

Statement of Qualifications Rating Worksheet

Applicability: to be used in conjunction with the LA DOTD Statement of Qualifications Rating Sheet and the Standard Form 330 (SF 330) Part I for the selection of consultants by a Qualifications Based Selection process. This worksheet provides guidance to the Consultant Selection Committee (CSC) on evaluating the qualifications received in the SF 330 and will aid the CSC in completing the Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) Rating Sheet.

Adherence to the LA DOTD Aviation Consultant Selection Process will ensure compliance with all applicable Federal Aviation Administration regulations and requirements regarding procurement of professional services, and is required for any proposed contracts with LA DOTD receiving funding from the Aviation Trust Fund.

Key Terms:

- **Consultant Selection Committee (CSC):** a committee formed by the airport sponsor, in accordance with LADOTD policy, for the purpose of selecting a consultant firm when the airport sponsor is seeking FAA or LADOTD Aviation funding for eligible airport projects.
- **Qualifications Based Selection (QBS) Process:** a process by which a firm is selected according to its qualifications as opposed to a fee-based selection process. In the QBS process, fees are only discussed after the top firm is selected and is done through a fee negotiation process.
- **Rating:** how well a firm rates for a particular data item on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being highest.
- **Standard Form 330 (SF 330):** a form used by Federal agencies to receive statements of qualifications when procuring professional services, which is authorized for local reproduction. LADOTD Aviation Section has chosen this form for use by airport sponsors when selecting consultant firms for projects eligible for FAA or LADOTD Aviation funding.
- **Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) Rating Sheet:** a rating sheet developed by LADOTD Aviation Section to enable the CSC to rate the qualifications of each firm submitting a SF 330 for a proposed contract. This SOQ Rating Sheet is to be used to develop a short list of firms from which the CSC will receive proposals through the Request for Proposals (RFP) process.
- **Weight Factor:** a factor of importance assigned to each Section of the SOQ Rating Sheet. The average rating for each Section is multiplied by that Section's Weight Factor in order to determine the firm's score for that Section (i.e., if the average rating for a Section is 7, and the Weight Factor for that Section is 3, then the Overall Score is 21 ($7 \times 3 = 21$)).

PART I

The qualifications provided in Part I of the SF 330 are specific to the contract(s) that the sponsor is seeking to procure.

SECTION A CONTRACT INFORMATION

The evaluator should check for the completeness, general accuracy and reasonableness of all information provided. Each data item must be fully completed in order to be marked “yes”. Any incomplete data items must be marked “no”. If an evaluator indicates “no” to any of the data items requested, the deficiencies must be discussed by the CSC as a whole to determine if the firm is considered satisfactory or not.

The information in this Section is scored as pass or fail. Any data items receiving a “no” mark may be considered incomplete and may cause a firm to receive an overall score of “Fail” for this Section.

SECTION B ARCHITECT-ENGINEER POINT OF CONTACT

The evaluator should check for the completeness, general accuracy and reasonableness of all information provided. Each data item must be fully completed in order to be marked “yes”. Any incomplete data items must be marked “no”. If an evaluator indicates “no” to any of the data items requested, the deficiencies must be discussed by the CSC as a whole to determine if the firm is considered satisfactory or not.

The information in this Section is scored as pass or fail. Any data items receiving a “no” mark may be considered incomplete and may cause a firm to receive an overall score of “Fail” for this Section.

SECTION C PROPOSED TEAM

The evaluator should check for the completeness, general accuracy and reasonableness of all information provided. Each data item must be fully completed in order to be marked “yes”. Any incomplete data items must be marked “no”. If an evaluator indicates “no” to any of the data items requested, the deficiencies must be discussed by the CSC as a whole to determine if the firm is considered satisfactory or not.

Joint-venture firms and sub-consultants may or may not be required, depending on whether or not the prime firm can meet all of the requirements for the technical disciplines established in the criteria. If no information is received for Joint-Venture or Sub-Consultant firms, those items may be marked as “N/A”; however, Section C of the SF 330 should be reviewed carefully by the evaluator to ensure all key personnel meet the technical discipline requirements of the Selection Criteria. If

not all technical disciplines are met by the Prime Firm, then the absence of information for Joint-Venture or Sub-Consultants may result in those data items being marked “no”.

The information in this Section is scored as pass or fail. Any data items receiving a “no” mark may be considered incomplete and may cause a firm to receive an overall score of “Fail” for this Section.

SECTION D ORGANIZATIONAL CHART OF PROPOSED TEAM

The evaluator should check to ensure the firm has provided an organization chart showing the names and roles of all key personnel listed in Section E and the firm they are associated with as listed in Section C. The chart should provide a clear picture of the working relationship between all key personnel on the proposed team.

