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INTRODUCTION
Consultants who express interest in working on NYSDOT construction inspection projects are evaluated in a two-step process. The first step is evaluation by an automated process which produces a shortlist of the best-qualified teams. The second step is evaluation by a committee of experts who consider only the teams which have been shortlisted. From the results of these evaluations, NYSDOT Executive Management selects the best-qualified team for designation.

The evaluation process considers the following factors. Each factor is given a weight appropriate for the specific project, and all factors and weights are described in the project advertisement (there are normally two sets of weights, one for the automated evaluation step and one for the committee evaluation step). For each step, consultant teams’ individual scores for each factor are multiplied by the weight for the factor, and then the weighted scores are added to produce a final aggregate score for the team. The weights for Factors 1 thru 4 will total 100%. Factors 5 thru 7 are bonuses or penalties that are added to or subtracted from the aggregate team score.

1) Prior experience
   a) Firm in general
   b) Staff
   c) With NYSDOT

2) Organizational capability for this type of work
   a) Prior NYSDOT performance ratings
   b) Workload/Capacity
      i) Workload with NYSDOT division vs. capacity
      ii) Total remaining workload with NYSDOT

3) Logistics & Familiarity
   a) Location
   b) Familiarity

4) Other Factors (optional)
   a) A. Standard
   b) B. Special
   c) C./D./E. Technical Proposal
   d) F. Oral Presentation

5) D/M/WBE Participation

6) D/M/WBE Subconsultants
   a) Performance and Experience
   b) Workload with NYSDOT division

7) Time since last designation
Rating Factors 1B (staff experience), 3B (familiarity) and, if included, 4C thru 4F are evaluated only in the committee evaluation step, and are not discussed further here. The methodology used by the automated process to score the remaining factors is presented on the following pages.
SCORING SYSTEM - RATING FACTOR 1A

General Summary

This rating factor evaluates prior jobs completed by all of the firms in a team (prime or joint
venture members plus subs), and scores based on how they compare with the project where
consultant services are needed (hereafter referred to as the target project). The primary attributes
considered are construction cost and complexity. These attributes are divided into separate
categories for highway and bridge work, although for most target projects only one of the
categories will be used. Appurtenance and other types of target projects are included in the
highway category. Three additional factors are considered which can modify the scores for all of
the components - these factors are project owner, project type and work class.

Each prior job that a firm submits is scored for each applicable component, depending on
whether the target project includes highway or bridge work, and whether the firm being scored is
assigned to inspect that type of work. Prior jobs that included both highway and bridge work are
scored twice for each applicable component (once using the prior job’s highway cost and
complexity, and once using its bridge cost and complexity), and the higher of the two scores is
used. The four (4) components are as follows:

- **Highway Cost Score** = Base Cost Score (Highway) x Project Owner Factor x Project Type
  Factor x Work Class Factor

- **Highway Complexity Score** = Base Complexity Score (Highway) x Project Owner Factor x
  Project Type Factor x Work Class Factor

- **Bridge Cost Score** = Base Cost Score (Bridge) x Project Owner Factor x Project Type
  Factor x Work Class Factor

- **Bridge Complexity Score** = Base Complexity Score (Bridge) x Project Owner Factor x
  Project Type Factor x Work Class Factor

One exception is that jobs completed more than 12 years previously receive a score of 0.

A firm’s score for each component is the sum of its 10 highest individual job scores for that
component, capped at a maximum score of 10. For each firm, the highway and/or bridge cost and
complexity scores are averaged separately to get an overall firm score for that type of work. Cost
and complexity are normally given equal weight (50%/50%). However, if the complexity of the
target project is routine but the cost is moderate or large, cost/complexity weighting is 100%/0%,
and if the complexity is moderate or complex but the cost is large, cost/complexity weighting is
70%/30%.

Once a highway and/or bridge score is determined for each firm, highway and/or bridge scores
for all firms in the team are blended, based on the % of work the firms are assigned, to get an
overall team score for that type of work. Lastly, if a target project includes both highway and
bridge work, the overall team scores for each type of work are blended, based on the relative construction cost of each share in the target project, to produce the overall team score for this Rating Factor.

