

Memorandum

*Serious drought.
Help save water!*

To: ANGELA SHELL, Chief
Division of Procurement and Contracts

Date: March 29, 2016

File: P4000-0402

From: WILLIAM E. LEWIS
Assistant Director
Audits and Investigations



Subject: **FINAL AUDIT REPORT OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL PROCESS (REVISED)**

Attached is Audits and Investigations' (A&I) final audit report of the Request for Proposal Process. Your response has been included as part of our final report. This information is intended for your information.

Please provide our office with status reports on the implementation of audit finding dispositions 60-, 180-, and 360-days subsequent to the report date. If the finding has not been corrected within 360 days, please continue to provide status reports every 180 days until the audit finding is fully resolved. If you would like, the audit staff can be available to consult in the early stages of implementation to ensure that your corrective actions address the finding and recommendations in our report. As a matter of public record, this report and the status reports will be posted on Caltrans' website.

We thank you and your staff for the assistance during this audit. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Zilan Chen, Chief, Internal Audits, at (916) 323-7877.

Attachment

c: Malcolm Dougherty, Director
Kome Ajise, Chief Deputy Director
Cristiana Rojas, Deputy Director, Administration
Kelly Takigawa, Assistant Division Chief, Policy, Communications, and Material Management
Lindy Wilson, Assistant Division Chief, Non-Information Technology Contracts
Zilan Chen, Chief, Internal Audits, Audits and Investigations

Department of Transportation
Request for Proposal Process Audit

P4000-0402

March 2016

Prepared By:

Audits and Investigations

California Department of Transportation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY	1
BACKGROUND	2
CONCLUSION	2
VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS	3
FINDING AND RECOMMENDATIONS	4
FINDING – Improvement Needed in Written Guidelines, Procedures, and Documentation	4
ATTACHMENT	
Response to the Draft Audit Report from the Division of Procurement and Contracts	

SUMMARY, OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, METHODOLOGY, BACKGROUND, AND CONCLUSION

SUMMARY

Audits and Investigations (A&I) has completed an audit of the California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans) procurement process for the Request for Proposal (RFP) 88A0095. The purpose of the audit was to determine whether the procurement process used during the solicitation, evaluation, award, and protest of RFP 88A0095 was adequate and in compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

Our audit disclosed that, in general, Caltrans has policies and procedures to process the procurement and protests of contract awards for RFP solicitations. The procurement of RFP 88A0095 complied with existing Caltrans policies and procedures except Division of Procurement and Contracts (DPAC) needs to improve its written guidelines, procedures, and documentation.

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

The audit was performed in accordance with the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing. The objectives of the audit were to determine whether:

- Caltrans policies and procedures over the request for proposal process are adequate to ensure compliance with laws and regulations.
- The procurement of RFP 88A0095 complies with Caltrans policies and procedures.
- The protest process for RFP 88A0095 is conducted in accordance with established policies and procedures.

The audit focused on DPAC's processing of RFP 88A0095 during the period June 1, 2014, to June 30, 2015. We completed our field work on November 30, 2015. Changes after this date were not considered, and accordingly, our conclusion does not pertain to changes arising after November 30, 2015.

In order to achieve the audit objectives, we interviewed DPAC officials to obtain an understanding of internal controls, the procurement and protest processes of a Request for Proposal type procurement. We also reviewed the reliability of DPAC's information technology (IT) systems with respect to the processing of RFP 88A0095 data. Finally, we performed substantive tests on RFP 88A0095.

BACKGROUND

RFP is a formal competitive bidding solicitation process to obtain complex and/or unique services. Contract analysts in DPAC's contract office review bids submitted for non-IT service contracts. The Contract Office is the point of contact to assist programs, divisions, and districts with solicitations, and requests for proposal development, evaluations and consensus scoring of technical proposals and oral presentations.

The RFP evaluation process is conducted by an evaluation committee comprised of at least three voting members which includes technical experts representing the functional area of the responsible program. Evaluation committee members are charged to provide an independent and consensus review of each proposal deemed eligible by DPAC. Under the RFP process, the lowest bidder (Primary Method) or the highest scoring bidder (Secondary Method) is awarded the contract.

DPAC is responsible for maintaining the integrity of the service contract process. DPAC accomplishes this by ensuring all applicable procurement laws, regulations, and policies are followed so the procurement process is not arbitrary, capricious, or abused.

