

MEMORANDUM

To: CMAP Board

From: Stephane Phifer, Deputy of Planning

Date: June 10, 2026

Subject: Authorization to pre-approve 63 vendors to bid on scopes of work to perform Project Consulting Services

Action Requested: Approval

Purpose

CMAP is seeking to prequalify 63 firms under 14 Service Areas as a result of the formal RFQ process for Project Consulting Services. RFQ 341 invited firms to submit qualifications for at least one of the service areas listed below. The individual service areas are:

- **SERVICE AREA 1:** ADA public right-of-way self-evaluation and transition plans
- **SERVICE AREA 2:** Bicycle and pedestrian-focused transportation plans / supplemental support
- **SERVICE AREA 3:** Capital improvement planning
- **SERVICE AREA 4:** Consensus-based stakeholder communications and engagement strategy development and management
- **SERVICE AREA 5:** Land use plans
- **SERVICE AREA 6:** Local road safety plans/ Safety action plans / supplemental support
- **SERVICE AREA 7:** Market and demographic analysis
- **SERVICE AREA 8:** Pavement management planning
- **SERVICE AREA 9:** Planning renderings, illustrations, drawings, and graphic design
- **SERVICE AREA 10:** Regional policy analysis
- **SERVICE AREA 11:** Transportation modeling and technical analyses
- **SERVICE AREA 12:** Transportation plans
- **SERVICE AREA 13:** Travel activity data capture and processing by camera and other detection devices
- **SERVICE AREA 14:** Water quality

Background

Each year projects are identified to determine how much work will occur across the northern Illinois region, within service areas as listed above. CMAP anticipates approximately ten (10) or more projects will be issued per year as a result of RFQ 341. However, projects depend on many factors, such as available funding, and CMAP makes no guarantee of a minimum quantity or value for the anticipated projects. As projects progress and consultant assistance needs within a Service Area are identified, project authorization orders (PAOs) will be compiled and CMAP will transmit requests for bids to all firms who have been prequalified under the applicable Service Area. Contractor or firm selection for each PAO will be based upon cost, best overall value, project understanding, and reference verification.

For each project, the firm will work directly for CMAP, although interaction with the local project sponsor (typically a municipality) will often be needed as well. Projects may consist of a single community, a subarea, or a multijurisdictional project. The specific communities where the work will be conducted will be determined by CMAP as projects advance.

Procurement process

A formal Request for Qualifications was posted to CMAP's Procurement site, and direct communication was sent to all firms registered to receive updates regarding CMAP procurement opportunities.

The key dates were as follows:

RFQ Release	February 20 th , 2026
Pre-Submittal Meeting (optional)	February 25 th , 2026, at 1:00 PM Central Time
Deadline for Questions	March 4 th at 3:00 PM Central Time
Submission deadline	March 25 th at 3:00 PM Central Time
Estimated award recommendation	June 17 th , 2026

As a result of the solicitation process, CMAP received 346 responses to the RFQ, submitted by 104 unique vendors.

PLEASE NOTE: Following the submission deadline, but prior to the review of submitted responses, CMAP determined it will not move forward with contracting through this RFQ for Service Area 8: Pavement management planning.

Evaluation and Recommendation for Selection

CMAP received 346 responses to the RFQ, submitted by 104 unique vendors. RFQ submissions were reviewed by individual Service Area evaluation panels composed of CMAP staff, who scored each proposal independently based on the evaluation criteria included in the RFQ as shown in the below tables. Proposals were assessed based on the following criteria:

- 1) Firm capability
Overview of the firm's qualifications to provide the services and complete the projects and tasks as described in the Service Area description.
- 2) Project approach
The firm approaches the projects and tasks as described in the Service Area

description.

- 3) Public engagement approach (if applicable)
A summary explaining the firm’s philosophy toward public engagement and provide clear examples of how the firm’s project tasks, activities, or events demonstrate that philosophy in action. (PLEASE NOTE: This is not applicable to the following Service Areas: 7, 9, 10, 11, 13)
- 4) Working with agencies similar to CMAP or completing similar scopes of work
A practical explanation of how the firm will work and coordinate with CMAP staff, including explaining the firm’s understanding of the role of client in the projects and tasks as described in the Service Area description.
- 5) Project team resumes
Resumes of project team members who would work on projects and tasks as listed in the specific Service Area description.
- 6) Project examples
3 project examples demonstrate experience completing tasks and projects as described in the Service Area description.

The maximum possible points for each criterion are shown in the tables below.

