

# Consultant Selection Rating Results

**Opening Date: 12/08/2023**



		Selection Committee Member Scores			Total Score
		City Administrator	City Engineer	Public Works Supt.	
		Nick Dutro	Matt Watson	Brandon Burner	
<b>Firms</b>	<b>OHM</b>	84	81	80	245
	<b>American Structurepoint</b>	90	89	84	263
					0

Consultant Selection Rating Form  
for  
Programmatic Selections

Project: SEN-SR 53  
 PID: 120415  
 Project Type: ROAD/SIGNAL/SAFETY  
 District: 2  
 Selection Committee Members:  
NICK DUTTO  
 BRANDON BURNER  
 MATT WATSON

Firm Name: OHM

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	20
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	26
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		22
<b>Total</b>	100		84

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 **SEN - SR 53**  
 PID **120415**  
 Project Type **ROAD/SIGNAL/SAFETY**  
 District **2**  
 Selection Committee Members

Firm Name **American Structurepoint**

**Nick D'Amico**  
**Brandon Burner**  
**Matt Watson**

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	<b>8</b>
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	<b>23</b>
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	<b>8</b>
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	<b>26</b>
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		<b>25</b>
<b>Total</b>	100		<b>90</b>

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 SEN-SR 53  
 PID 120415  
 Project Type ROAD/SIGNAL/SAFETY  
 District 2  
 Selection Committee Members  
NICK Dutro  
Brandon Burner  
Matt Watson

Firm Name OHM

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	<u>8</u>
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	<u>21</u>
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	<u>7</u>
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	<u>24</u>
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		<u>20</u>
<b>Total</b>	100		<u>80</u>

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 SEN-SR 53  
PID 120415  
Project Type ROAD/SIGNAL/SAFETY  
District 2  
Selection Committee Members

Firm Name American Structurepaint

Nick Duto  
Brandon Burner  
Matt Watson

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	26
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		21
<b>Total</b>	100		84

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 SEN-SR 53  
PID: 120415  
Project Type ROAD/SIGNAL/SAFETY  
District: 2  
Selection Committee Members

Nick Dutro  
Brandon Burner  
Matt Watson

Firm Name OHM

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	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	26
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		18
<b>Total</b>	100		81

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 **SEN-SR 53**  
PID **120415**  
Project Type **ROAD/SIGNAL/SAFETY**  
District **2**  
Selection Committee Members

Firm Name **American Structurepoint**

**Nick Duto**  
**Brandon Burner**  
**Matt Watson**

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	<b>9</b>
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	<b>22</b>
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	<b>10</b>
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	<b>26</b>
<b>Project Approach</b>	25		<b>22</b>
<b>Total</b>	100		<b>89</b>

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.