Subs with no active CI project inventory in the NYSDOT database receive a score of 0 for all components. Primes or joint ventures with members that have no active CI project inventory will not be scored at all.

**Explanation of General Summary**

The primary attributes are construction cost and complexity. The rationale is that these 2 attributes are of primary importance in evaluating a firm’s experience, and that they are related but distinct. Bigger jobs will tend to be more complex, and complex jobs will usually be large ones, but it is also possible to have a large job that is more or less routine (e.g. 20 miles of resurfacing) or, less frequently, a small job that still involves complex technical issues and coordination of multiple elements and interest groups. Cost and complexity are normally weighted equally in scoring. However if the target project is significantly more difficult with respect to its cost than its complexity (e.g., a large project of routine complexity); cost will be given more weight than complexity. The rationale is that it is more important to discriminate based on the attribute that makes the job more difficult.

Construction cost and complexity are both subdivided into separate categories for highway and bridge work. The rationale is that these two categories represent substantially different types of work, for which the cost and complexity can be different on individual jobs. To use a broad simplification, highway work typically involves earthwork and asphalt or concrete paving, and bridge work typically involves installation and/or repair of structural concrete and steel. Appurtenance and other types of projects are included in the highway category - the rationale is that these projects are generally more similar to highway jobs than to bridge jobs. For scoring, the highway and bridge categories are weighted based on the relative construction cost of each category on the particular target project - these costs are submitted by the Region as part of the CONR389b form (Request for Consultant Services for Construction Inspection). Most target projects will have only one of the two categories, reflecting the primary work class of the target project.

Three additional factors can modify the scores for the basic scoring components - these factors are project owner, project type and work class. The rationale for the project owner factor is that prior jobs done for owners other than NYSDOT should be of lesser value. Standard procedures and expectations for these jobs can be very different from NYSDOT’s, and their scores should vary accordingly. The rationale for the project type and work class factors is to allow reduced cross-credit for jobs that are of a significantly different character than the target project (e.g. design vs. construction inspection or bridge vs. highway), but which are still of some value.

Firms are scored separately for each of the basic scoring components. The rationale is that submitted projects which score highly in one component may very well not score highly in others. For example, the 10 highest-scoring projects in the highway category are very likely to be different from the 10 highest-scoring projects in the bridge category. It is also possible, though
less likely, for the 10 highest-scoring jobs for the highway cost component to be different from
the 10 highest-scoring jobs for the highway complexity component. Therefore, to provide the
fairest and best possible evaluation, the 10 highest-scoring projects are determined separately for
each component.

Firm scores are blended based on the type and % of work that each firm is assigned in their
Expression of Interest. The rationale is that the experience of all firms on the team must be
considered to provide the best possible evaluation, and that weighting based on % of work is the
fairest way to do this.

Jobs completed more than 12 years ago are given a score of 0. The rationale is that experience
must be relatively recent to be of value, because specifications, procedures, regulations and
technology may all change significantly over the course of several years, and staff turnover
makes it increasingly unlikely that staff who worked on older projects will still be with a firm.

CONSTRUCTION COST AND COMPLEXITY SCORING

Base Construction Cost Score (Highway):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway/Other Construction Cost of Target Project</th>
<th>Construction Cost of Project Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; $2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $2M</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2M-$10M</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$10M-$30M</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$30M</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base Construction Cost Score (Bridge):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge Construction Cost of Target Project</th>
<th>Construction Cost of Project Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; $1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $1M</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1M-$10M</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$10M-$20M</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$20M</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the cost of a target project is at the low end of a range, the ranges for “Construction Cost
of Project Submitted” will be adjusted so that submitted projects with a cost at the high end of
the next range down will be scored as if they are equivalent.
Base Complexity Score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complexity of Target Project</th>
<th>Complexity of Project Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Complex</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the project submitted does not have a construction cost or complexity for the category being scored, use the construction cost and complexity for the other category as if it were of the category being scored (e.g. if target project has a $13 million highway cost, and project submitted has no highway cost but a $5 million bridge cost, then base highway cost score is 0.4).