According to DPAC, its Protest Roles and Responsibilities Branch is required to provide customers with responsive unbiased resolution services in compliance with rules, policies, procedures, and statutes, while protecting Caltrans from risk and liability, as well as from fraud or appearance of special treatment to vendors of Caltrans. The protest analysts' responsibilities include facilitation of meetings as well as providing a meeting summary to all participants involved in the protest. Additionally, Caltrans' Legal Division provides DPAC staff with legal opinions on the issues of the protest and reviews the draft decision letters.

The Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Support Services, RFP 88A0095, was for the purpose of increasing the total number of certified DBE firms active in the federal-aid highway construction industry and contributing to their growth and eventual self-sufficiency. Three proposals were submitted and evaluated for this RFP; and on August 4, 2014, DPAC awarded the contract to GCAP Incorporated (GCAP). A protest and subsequent court decision identified issues regarding the contract award, specifically indicating that DPAC did not completely follow federal and state laws governing the request for proposal award.

CONCLUSION

Our audit disclosed that, in general, Caltrans has policies and procedures to process the procurement and protests of contract awards for RFPs. The procurement of RFP 88A0095 complied with existing Caltrans policies and procedures except for DPAC needs to improve its written guidelines, procedures, and documentation.

DPAC has taken steps to address some of the deficiencies identified during the audit. Specifically, DPAC has updated its RFP Manual with additional guidelines and procedures regarding future requests for proposal evaluations and award reporting. DPAC has also revised its scoring methodology and evaluation, and other forms in order to make the evaluation process easier and more transparent. A&I did not perform tests to determine the sufficiency of the revisions.

VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS

We requested and received a response to our finding from the Acting Chief, Division of Procurement and Contracts, who concurred with the finding. Please see the attachment for the response.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "William E. Lewis", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

WILLIAM E. LEWIS, CPA
Assistant Director
Audits and Investigations

March 18, 2016

FINDING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDING – Improvement Needed in Written Guidelines, Procedures, and Documentation

Based on our audit, we determined that, although the Division of Procurement and Contracts (DPAC) has written procedures for both the request for proposal (RFP) and protest processes, these procedures were not always complete or clear in their intentions. We also noted deficiencies in documentation due to lack of written procedures. State Administrative Manual (SAM) Section 20050 requires entities to regulate and guide operations by using documented tools and methods such as narratives and desk procedures. Specifically, we found the following:

No Documentation of Protest Meetings

The protest analyst did not document the initial meeting and review of the protest with the required Caltrans staff. This documentation is necessary to record and support pertinent facts surrounding the protest, ensure accurate preparation of the protest decision letter, and enhance the likelihood of prevailing at a hearing.

Government Code Section 13403 requires state agencies to have effective internal administrative controls. Internal administrative controls comprise the methods and procedures that address operational efficiency and adherence to management policies, and include “an established system of practices to be followed in performance of duties and functions in each of the state agencies.” Internal controls also include “a system of policies and procedures adequate to provide compliance with applicable laws, criteria, standards, and other requirements.”

Undocumented Description of DPAC Supervisors’ Role in Evaluation Committees

The RFP Manual (Manual) did not describe the roles and responsibilities of DPAC supervisors in the evaluation process despite the fact that they participate in a non-voting capacity to provide advice and guidance to the evaluation committee. DPAC staff also stated that it is occasionally necessary to seek the advice and guidance of other sources such as the Legal Division during the evaluation process. However, the 2013 Manual did not include DPAC supervisors or other sources as participants in the evaluation process. The lack of complete documented procedures and the rationale of the decisions can give the impression of noncompliance and the appearance of potential undue influence in the RFP process.

Supporting Evidence for Consensus

Although the results of the consensus and scores arrived at by the evaluation committee of RFP 88A0095 are documented in the evaluation summary, there is no supporting evidence such as signatures on the evaluation summary that all the committee members agreed with or acknowledged the final scores. Moreover, DPAC shreds individual notes of evaluation committee members after compilation by the committee’s scribe and DPAC’s contract analyst.

SAM Section 20050 requires adequate internal controls for state agencies in order to provide reasonable assurance that measures to safeguard assets, ensure operational efficiency, and enable adherence to management's policies.

