Revised Response to Announcement Instructions Panel Discussion – 9-9-14 - Partnering Conference

(C) Page #1 is basic information and certifications. As a consultant what challenges and/or questions does your office staff encounter when preparing this page for response? This page and certifications have never been a problem for us. Typically we will do a quick review to make sure that the bulletin specific information is correct and that we have a signed Page 1 from all of our subconsultants.

(PS) What purpose does this page #1 serve and do you check or verify any of the information. Only the Prime responding firms need to certify that the information is correct. Only firms providing engineering services are required to certify that the firm is registered with the Commonwealth of Kentucky in accordance with KRS 322.060. We will verify that the response is eligible or allow until 4:30pm to obtain necessary certifications.

(SC) Do you look at page #1? Yes, briefly check to see if project specific information (County, Item No., etc) are correct. Also check to see what office will be doing the work.

(C) Page #2 is a summary of project services and staff. How do you make sure you cover all of the prequalification requirements and what additional information do you include for this page? We will use a simple checklist to ensure that we have covered all of the prequalifications' requirements. We actually start with the prequalifications to determine what our team will look like. For Page 2B, we study the specific requirements for the project and identify the activities we think will be critical to project development. We then list those activities along with anticipated staff assignments.

(PS) How does Professional Services check or verify any of the information? When PS staff receives responses, we check for signatures, certifications and number of copies on the day responses are received. Prequalification requirements are checked the following day. We ensure that atleast 1 firm on their consultant team is prequalified to perform each of the required services specified in the project advertisement. Now by the date of response rather than date of advertisement.

(SC) Do you look at page #2? Yes, definitely want to know who the subs will be and who, specifically will be doing the work. Although not required, if the Consultant is pre-qualified in any areas that may be relative to the project, but were not required in the RFP (i.e. – structure design for a project with a bridge) it's nice information for the Project Manager to be aware of. However, this information has no bearing on the selection process.

(C) Page #3 is the organization chart for the proposed project team. What do you want the selection team to see? What is the best way to present your team? The first thing we do is examine the scope of the project and identify specific project needs. We then begin to develop our organization chart based the availability of staff who have experience with the types of critical issues facing this project, and who have a working familiarity with the administering District. We also explain what work will be done by subconsultants and how the subconsultants will be integrated into the project team.

(PS) At any point in the selection process, do you verify the proposed team? PS checks that the proposed project manager is present at the project scoping meting and through negotiations. If the firm does not provide the project manager proposed in the response, KYTC must approve the change or is able to negotiate with the second ranked firm. A firm must request in writing any change in consultant project manager.

(SC) What are you looking for from this chart? I want to know who the primary contact person will be as well as who the contacts will be for the subs. Also like to see who will be doing the actual engineering and technical work.

(C) Page #4 is for the resumes. What is important to include on these resumes? Which team members to you include them for? Having examined the scope, we then give very careful consideration to which members of our staff are the best fit for the project—especially those who will have a key supervisory and/or technical role. Who we include depends on the number of subconsultants needed and the relative importance of various aspects in the project scope. For example: How likely is it that a requested service will actually drive a consultant team selection? The most important information we aim to convey is our team members' specific experience on similar projects.

(SC) What is in the resume that is important to you? How would you prefer to see them organized? Early on, I wanted to see pictures so that I could associate names with faces. Also wanted to know if they had worked on projects within the district or geographic region. It's nice to know relative experience of each individual on similar projects. For a normal size project, bios beyond the top 2-3 from the organizational chart are typically only briefly reviewed.