Firms that were subconsultants on individual projects submitted will have the construction cost of those projects prorated at the % of work they were responsible for and, for non-routine projects, the complexity lowered by one category, if they are being scored as a prime or joint venture member. In addition, the scores for both construction cost and complexity will be multiplied by a “sub as prime factor” of 0.85 (for small jobs), 0.7 (for moderate size jobs) or 0.6 (for large jobs). **Exception:** The sub as prime factor is 1.00 if the project is routine and the estimated construction cost is under $15M.

Projects which are listed as individual experience rather than firm experience will have their scores for both construction cost and complexity multiplied by an individual experience factor of 0.60, or 60%.

**Explanation of Construction Cost and Complexity Scoring**

Construction cost is grouped into 4 ranges, beginning with jobs that are smaller than NYSDOT ever proposes under normal circumstances, and progressing to very large projects which NYSDOT normally proposes only in New York City and surrounding Regions. Different ranges are provided for the highway and bridge categories to reflect the different distribution of construction cost for these categories on projects typically proposed by NYSDOT.

Complexity is divided into 3 ranges. NYSDOT has detailed guidelines that are used to determine the complexity of target projects, and consultant firms have been provided with a condensed summary of these guidelines to use for self-rating the complexity of their prior jobs.

The scoring tables are designed so that firms which submit at least 4-7 jobs of an equal or higher level of difficulty than the target project will achieve the maximum score of 10.0. The goal of this scoring system is to provide appropriate differentiation between firms, while still allowing firms to achieve the maximum score if they have completed a sufficient number of similar jobs. Jobs submitted which are of a lower level of difficulty than the target project will get a lower score, so that it becomes increasingly difficult for a firm to achieve the maximum score of 10.0 as the jobs it has submitted become less difficult in relation to the target project. On the other hand, jobs submitted which are of a higher level of difficulty level than the target project will not get a higher score than jobs of an equal level of difficulty - the rationale for this is that firms tend
to specialize in, and are therefore best suited for, projects at a particular level of difficulty. Firms working on projects that are less difficult than they normally work on may simply devote too much effort to the project, with resulting inefficiencies.

Firms that were subconsultants on individual jobs submitted have both the construction cost and the complexity of those jobs reduced, *if they are being scored as a prime or joint venture member*. The rationale is that work as a prime is both qualitatively and quantitatively different from work as a subconsultant. Primes are ultimately responsible for projects as a whole, even if some of the work is assigned to subs. Subs are responsible only for the portion of work assigned to them. In addition, there are many overall project issues that are typically handled solely by the prime. Examples include maintenance and protection of traffic; communications with local residents, businesses and other public and other public or private agencies affected by the work; overall project coordination, liaison with the project owner, etc. These represent many of the issues that make a large and/or complex project more difficult. **Exception:** The sub as prime factor is 1.00 if the project is routine and the estimated construction cost is under $15M.

Projects which represent the experience of an individual employed by a firm, rather than the firm as a whole, have their scores for both construction cost and complexity reduced. The rationale is that experience of a management-level individual is a good indication that the firm will be able to manage jobs of a similar size and complexity; it is not as valuable as firm experience, where it is likely that a larger number of staff at different levels of responsibility had experience with the project.

**CHANGING CONSTRUCTION COST AND COMPLEXITY SCORING TABLES**

The construction cost and complexity scoring tables can be modified for individual target projects. The rationale is that, while the tables have been designed to be generally applicable to all projects, they can also be tailored to be more specifically applicable to the requirements of the target project and the quantity and quality of the firms that are expected to express interest. NYSDOT staff should consider the following impacts when modifying scoring tables:

1) Increasing the scores in the tables may result in less differentiation between firms, because it will be easier to achieve the maximum score of 10.0. It will benefit firms which submit fewer projects that are equal to or better than the target project. It may be appropriate for target projects where it is expected that only a small number of firms with limited experience will express interest (e.g. projects selected as a small firm opportunity).