According to DPAC, not all committee members prepare notes, and the notes frequently do not reflect the final score. However, documents supporting the solicitation and evaluation processes can provide insight on how RFPs are evaluated. Without supporting documents or committee members' signatures on the evaluation summary, it is difficult to prove that the evaluation summary correctly reflected the consensus of the evaluation committee.

Incomplete Confidentiality Forms

One nominee of the evaluation committee did not complete the confidentiality form, while two evaluation committee members participated without being nominated. In addition, there was no documentation to indicate if required roles, such as scribe or chairperson, were assigned to committee members.

Confidentiality forms are essential to require committee members to protect sensitive or confidential information submitted by bidders. DPAC's Manual states that an evaluation committee nomination must be completed and submitted to DPAC. Each member of the committee is required to sign a confidentiality statement, "RFP/RFQ Evaluation Committee Member Rules and Code of Ethical Standards," and the conflict of interest form. Additionally, the Manual indicates that selected committee members cannot be replaced or substituted when they withdraw or are dropped for any reason after the initial evaluation has started. The Manual also provides that the contract manager must assign a scribe to record the evaluation narrative that is attached to each score sheet. The designated scribe documents the discussion that takes place identifying each proposal's strengths, weaknesses, and substantiates the consensus scoring. The committee chairperson is a non-voting member who facilitates committee discussions, calculates the final score for each evaluation criterion, and prepares the final evaluation reports displaying the consensus score.

According to the RFP branch chief, the Evaluation Participation Nominee form was missing from the file and could not be located at the time of the audit. The absence of properly completed confidentiality forms may expose Caltrans to questions about the appropriateness of panel members and the confidentiality of the bid proposals.

Lack of the Evaluation and Selection Staff Report

DPAC did not prepare the Evaluation and Selection Staff Report which documents the conclusion of the evaluation committee and provides the basis for making the contract award. Also, to support the evaluation process, DPAC did not document that the required internal meetings were conducted, including the pre-technical meeting that instructs the evaluation committee members on the appropriate evaluation method to use for the specific request for proposal.

The Manual states that at the end of the RFP evaluation process, the consensus scoring evaluation score sheets and all technical and cost proposals become a part of the DPAC staff report titled "Evaluation and Selection Staff Report." This report documents the conclusions of the evaluation committee and is used as the basis for making the contract award. The Manual also states that internal meetings are a part of the request for proposal process and may be held during the course of the initiation and evaluation if applicable. In addition, prior to the technical proposal review, the evaluation committee members are required to be given preliminary instructions that pertain to the proposal including procedures for use and how to interpret the evaluation criteria.

The DPAC RFP Office Chief stated that preparation of the Evaluation and Selection Staff Report had not been implemented.

Undocumented Justification for Waiver to Error in Cost Proposal

The cost scoring worksheet prepared by DPAC that summarizes the score given to each proposer's cost proposal showed that DPAC waived an error in one of the three cost proposal numbers without providing any justification.

State Contracting Manual (SCM) Section 6.40 advises that the agency should ensure that all bidders are treated fairly and impartially. The section also advises that the waiver of immaterial defects in any one proposal should not unduly prejudice other proposals.

DPAC considered the changes to the cost proposal to be immaterial. However, waivers to competing proposals without appropriate supporting justification increases the chance of a protest upon contract award and may provide the appearance of bias.

Lack of Eligibility Documentation

The contract/acquisition analyst did not document necessary proposal eligibility information such as the required number of proposals, proposer name, place, and time received by DPAC. Proposal eligibility documentation provides a record of proposals received for an RFP and satisfies the competitive bidding requirement. Without such a record, the evaluation process could be called into question if the eligibility requirements for submission of proposals have not been met.

Incorrect Information on Contracting Documents

We noted a number of contracting forms to be incorrect or not updated. Specifically, the contract request package for the re-bid RFP did not include an updated and approved Form ADM 360, Service Contract Request, that reflected the correct contract amount and fiscal years. Additionally, Form ADM 4011, Public Relations Services Certification, was not updated to reflect the re-bid contract amount. Also, DPAC did not indicate on Form STD 215 the Agreement Summary with GCAP Services Incorporated (GCAP Inc.), that it had previously awarded a contract for similar services, Contract Number 88A0088, to GCAP Inc.

