

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**  
Engineering Services, 5300 Bishop Blvd., Cheyenne, WY 82009-3340  
Telephone: 777-3820  
Fax: 777-3852

**CONSULTANT SELECTION PROCEDURE**

**FEDERAL FUNDED LARGE AGREEMENTS (>\$250,000):**

A two-step selection process including a Request for Proposals (RFP) is required for federal funded large agreements.

Letters of Interest will be solicited by Engineering Services. Only firms who submit a Letter of Interest (LOI) can be considered.

**STEP ONE:**

1. A preliminary selection meeting will be held to determine the short list of firms to receive the RFP and the RFP requirements.
2. The selection committee selects a chair to record the ranking of each firm by the committee members.
3. The project administrator explains the scope of work to provide the committee members with the basis for the selection.
4. If necessary, explain how the list of qualified consultants was derived.
  - a. Consultants submit a general Statement of Interest (SOI) to be considered for WYDOT work.
  - b. A project-specific LOI is solicited from all firms on the Consultant Registry long list, plus posting on the WYDOT website.
  - c. A consultant may be disqualified from the selection if the committee determines they do not engage in the type of services described in the scope of work.
5. Determine the short list of firms to receive the RFP using the CS-5a Form. A minimum of five (5) firms must be selected if enough LOIs are submitted for consideration.
6. Determine the requirements for the RFP as follows:
  - a. Detailed scope of work.
  - b. Technical requirements.
  - c. Proposed schedule for completion of the project.

- d. Evaluation criteria which are conducive to the requirements of the project. The criteria listed in these instructions are representative of typical criteria, but are not required to be used and can be supplemented by other criteria established by the committee. A minimum of three (3) criteria should be used.
- e. Relative factor weights (%) for each of the evaluation criteria. The total of the factor weights should equal 100%.
- f. Anticipated schedule leading to consultant selection.
- g. Type of agreement to be used and the basis for compensation.
- h. Whether or not interviews will be required or possible.
- i. Identification of any subconsultants.
- j. Cost proposals (if allowable for the specific project).

**STEP TWO:**

1. A final selection meeting will be held using the CS-5b Form provided by Engineering Services.
2. Each committee member should review the RFP, general SOI, and LOI for each firm, and determine a rating for that consultant relative to the evaluation criteria. Ratings are done on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (superior). If it becomes apparent that a particular consultant does not have relevant project experience, that consultant may be eliminated from further consideration. Additionally, if there is not sufficient information available to make a determination, an average rating (3) must be given to prevent unwarranted penalization of the consultant.
3. After committee members have reviewed each firm's RFP, general SOI, and LOI, and ranked them for all evaluation criteria on their individual rating forms, the committee should discuss each consultant and determine an appropriate final rating for each criteria. That number is then entered on an official CS-5b, Evaluation & Ranking form. All evaluation rankings must be completed for each firm before proceeding to the next consultant.
4. Upon completion of the evaluation, the factor weight is multiplied by the rating for each consultant to determine the scores for each criteria. The scores should then be totaled, with the highest scoring consultant being chosen for the project.
5. The committee chair should forward all Evaluation & Ranking forms (the official form and all committee members' forms) to the Engineering Services office for action.

**STANDARD SELECTION CRITERIA:**

The standard criteria are defined as follows:

Related Work Experience - This evaluates the firm's established expertise and job history as it relates to the services required for the project.

Personnel Qualifications - This evaluates the capability of the firm's staff to perform the required services.

Previous WYDOT Experience - This evaluates how well the consultant has performed on past WYDOT projects. Written performance reviews can be found in the consultant's SOI file for those consultants who have completed services to the Department in the past five (5) years. If a consultant has no previous WYDOT experience or unrelated previous WYDOT experience, an average rating (3) should be given.

Knowledge of Project - There is usually some benefit to the Department if the consultant has some prior knowledge of the project and required services.

Current Workload of Firm - The committee may request a print out from Engineering Services of what projects each consultant currently has with the Department.

Ability to Meet Project Schedule – This evaluates the firm's ability to meet the requirements of the project schedule as stated in the request for interest or the RFP.

Product Delivery Requirements - This factor addresses the firm's ability to produce the necessary project deliverables. Delivery requirements may relate to items such as available equipment, computer hardware/software, etc.

Local Presence - This criteria may be used where a local presence will add value to the quality or efficiency of the project delivery, but will still allow for the consideration of a sufficient number of qualified firms. In-state versus out-of-state cannot be considered as part of this criteria. This criteria may only equal up to 10% of the total weighted factors. Note: if DBE participation is added as a criteria, the two categories combined may not equal more than 10% of the total weighted factors.

(Revised February 2020)

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
ENGINEERING SERVICES**

**CONSULTANT SELECTION REPORT  
SHORT LIST EVALUATION & RANKING**

**Project Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**County:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Committee Members:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

The Selection Committee has collectively compared the project scope of work with the list of qualified firms for short listing evaluation and ranking.

Note the ratings are the collective recommendations of the Selection Committee.

Based on the Selection Committee's collective ranking, the following firms are recommended for the short list (5 minimum if possible):

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_
7. \_\_\_\_\_
8. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Selection Committee Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**SHORT LISTING EVALUATION & RANKING**

Project Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Committee Member Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

County: \_\_\_\_\_

		Name of Firm										
Committee Member:												
Total Score:												
Ranking:												

Ranking: Each committee member should rank their top 5 firms from 1-5. All other firms will receive a ranking of 6. Total ranking will be based from lowest to highest Total Score.

**WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
ENGINEERING SERVICES**

**CONSULTANT SELECTION REPORT  
EVALUATION & RANKING**

**Project Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**County:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Committee Members:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

The Selection Committee has collectively compared the project scope of work with the short list of qualified firms for final evaluation, ranking, and selection.

Note the ratings are the collective recommendations of the Selection Committee.

Based on the Selection Committee's collective ranking, the firm of \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ has been selected to provide consulting services pending approval by the Division Administrator and the successful negotiation of fees.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Selection Committee Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**CONSULTANT EVALUATION & RANKING**

Project Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Committee Member Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
 County: \_\_\_\_\_

FIRM ID	FIRM NAME	LOCATION
A		
B		
C		
D		
E		
F		
G		

Evaluation Factors:	SCORE														
	Factor Weights	A Rate	A Score	B Rate	B Score	C Rate	C Score	D Rate	D Score	E Rate	E Score	F Rate	F Score	G Rate	G Score
Total Score	100														

**Evaluation Factor Weights:** The selection committee shall weigh each evaluation factor by a percent with a total factor weight of 100%.  
**Rating Scale:** 1 = Poor; 2 = Fair; 3 = Average; 4 = Good; 5 = Superior