2) Decreasing the scores in the table could result in either more or less differentiation between firms. It will be harder to achieve the maximum score of 10.0, but if the criteria are made too strict, firms could wind up clustered in a small band at the bottom of the scoring spectrum. It will penalize firms which submit fewer projects that are equal to or better than the target project. It may, however, be appropriate for target projects where it is expected that a large number of firms with a great deal of experience will express interest.
3) Increasing the scores for projects which are larger and/or more complex than the target project will benefit the larger, more experienced consultant firms who have submitted these types of projects. It will penalize the smaller, newer firms who have not submitted larger and/or more complex projects.

4) Decreasing the scores for projects which are larger and/or more complex than the target project may penalize the larger consultant firms who have submitted these types of projects, if they have not also submitted projects of the same type as the target project. It will benefit firms who have submitted projects of the same cost range and/or complexity as the target project.

5) Increasing the scores for projects which are smaller and/or less complex than the target project will benefit the smaller, newer firms and allow them to compete for target projects that may be more difficult than their usual range of experience. It should therefore be considered very cautiously.

6) Decreasing the scores for projects which are smaller and/or less complex than the target project will penalize the smaller, newer firms and make it harder for them to compete for target projects that are more difficult than their usual range of experience.

**Modifying Factor #1: Project Owner**

**Project Owner Factor:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Owner</th>
<th>Project Owner Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYS Thruway or other Transportation Authority in NYS</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All NYCDOT or other Municipality in NYS if Fed. Aid</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Transportation Agency of Another State</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality Within NYS (Not Fed. Aid)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Includes permit work on NYSDOT facilities)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rationale for this factor is that prior jobs done for NYSDOT provide better experience for future NYSDOT work than do equivalent jobs done for other owners. NYSDOT has a unique set of specifications and procedures, and its expectations may also be different from other owners. Familiarity with these specifications, procedures and expectations is a valuable asset in a consultant, because it can save a lot of “learning time”. The closest equivalents to NYSDOT are the NYS Thruway Authority and NYCDOT, which use the same specifications and most of the same procedures. Transportation agencies in other states will almost certainly have their own set of specifications, but there will be many similarities as a result of the constant sharing of research and ideas between the states, as well as the nationwide guidance provided by the FHWA. For these reasons, and in the interest of collegiality, jobs done for other state DOTs are rated almost as highly as jobs done for NYSDOT. Municipalities such as cities and counties within NYS also look to NYSDOT for guidance on the management of highway and bridge-related projects, and many of them also use some NYSDOT specifications. The amount of similarity is highly variable, however, and municipalities may also have less stringent
requirements on oversight and recordkeeping. These differences are typically even greater on jobs done for other types of owners, such as municipalities outside NYS, private corporations or individuals.

The project owner scoring table can also be modified for individual target projects. The rationale for this is that there may be very unique types of jobs that NYSDOT does only rarely (e.g., buildings, electro-mechanical work, major hazardous waste cleanup). For these jobs, it is probably more important to consider whether a firm has done that type of work at all than to consider who they have done it for. Another rationale for changing the table could be for a job involving work which NYSDOT does in a way that is unique or substantially different from other owners.

**Modifying Factor #2: Work Class**

**Work Class Factor:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Class of Project Submitted</th>
<th>Work Class of Target Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appurtenance</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target projects which are work class “Highway and Bridge” will use the “Highway” column for scoring highway cost and complexity and the “Bridge” column for scoring bridge cost and complexity.

The rationale for this factor is that jobs which involve a different class of work are of lesser value than jobs of the same primary work class. Highway and bridge jobs are significantly different, as noted in the Explanation of General Summary above, but they also have many things in common (e.g. earthwork, maintenance & protection of traffic, recordkeeping forms, payment and dispute procedures, etc.). Jobs of a different work class are therefore still given some reduced “cross-credit”. Appurtenance work is usually much simpler than either highway or bridge work - in fact, it is a regularly a component of highway jobs. Therefore, while highway and bridge jobs are given full cross-credit when scoring an appurtenance target project, appurtenance jobs are given a much smaller cross-credit when scoring a target project that is either highway or bridge.