Incomplete and inadequate documentation of evaluation committee membership and review of competing proposals increase DPAC's chance of not being able to support the award decision in the event of a protest. In addition, if the confidentiality forms are not completed, biased and inaccurate evaluations could be made by evaluation committee members. Further, when issuing a protest decision, it is difficult, if not impossible, to provide adequate justifications without proper supporting documents. Finally, the cumulative effect of missing, incomplete, or incorrect documentation could give the appearance of circumvention regarding the RFP and protest processes.

The lack of adequate training and limitations in the Contract Administration Tracking System (CATS) are factors contributing to the inadequate or incorrect documentation as follows:

- Regarding training, we observed that some DPAC analysts did not complete recommended training relating to the RFP and protest processes. For instance, we noted that only two of the six contract analysts completed one or two of the four recommended RFP courses offered by the Department of General Services (DGS) on Cal-PCA/Contracting. According to DPAC, DGS stopped offering the courses before the staff could complete them.
- A combination of an error by the contract manager and limitations in CATS contributed to the incorrect information on Form STD 215. Contract analysts used information on Form ADM 360, which is submitted by contract managers, when preparing Form STD 215 for the contract with a winning bidder. According to DPAC, contract managers are occasionally confused whether contracts are "new" or "renewals." In this particular instance, the contract manager erroneously indicated on Form ADM 360 that the request was for a new service rather than a renewal or continuation. Since the CATS history database capability is limited, DPAC claimed the contract analyst preparing Form STD 215 could not verify whether GCAP Inc. had been used previously for the same services, and relied on the information on the Form ADM 360.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend DPAC management:

1. Finalize and implement the updated Manual as soon as possible. These procedures should adhere to the regulations governing the preparation, advertisement, and receipt of solicitations. Additionally, these procedures should provide guidelines for RFPs that are subsequently cancelled and for the approval protocol of RFPs that are bid more than once.
2. Require evaluation committee members to sign off on RFPs' evaluation summaries as proof of their consensus of the bidders' scores.
3. Ensure updated forms documenting specific meetings and nominating evaluation committee members are accurate, complete, identify assigned roles and are maintained in the RFP file for propriety and to support conclusions reached.
4. Require all necessary documentation to support the initiation and award of the RFP be maintained in file format (manual and/or electronic) or appropriately explained.
5. Ensure documentation is provided to support the decision and conclusions reached if changes are made to a competing proposal.

6. Provide clear guidance on how to track and document protests received, correspondence with the protester, and instructions for requesting repayment of contract funds if required on a terminated contract.
7. Require all necessary documentation to support the conclusions and decision of protests including all levels of review and approval are maintained in file format (manual and/or electronic) or appropriately explained.
8. Require that DPAC analysts attend the recommended training pertinent to the solicitation, evaluation and award, and protests of RFPs. In the absence of DGS classes, DPAC should consider providing in-house refresher training conducted by more experienced staff.
9. Remind contract managers to complete Form ADM 360 correctly for contracts that are being renewed.

DIVISION OF PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTS RESPONSE

The Division of Procurement and Contracts concurs with the finding and recommendations. Please see the attachment for details of the response and action plan.

AUDIT TEAM

Zilan Chen, Chief, Internal Audits

Douglas Gibson, Audit Manager

Kathy Brooks, Auditor

ATTACHMENT

Response to Draft Audit Report from the Division of Procurement and Contracts

Memorandum

*Serious drought.
Help save water!*

To: WILLIAM E. LEWIS
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
AUDITS AND INVESTIGATIONS

Date: March 25, 2016

File: P3000-0402

From: LORI A. GUINAN 
Acting Division Chief
Division of Procurement and Contracts

Subject: **DRAFT RESPONSE - REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL PROCESS AUDIT**

The Division of Procurement and Contracts (DPAC) has attached the draft audit response for the Request for Proposal Process Audit dated March 18, 2016. DPAC has successfully implemented changes to satisfy recommendations 1:3 and 1:4. We will continue to make process improvements on the remaining recommendations.

If you have any questions regarding the status report, please contact Sabrina McGlothlin at (916) 227-6071.

