

**CAMINO REAL REGIONAL MOBILITY AUTHORITY
BOARD RESOLUTION**

WHEREAS, the Camino Real Regional Mobility Authority (CRRMA) adopted an Expedited Selection Process for Professional Engineering Services via Board Resolution of August 29, 2012 (the Expedited Process), which allows for a pre-qualified list of engineering firms, by discipline, from which the CRRMA may issue requests for proposals when seeking to engage a firm on an expedited timeline and subject to other restrictions;

WHEREAS, the CRRMA has entered into a project development agreement (PDA) with the Texas Department of Transportation for the completion of the remaining design work necessary for the I-10 at Loop 375 (Americas Interchange) Project, which includes the final two direct connectors (southbound to eastbound (SBEB) and northbound to eastbound (NBEB)) as well as additional frontage road and cloverleaf design services; and

WHEREAS, the CRRMA desires to utilize the Expedited Process for the selection of some of the design services necessitated by the PDA, but would like to establish the selection criteria and scoring to be used in any such selection processes in advance;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CAMINO REAL REGIONAL MOBILITY AUTHORITY:

THAT the CRRMA hereby adopts the selection criteria and scoring identified in **Attachment "A"**, which is attached hereto, as it utilizes its Expedited Selection Process for Professional Engineering Services in relation to the selection of firms for the remaining design work on the I-10 at Loop 375 (Americas Interchange) Project.

PASSED AND APPROVED THIS 13TH DAY OF MARCH 2013.

**CAMINO REAL REGIONAL
MOBILITY AUTHORITY**

ATTEST:

Scott McLaughlin, Chair

Susan A. Melendez, Board Secretary

APPROVED AS TO CONTENT:

Raymond L. Telles
Executive Director

ATTACHMENT "A"



CAMINO REAL
REGIONAL MOBILITY
AUTHORITY

Engineering Selection Criteria

SCORE SHEET

Project:

| Response Elements | | Maximum Points | Scores | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | Consultant 1 | Consultant 2 | Consultant 3 | Consultant 4 |
| PROJECT UNDERSTANDING | | 40 | | | | |
| Did the consultant demonstrate familiarity with the project? | 10 | | | | | |
| Did the consultant demonstrate an understanding of the overall goal and project objective? | 5 | | | | | |
| Did the consultant demonstrate an understanding of how the project fits into the overall transportation system? | 5 | | | | | |
| Did the consultant present a demonstrated solution to reaching the project goal/objective? | 10 | | | | | |
| Did the consultant provide a detailed approach to accomplishing the project and key deadlines? | 10 | | | | | |
| VALUE ADDED | | 10 | | | | |
| Did the consultant present any value added concepts? | 10 | | | | | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL (QA/QC) | | 10 | | | | |
| Evaluate the consultant's QA/QC policy, implementation responsibility and examples of how it has been successfully used. | 10 | | | | | |
| PROJECT MANAGER/CONSULTANT EXPERIENCE | | 35 | | | | |
| Has the Project Manager successfully completed similar projects on schedule and budget? | 10 | | | | | |
| Is the Project Manager familiar with local project issues, agencies and the local and regional setting? | 10 | | | | | |
| Has the consultant completed similar projects on schedule and budget? | 5 | | | | | |
| Did the consultant provide any additional qualification information related to the project? | 5 | | | | | |
| Has the project team worked on similar types of projects before? | 5 | | | | | |
| DBE UTILIZATION | | 5 | | | | |
| Does the consultant provide DBE utilization or is the consultant a DBE? | 5 | | | | | |
| TOTAL SCORES | | 100 | | | | |