The work class scoring table is not normally changeable for individual target projects. The rationale for this is that the work class factor provides systematic and generally applicable cross-credits, and that there is little or no reason to vary these for a particular target project.
Modifying Factor #3: Project Type

Project Type Factor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type of Project Submitted</th>
<th>Work Class of Target Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Inspection</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Condition Inspection</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rationale for this factor is that prior jobs submitted by consultants which did not involve construction inspection, can still be of some value as experience for a consultant inspection target project. Design projects, for example, will usually include survey, selection/development of specifications, preparation of traffic control plans, and estimation of project cost and schedules. The various details of design can also be useful experience for reviewing field changes, value engineering proposals, demolition and erection plans, etc. In short, familiarity with all of the details of transportation-related plans, specifications and estimates is a valuable and necessary skill in construction inspection. Bridge condition inspection is a different type of skill, but one that also has application to construction inspection projects, if they include bridge work. Bridge condition inspectors will be familiar with the various structural elements that make up a bridge, and probably also many of the techniques for bridge construction and repair. In addition, experienced bridge condition inspectors should be able to evaluate which elements have deteriorated enough to warrant repair or replacement, regardless of whether the repair or replacement work was included in the original contract.

The project type scoring table is not normally changeable for individual target projects. The rationale for this is that the project type provides systematic and generally applicable cross-credits, and that there is little or no reason to vary these for a particular target project.

**SCORING SYSTEM - RATING FACTOR 1C**

Score the same as rating factor 1A but include only projects where the project owner was NYSDOT, NYS Thruway Authority, another Transportation Authority in NYS, all NYCDOT or other municipality in NYS if Federally aided.
Table for scoring 1C Project Owner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Owner</th>
<th>Project Owner Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYS Thruway or another Transportation Authority in NYS</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All NYCDOT or other Municipality in NYS if Fed. Aid</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Transportation Authority of Another State</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality Within NYS (Not Fed. Aid)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Includes permit work on NYSDOT facilities)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCORING SYSTEM - RATING FACTOR 2A

For each firm (or joint venture), overall ratings from prior NYSDOT construction inspection performance evaluations in the past 6 years will be averaged. For primes (or joint venture members), only prior performance ratings as a prime or JV member will be averaged. For JV’s, the average score for the JV members will be averaged (giving each partner firm equal weight) to produce an average score for the JV as a whole.

The score for firms which have no prior NYSDOT performance evaluations will be the mode of the scores for all other firms which submit an Expression Interest for the project.

Primes or JV members will get the mode of the scores for all other primes or JV members.

Subs will get the mode of the scores or all other subs.

If no primes/JV members or subs (as appropriate) which submitted have prior evaluations, they will all get a score of 5.

As a final step, blend scores for the prime (or joint venture) and sub(s), using only one-half the % of work assigned to each sub and adding the difference to the prime’s (or joint venture’s) % of work. Multiply each firm’s (or joint venture’s) score by this revised % and then sum up to get an overall team score for the factor.

SCORING SYSTEM - RATING FACTORS 2B1 AND 2B2

For rating factor 2B1, use current remaining division workload with NYSDOT submitted by the prime (or joint venture members) and sub(s). Consistent with the instructions for completing for CONR 386, “Current Workload and Last Designation Disclosure”, for Biennial Bridge Inspection and East River Bridge Inspection agreements, once a draft agreement has been accepted by signature of the prime consultant or JV and received by the NYSDOT Contract Management Bureau, the consultant shall not include the non-expendable direct non-salary cost items such as equipment rental and sub-contracting of Work Zone Traffic Control (WZTC) services. Non-expendable direct non-salary costs are defined as goods and services rented, leased, or purchased which are not consumed for project work. If workload for the prime (or total workload for all members of a joint venture) is >$1 million, it is multiplied by a Capacity Factor, if the Capacity Factor is less than 1.
Maximum reduction is 50%, and never to less than $1 million.

