified in the project notification should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

As above, other agencies may be contacted.

3. The consultants' past performance on similar projects shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis, with the highest ranked consultant receiving a commensurately greater number of points. The selection team should consider ODOT CES performance ratings if available, and consult other agencies as appropriate. The use of CES ratings shall place emphasis on the specific type of services requested.

The differential scoring should consider the complexity of the project and any subfactors identified in the project notification.

4. The consultant's workload and availability of qualified personnel, equipment and facilities shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis. The scoring shall consider quantifiable concerns regarding the ability of a firm (or firms) rated higher in other categories to complete the work with staff members named in the letter of interest.

CV

Consultant Selection Rating Form  
for  
Programmatic Selections

Project: CUY\_CHAGRIN BLVD  
PID: TBD  
Project Type: Roadway Improvement  
District: 12  
Selection Committee Members: 3

Firm Name: McCormick Taylor

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	7
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	20
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	7
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	20
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		25
<b>Total</b>	100		79

If Applicable: Adequate good faith efforts made to meet DBE goal Y/N

**Exhibit 1 - Consultant Selection Rating Form Notes**

1. The proposed project manager for each consultant shall be ranked, with the highest ranked project manager receiving the greatest number of points, and lower ranked project managers receiving commensurately lower scores. The rankings and scores should be based on each project manager's experience on similar projects and past performance for the LPA and other agencies. The selection committee may contact ODOT and outside agencies if necessary. Any subfactors identified should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

Differential scoring should consider the relative importance of the project manager's role in the success of a given project. The project manager's role in a simple project may be less important than for a complex project, and differential scoring should reflect this, with higher differentials assigned to projects that require a larger role for the project manager.

2. The experience and strength of the assigned staff, including subconsultant staff, should be ranked and scored as noted for Number 1 above, with higher differential scores assigned on more difficult projects. Any subfactors identified in the project notification should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

As above, other agencies may be contacted.

3. The consultants' past performance on similar projects shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis, with the highest ranked consultant receiving a commensurately greater number of points. The selection team should consider ODOT CES performance ratings if available, and consult other agencies as appropriate. The use of CES ratings shall place emphasis on the specific type of services requested.

The differential scoring should consider the complexity of the project and any subfactors identified in the project notification.

4. The consultant's workload and availability of qualified personnel, equipment and facilities shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis. The scoring shall consider quantifiable concerns regarding the ability of a firm (or firms) rated higher in other categories to complete the work with staff members named in the letter of interest.