(C) The instructions for Page #5 have changed. Explain some of these changes and how you see this helping the selection process. We don't see Page 5A, which addresses availability of key personnel, as a change. We will continue to present Page 5A as we have in the past. Changes to Page 5B, which addresses a firm's active contracts with KYTC, if properly implemented, will help ensure that the project information provided is consistent. In the past, the requested information could be broadly interpreted, causing the responses to vary widely. As a result, these responses were essentially discounted by the selection committee members. The new format, while certainly not perfect, makes the consultant community responsible for reporting current project commitments, including the number of KYTC contracts, how much work is internal, and how work is being passed through to subconsultants. The financial information is proportional to person hours and will provide a metric that will relate the relative size of projects to the selection committee. The new format ensures work being done as a subconsultant and as a part of a statewide contract is included. The information is verifiable by a simple review of contract information and recent invoices. The new format should help to level the playing field.

(PS) Are you going to check each response to verify that all project related information and status is complete and accurate?
Our goal is to clearly show remaining work to be performed by the prime consultant. The format provided is only an example, but as long as the minimum requirements are met it can be reformatted to include clarifying text. PS will randomly spot-check information provided on Page 5B. A selection committee member may also request PS to check information provided on 5B for a specific response. If

consultant information is inaccurate once, we will call and advise the firm. If consultant information is inaccurate a second time, it will be ineligible.

(SC) What do you like or dislike about these additions to the Page #5? Do you think it will help you in determining the best qualified team? How important is it to “spread the work?” I like changes made on capacity. I think it now better represents how much work a consultant actually has. It should make it an easier ‘apples to apples’ comparison easier to quantitatively compare the consultants and verify what’s being said in any capacity narrative. When work was scarce a few years ago, I felt that “spreading the work” was very important. We actually did spread it as much as possible. Now that there is more work out there, it’s still important, but probably not as important as it once was.

(C) Which projects do you choose to represent the team’s qualifications? What information are you trying to convey to the selection committee? As we all know, no two highway design projects are the same. We select similar projects that share as many common characteristics with the proposed project as possible. And we ask ourselves the key question: Are the folks who worked on those projects still around and available to bring that relevant experience to the proposed project. If so, on the project sheets we highlight their participation to draw a connection to the organization chart and resumes.

(SC) What are you looking for with similar projects? How does this affect your rating a team’s proposal? If the consultant has done work on a very similar project within the district, then that would be the best scenario. If projects are not similar, but were listed because of a good rating, I mark down. If projects are somewhat similar, but on the other side of the state, I’ll likely mark down. I look for very similar and within the district or region. *(I don’t necessarily agree with this. A very similar projects in another region isn’t as desirable as a similar local project, but I wouldn’t count it against a Consultant by any means. Not sure how you want to handle this for our official response –BB)*

(C) What do you do to prepare a project approach write up? How many hours and how many different people are involved? This varies widely with the type of project. Generally, we familiarize ourselves with available project documentation including the Data Needs Assessments, available studies, environmental documents, and any preliminary plans made available. We always visit the site on the ground, note key features and photograph the area, as needed. We identify what we think will be the key factors that will influence project development. The discussion within the project approach will include how we propose to address those key factors.

On smaller jobs, 2 to 3 people will work on a proposal for 40 to 60 hours. On larger jobs the number of individuals involved in the proposal increases to 5 to 6 people and the number of hours can range from 80 to 200.

(SC) What do you look for in a project approach? How does the project approach relate to the proposed teams qualifications? I look for unique solutions to unique problems. I also like when consultants notice the small things that might slow the schedule or require additional work. A good team has the appropriate staff members (experience) to identify and address those little issues. Any information about existing conditions that is blatantly incorrect is seen in a negative light.

(ALL) Overall what do you think of the revised guidelines for responding to a KYTC advertisement? ?

The revised guidelines more clearly define a level playing field for consultants responding to the advertisements. In the past, there were potential issues with what was fair game: information on backs of covers or no backs of covers, tabs with information or no tabs, backs of pages within the approach or no backs of pages, and what to show (or not show) with regard to capacity. All this created gray areas and, thus, created a potentially uneven playing field.

I like them. It should help level the playing field and help shift the focus back more to engineering than graphic layout and design.