Capacity Factor = \[
\text{Median number of construction personnel in NYS or NYC metro area for all upstate OR downstate firms (see explanation below) in the current NYSDOT database with >54 employees and >0 construction personnel} \\
\text{Number of construction personnel in NYS or NYC metro area for prime (or total number of construction personnel in NYS or NYC metro area for all members of joint venture combined)}
\]

Upstate firms are firms having at least one office with an upstate NY zip code. Downstate firms are firms having at least one office with a NYC metro area zip code. Contract Management inputs will identify which calculation to use on specific target projects.

Primes or joint ventures with members that have no active certified salary roster in the NYSDOT database will be assumed for scoring purposes to have 0 construction personnel in the NYS or NYC metro area. For rating factor 2B2, use current remaining workload with NYSDOT submitted by prime (or total for joint venture members) and sub(s).

For both rating factors 2B1 and 2B2, multiply adjusted workload for prime (or joint venture) and sub(s) by their respective % of work, sum up to get team workload, then score team based on the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Workload</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$6 million</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$801 thousand - $1.100 million</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.001 million - $6.000 million</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$501 thousand - $800 thousand</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.001 million - $4.000 million</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$201 thousand - $500 thousand</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.701 million - $2.000 million</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1 - $200 thousand</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.401 million - $1.700 million</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.101 million - $1.400 million</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORING SYSTEM - RATING FACTOR 3**

Score prime (or joint venture) and sub(s) using the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance (office to project)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Distance (office to project)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;160 miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46-60 miles</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-160 miles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36-45 miles</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106-125 miles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21-35 miles</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-105 miles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11-20 miles</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-85 miles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0-10 miles</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70 miles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a final step, the scores for the prime (or joint venture) and sub(s) will be multiplied by their % of work and then summed up to get an overall team score for the factor.
SCORING SYSTEM - RATING FACTOR 4

One or more other factors may be identified in the Region’s project-specific profile - each is scored separately for all firms identified as responsible for that particular factor.

For the small firm opportunity credit, primes (or joint ventures) only will be scored. They will receive a full score of 10 for the factor if they answer “Yes” to the question “Does your firm or joint venture meet the requirements for a small firm credit as defined in the project advertisement?” They will receive a score of 0 if they answer “No”.

For standard other factors that are already part of NYSDOT’s consultant database, firms (or joint ventures) that are assigned responsibility for a particular factor will get a score for each of their prior jobs submitted that included that factor. Each project that included the factor will normally score 2.0, but this may be modified for particular factors on specific target projects. Projects completed more than 12 years ago receive a score of 0, and projects listed as individual experience rather than firm experience will have their scores multiplied by an “Individual experience factor” of 0.60. The overall rating for each particular factor will be a simple summation of the project scores, capped at a maximum rating of 10. Subs with no active CI project inventory in the NYSDOT database receive a score of 0 for all standard other factors. Primes or joint ventures with members that have no active CI project inventory will not be scored at all.

For special other factors, firms (or joint ventures) will be scored based on a specifically requested numeric response in their Expressions of Interest. Responses will be an integer from 0 to 10. The project advertisement will provide a description of each special factor and instructions on how it is to be scored. Firms (or joint ventures) who do not respond will get a score of 0 for that factor.

As a final step, the total scores for all firms (or joint ventures) identified as responsible for the special factor will be multiplied by their % of work and then summed up to get an overall team score for the factor.

NOTE: RATING FACTORS 5-7 ARE BONUSES OR PENALTIES APPLIED TO THE OVERALL TEAM SCORE CALCULATED BY SCORING AND WEIGHTING FACTORS 1A THRU 4

SCORING SYSTEM - RATING FACTOR 5

Score = (A x B/10)/10 x C

Where:
   A = Total proposed D/M/WBE participation (currently capped at 20% for maximum bonus), from the team’s Expression of Interest
   B = Prime’s (or average of JV members=) D/M/WBE performance score, from Contract’s database
   C = Weight for factor (current standard is 0.10)
This score is added to the overall team score for factors 1A thru 4.

**SCORING SYSTEM - RATING FACTOR 6A**

Average, for each D/M/WBE sub, their scores for rating factors 1A, 1C, 2A and 4, as applicable:

1) For subs not responsible for any subfactors of factor 4, average factors 1A, 1C and 2A.