Attachments:

- (1) RFP Evaluation Committee Nomination Form
- (2) Oral Presentation and Evaluations Sign-in Sheet
- (3) Technical Proposal Evaluations Sign-in Sheet
- (4) RFP Method: Primary (low bid)
- (5) RFP Method: Secondary (high score)

- c: Lindy Wilson, Assistant Division Chief, Service Contracts and Procurement, Division of Procurement and Contracts
Tracy Franco, Acting Assistant Division Chief, Policy, Protests, Communications and Materiel Management, Division of Procurement and Contracts
Michelle Thompson, Acting Office Chief, Policy, Protest, and Communications, Division of Procurement and Contracts
Sabrina McGlothlin, Branch Chief, Policy, Division of Procurement and Contracts

Audits and Investigations (A&I) - Response to Draft Report

Audit Name: Request for Proposal Process Audit

Audit No. P4000-0402

Auditee: Division of Procurement and Contracts (DPAC)

Audit Report Finding
Origin: Process Weakness

	A&I Audit Recommendation	Auditee Response to Draft Report	Estimated Completion Date	Staff Responsible
1:1	Finalize and implement the updated Manual as soon as possible. These procedures should adhere to the regulations governing the preparation, advertisement, and receipt of solicitations. Additionally, these procedures should provide guidelines for RFPs that are subsequently cancelled and for the approval protocol of RFPs that are bid more than once.	Updated RFP Manual will be finalized and implemented in April 2016.	4/29/2016	Rajit Sharma
1:2	Require evaluation committee members to sign off on RFPs' evaluation summaries as proof of their consensus of the bidders' scores.	Evaluation consensus forms will be revised to include committee signatures.	4/29/2016	Rajit Sharma
1:3	Ensure updated forms documenting specific meetings and nominating evaluation committee members are accurate, complete, identify assigned roles and are maintained in the RFP file for propriety and to support conclusions reached.	RFP Process Report, updated RFP Evaluation Committee Nominations Memorandum, and Sign-in sheets for all participants (voting and non-voting) for all RFP evaluations meetings have been implanted in the RFP process to address the audit finding and recommendations.	Completed	Rajit Sharma
1:4	Require all necessary documentation to support the initiation and award of the RFP be maintained in file format (manual and/or electronic) or appropriately explained.	RFP Process Report has been implemented to document key dates, participants, proposers and scores/results of all RFP solicitations. All appropriate documentation to support the RFP Process Report information will be retained in the contract file.	Completed	Rajit Sharma
1:5	Ensure documentation is provided to support the decision and conclusions reached if changes are made to a competing proposal.	Maintaining appropriate documentation to support changes made to a competing proposal or waiver of immaterial errors when applicable in contract files will be implemented in the RFP Manual in April 2016	4/29/2016	Rajit Sharma
1:6	Provide clear guidance on how to track and document protests received, correspondence with the protester, and instructions for requesting repayment of contract funds if required on a terminated contract.	DPAC will revise protest policies and procedures to adequately address the identified areas of improvement.	8/31/2016	Gwyn Reese
1:7	Require all necessary documentation to support the conclusions and decision of protests including all levels of review and approval are maintained in file format (manual and/or electronic) or appropriately explained.	DPAC will incorporate an internal records retention policy and procedure into the protest process to correct the identified areas of improvement.	8/31/2016	Gwyn Reese
1:8	Require that DPAC analysts attend the recommended training pertinent to the solicitation, evaluation and award, and protests of RFPs. In the absence of DGS classes, DPAC should consider providing in-house refresher training conducted by more experienced staff.	DPAC will continue its efforts in coordinating the recommended training pertinent to the solicitation, evaluation and award, and protests of RFP and other contracting methods used in DPAC with DGS. The Communications Branch is in the process of developing in-house training for DPAC analysts in all areas, which will include all aspects of the contract process. In addition, a desk reference manual for contract analysts is development to support the analysts in the contracting process.	9/23/2016	Kimberly Fox
1:9	Remind contract managers to complete Form ADM 360 correctly for contracts that are being renewed.	The existing Contract Manager training will revise a section regarding the submission of complete ADM 360 forms to include that an incomplete ADM 360 will not be accepted by DPAC. DPAC Contract Officers will be reminded not to accept incomplete ADM 360 forms before assigning contracts to analysts.	5/1/2016	Kimberly Fox

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Oral Presentations and Evaluations Sign-in Sheet

RFP No.: _____

RFP Title: _____

Meeting Date: _____

Meeting Location: _____

Voting Members:

Name	Signature
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

Non-Voting Members:

Name	Signature
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

Memorandum

*Serious drought.
Help save water!*

To: Division of Procurement and Contracts (DPAC)
Attention: _____

Date: MM/DD/YYYY
File: _____

From: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION – DISTRICT XX / DIVISION OF _____

Subject: **RFP Evaluation Committee Nomination Form**

The following employees are nominated for participation on the evaluation committee for the upcoming (contract description) RFP. Prior approval has been obtained from each Headquarters (and/or District) Office Chief for the appointment of their respective representatives.