SECTION E RESUMES OF KEY PERSONNEL FOR THIS PROJECT

12 – 18. The evaluator should check for the completeness, general accuracy and reasonableness of all information provided. The evaluator should then review the experience, education, and professional qualifications provided for each key personnel proposed for the contract to ensure that the individuals listed are qualified for the project(s) planned by the airport.

19. The evaluator should review the projects listed, which should contain projects in which the individual had a significant role and demonstrates the individual’s capabilities in providing the required level of service for the airport’s proposed projects. These projects do not necessarily have to correspond to the projects listed in Section F, but it should be noted in the appropriate check box if the project was done with the firm to which the individual currently belongs.

Section E is the first Section of the SOQ Rating Sheet that is scored by a numerical value. An overall score of 1-5 (5 being the highest, 1 being the lowest) should be assigned to Section E after the evaluator has reviewed all resumes of key personnel and determined the value of the experience of the proposed team as a whole.

SECTION F EXAMPLE PROJECTS WHICH BEST ILLUSTRATE PROPOSED TEAM’S QUALIFICATIONS FOR THIS CONTRACT

21-23. The evaluator should check for the completeness, general accuracy and reasonableness of all information provided. The CSC should contact the owner of each project listed at this point in the selection process for a brief evaluation of the firm’s performance.

24. The evaluator should review the project description to determine its relevance to the projects being planned by the airport.

25. For each project, the evaluator should review the list of firms and the information provided with each and compare to firms listed in Section C. While it is not necessary for all firms listed for a project to correspond to Section C, the most important roles in each project should have been performed by firms in the proposed team listed in Section C.

Each project should be scored individually, with the overall score being derived from the average of all project scores in Section F. This score should be based on how well the example project demonstrates the firm's ability to perform the projects being proposed by the airport in the Request for Qualifications.

****NOTE:** if the firm has not provided the number of example projects requested by the CSC in the Request for Qualifications, then a score of 0 (zero) will be assigned to each project line left blank up to the requested amount of projects (i.e. if 7 projects are requested and only 4 provided, then projects #5 through #7 shall receive a score of 0)

SECTION G **KEY PERSONNEL PARTICIPATION IN EXAMPLE PROJECTS**

26-29. The evaluator should check for the completeness, general accuracy and reasonableness of all information provided. The evaluator should then review the list of key personnel listed for each project as well as the role each individual performed in the project.

29. The evaluator should score each project based on the participation of key personnel, and by comparing key personnel's role in that contract with their role in the proposed contract.

****NOTE:** If the firm has not provided the number of example projects requested by the CSC in the Request for Qualifications, then a score of 0 (zero) will be assigned to each project line left blank up to the requested amount of projects (i.e. if 7 projects are requested and only 4 provided, then projects #5-#7 shall receive a score of 0).

SECTION H **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

30. The evaluator should check for the completeness, general accuracy and reasonableness of all information provided. Section H of the SOQ Rating Sheet provides for the CSC to list additional criteria not mentioned in Sections A through G of the SOQ Rating Worksheet.

The data items listed in Section H should consist of additional criteria that the CSC feels are necessary for the proposed contract and reflect a particular need or needs not addressed by the Standard Form 330 Part I. Information on a firm's principal, business licenses and permits, information typically requested by auditors, and other pertinent info are examples of items to include in this Section. The CSC may use either a "Pass/Fail" or numerical rating scale for Special Criteria. A weighing factor should be applied to each separate Special Criteria.

Detailed criteria, such as proposed scope of services, technical approach descriptions, proposed schedules, presentations, and detailed proposals in general should be requested in the Request for Proposals stage of the Consultant Selection process rather than in Section H of the State of Qualifications

In order to include Special Criteria in the Request for Qualifications, the CSC must first complete the LA DOTD Aviation Special Criteria form and include it in the First Document Transmittal.

PART II

The qualifications provided in Part II of the SF 330 are the general qualifications of each firm/branch office that will be part of the team for the specific contract(s). As stated in the instructions, each separate firm on the team should provide a separate Part II as well as the different branch offices of a firm that will be involved (if applicable).

The evaluator should check for the completeness, general accuracy and reasonableness of all information provided.

This Part must be fully completed in order to be marked “yes”. If there are any incomplete Sections in this Part, then this Part must be marked “no”. If an evaluator gives a “no” indication to this Part, the deficiencies must be discussed by the CSC as a whole to determine if the firm is considered satisfactory or not.

The information for this Part is scored as pass or fail. If this Part receives a “no” mark it may be considered incomplete and may cause a firm to receive an overall score of “Fail” for this Part.