2) For subs responsible only for subfactors of factor 4, average factors 2A and 4.

3) For subs responsible for multiple subfactors of factor 4, blend these multiple scores into a single score for factor 4, weighting at the same ratio as the weights proposed for the subfactors in the Region’s project-specific profile, before averaging with the other rating factors.

4) For subs identified as responsible only for subfactors of factor 4 that are not weighted in scoring, score the sub for the subfactors as in rating factor 4, blend scores (if necessary) weighting each other factor equally, and then average factor 2A with the blended score for the non-weighted subfactors of factor 4.

**Score for each D/M/WBE sub = A x (B/C) x D**

Where:

A = Average score for that sub of factors 1A, 1C, 2A and 4  
B = Proposed D/M/WBE participation of that sub, from the team’s Expression of Interest  
C = Cap for maximum D/M/WBE participation bonus (currently 20%)  
D = Weight for factor (current standard is 0.055)

Sum up scores for all D/M/WBE subs and add total to overall team score for factors 1A thru 4.

**SCORING SYSTEM - RATING FACTOR 6B**

Use current remaining construction workload with NYSDOT submitted by each D/M/WBE sub and score based on the same table as in rating factors 2B1 and 2B2.

**Score for each D/M/WBE sub = A x (B/C) x D**

Where:

A = Workload score for that sub  
B = Proposed D/M/WBE participation of that sub, from the team’s Expression of Interest  
C = Cap for maximum D/M/WBE participation bonus (currently 20%)  
D = Weight for factor (current standard is 0.045)

Sum up scores for all D/M/WBE subs and add total to overall team score for factors 1A thru 4.
SCORING SYSTEM - RATING FACTOR 7

Use the following info submitted by the prime (or joint venture members) and sub(s): time since last designation, prorated agreement value of last designation, functions performed under last designation, current remaining workload with NYSDOT, and total number of transportation-related staff in the NYS or NYC metro area. Firms with no active certified salary roster in the NYSDOT database will be assumed for scoring purposes to have 0 transportation-related staff in the NYS or NYC metro areas. Score each firm based on the following formula:

\[
\text{Score} = (\cdot)(A + B)/2 \times C \times (D / E) \times F \times G \times H \text{ (except that if } A = 0, \text{ the score should also be 0)}
\]

Where:
- A = Time Factor, calculated as shown below
- B = Size Factor, calculated as shown below
- C = Project Functions Factor, calculated as shown below
- D = Workload Factor, calculated as shown below
- E = Capacity Factor, calculated as shown below
- F = Total proposed % of work of the firm
- G = Weight for factor (current standard is 0.05)
- H = Factor applied to a prime or JV partner’s score based on the value of their last designation.

A. Time Factor = Date Expression of Interest was due - date of last designation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months since last NYSDOT designation</th>
<th>&lt;1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Factor</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Size Factor = Prorated agreement value of last NYSDOT designation (in $ thousands) x 0.004 (this number should be rounded up to the nearest integer and capped at 20)

C. Project Functions Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions performed under last NYSDOT designation</th>
<th>Construction Inspection</th>
<th>No Construction Inspection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Functions Factor</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Workload Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remaining workload with NYSDOT</th>
<th>&lt;$250 thousand</th>
<th>$250 thousand to $1 million</th>
<th>$1-2 million</th>
<th>$2-4 million</th>
<th>&gt;$4 million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload Factor</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Capacity Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total transportation-related staff in NYS or NYC metro area</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-15</th>
<th>16-50</th>
<th>51-100</th>
<th>101-200</th>
<th>&gt;200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Factor</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Factor applied to a prime or JV partner’s score based on the value of their last designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Value of last designation in thousands</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime or JV Partner</td>
<td>1-300</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>301-999999</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum up scores for all firms, and subtract that total from the overall team score for factors 1A thru 4.

**Conversion of scores to a different scoring base**

If the base of the scoring system for a specific target project is different than the default base of 10, the program will make the appropriate adjustments by multiplying scores by the ratio target base/default base.