Voting Members:

Name	Classification	Supervisor's Name
District/Street Address	Business Phone	Email
Name	Classification	Supervisor's Name
District/Street Address	Business Phone	Email
Name	Classification	Supervisor's Name
District/Street Address	Business Phone	Email
Name	Classification	Supervisor's Name
District/Street Address	Business Phone	Email
Name	Classification	Supervisor's Name
District/Street Address	Business Phone	Email
Name	Classification	Supervisor's Name
District/Street Address	Business Phone	Email

Non Voting Members:

Name	Classification	Supervisor's Name
District/Street Address	Business Phone	Email
Name	Classification	Supervisor's Name
District/Street Address	Business Phone	Email

DPAC Staff:

Name	Classification	Supervisor's Name
District/Street Address	Business Phone	Email
Name	Classification	Supervisor's Name
District/Street Address	Business Phone	Email

Scribe:

Name	Classification	Supervisor's Name
District/Street Address	Business Phone	Email

 TYPE NAME – Signature Above
 Program/Office Chief

 TYPE NAME- Signature Above
 DPAC Branch Chief or Office Chief

c. Committee Members (and list of the Managers who will be cc'd)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Process Report for RFP No.: _____

RFP Title: _____

RFP Method: Primary (low bid)

Time Schedule:

Event	Date
RFP Advertised on Bidsync	
Pre-Proposal Conference	
Proposals Due	
Evaluations:	
Pre-Technical Evaluation Meeting	_____
Consensus Scoring of Technical Proposals	_____
Oral Presentations and Consensus Scoring	_____
Cost Proposal Opening	_____
Notice of Intent to Award	
OBEO Goals Approval	
Std 4 Evaluation	
Protest Received	
Protest Decision	
Agreement Award	
Agreement Approval	

Proposals:

Proposer Name	Date & Time Proposals Received	Responsive (Yes/No)	Reason for Non-responsive (when applicable)
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

Evaluation Committee:

Voting Members	Non-voting Members	DPAC Staff	Scribe
1.	1.	1.	1.
2.	2.	2.	
3.	3.	3.	2.
4.	4.	4.	
5.	5.	5.	

Final Scores and Costs:

Proposer Name	Technical Eval. Score	Pass/Fail (Passing Score: _____ or above)	Oral Eval. Score (when applicable)	Pass/Fail (Passing Score: _____ or above)	Cost (when applicable)	Final Rank
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						

Agreement Awardee: _____

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Process Report for RFP No.: _____

RFP Title: _____

RFP Method: Secondary (high score)

Time Schedule:

Event	Date
RFP Advertised on Bidsync	
Pre-Proposal Conference	
Proposals Due	
Evaluations:	
Pre-Technical Evaluation Meeting	_____
Consensus Scoring of Technical Proposals	_____
Oral Presentations and Consensus Scoring	_____
Cost Proposal Scoring	_____
Notice of Intent to Award	
OBEO Goals Approval	
Std 4 Evaluation	
Protest Received	
Protest Decision	
Agreement Award	
Agreement Approval	

Proposals:

Proposer Name	Date & Time Proposals Received	Responsive (Yes/No)	Reason for Non-responsive (when applicable)
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

Evaluation Committee:

Voting Members	Non-voting Members	DPAC Staff	Scribe
1.	1.	1.	1.
2.	2.	2.	
3.	3.	3.	2.
4.	4.	4.	
5.	5.	5.	

Evaluation Results:

Proposer Name	Final Score	Final Rank

Agreement Awardee: _____

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Technical Proposal Evaluations Sign-in Sheet

RFP No.: _____

RFP Title: _____

Meeting Date: _____

Meeting Location: _____

Voting Members:

Name	Signature
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

Non-Voting Members:

Name	Signature
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	