Evaluation Factor Table 1:

Service Areas requiring a public engagement approach: (Service Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 14)	
Evaluation Factor	Max Points
Firm capability (15%)	15
Project approach (30%)	30
Public engagement approach (10%)	10
Working with CMAP or similar agencies (5%)	5
Project team resumes (15%)	15
Project examples (25%)	25
TOTAL	100

Evaluation Factor Table 2:

Service Areas <u>not</u> requiring a public engagement approach: (Service Areas 7, 9, 10, 11, 13)	
Evaluation Factor	Max Points
Firm capability (20%)	20
Project approach (30%)	30
Working with CMAP or similar agencies (5%)	5
Project team resumes (15%)	15
Project examples (30%)	30
TOTAL	100

The overall evaluation scores and overall assessment of submitted responses are included in **Attachment 1**. The evaluation panels considered the consultant score along with anticipated

project needs, recommending between 5 and 14 consultants for prequalification in the different Service Areas, as provided in **Table 3**.

Table 3: Consultants recommended for service area prequalification:

1) <u>AECOM: 3, 6, 7, 12</u>	15) <u>Conlon Public Strategy: 10</u>	30) <u>High Street: 3</u>	46) <u>Oates 1</u>
2) <u>Antero Group: 3, 4, 5</u>	16) <u>Design Workshop: 5, 9, 10</u>	31) <u>Horizon 54: 4</u>	47) <u>Parametrix: 2, 3, 11, 12</u>
3) <u>Arcadis: 2, 10, 11</u>	17) <u>DLZ: 11, 13</u>	32) <u>HR Green: 3, 14</u>	48) <u>Psomas: 1, 9</u>
4) <u>Baxter & Woodman: 3, 14</u>	18) <u>EBP: 7</u>	33) <u>ICF: 10</u>	49) <u>R.M. Chin: 4</u>
5) <u>Benesch: 1, 2</u>	19) <u>ECT: 14</u>	34) <u>Jacobs: 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 12</u>	50) <u>RSG: 11</u>
6) <u>Borderless Studio: 4, 9</u>	20) <u>Egret & Ox Planning: 5</u>	35) <u>Jasculca Terman: 4</u>	51) <u>SB Friedman: 7, 10</u>
7) <u>Buro Happold: 7, 10</u>	21) <u>Epstein: 2, 12</u>	36) <u>Kimley-Horn: 1, 11</u>	52) <u>Smith Group: 5, 6, 12</u>
8) <u>Cambridge Systematics: 6, 11, 12</u>	22) <u>ESI: 7</u>	37) <u>KPMG: 7, 10, 11</u>	53) <u>Spheros: 14</u>
9) <u>Canete Medina: 7</u>	23) <u>Estolano Advisors: 4</u>	38) <u>LJC: 5, 9</u>	54) <u>SRF: 6, 11</u>
10) <u>Cascadia: 10</u>	24) <u>Foursquare ITP: 2, 4</u>	39) <u>Lochner: 2</u>	55) <u>Stanley Consultants: 6</u>
11) <u>CDM Smith: 10, 12</u>	25) <u>Geosyntec: 10, 14</u>	40) <u>MIG: 5, 7</u>	56) <u>Stantec: 5, 6, 7, 12</u>
12) <u>Civiltech: 1, 9, 11, 12, 13</u>	26) <u>Gewalt Hamilton: 3, 13</u>	41) <u>MK Corona: 10</u>	57) <u>Terra:13</u>
13) <u>Cole & Associates: 1</u>	27) <u>Greenprint Partners: 4, 9</u>	42) <u>MKSK: 5</u>	58) <u>Teska Associates: 5</u>
14) <u>Collabo: 9</u>	28) <u>HDR: 1</u>	43) <u>Morreale: 4</u>	59) <u>Toole Design 2, 6, 9</u>
	29) <u>Hey and Associates: 14</u>	44) <u>Muse: 4, 5, 9</u>	60) <u>TY Lin: 1, 2, 6, 10, 12</u>
		45) <u>NN Engineering: 2, 6, 10, 11, 12</u>	61) <u>Urban: Works 5, 9</u>
			62) <u>Vitruvian 1</u>
			63) <u>WSP: 3, 11, 1</u>

Attachments:

Attachment 1: Firm Evaluation and Scoring Details



Attachment 1: Firm Evaluation and Scoring Details

SERVICE AREA 1: ADA public right-of-way self-evaluation and transition plans

Service Area 1 description:

These projects seek to assist local municipalities develop and implement ADA transition plans and self-evaluations in compliance with Title II requirements, specifically focused on public rights-of-way. Projects require:

- Measuring, inventorying, analyzing, and prioritizing public ROW components and their compliance status
- Development of grievance procedures
- Robust public outreach
- Integration of recommended ADA infrastructure improvements into existing capital improvement plans and municipal budgeting processes

Service Area 1 recommendations for pre-qualification summary:

Nineteen (19) responses were submitted for Service Area 1. The evaluation team determined that prequalifying nine (9) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Benesch, Civiltech, Cole & Associates, HDR, Kimley-Horn, Oates, Psomas, TY Lin, and Vitruvian Planning.

Several of the firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated impressive experience and approaches to developing ADA transition plans but did not receive as high an overall average score as the top-scoring nine firms.

Service Area 1 recommendations for pre-qualification summary:

Nineteen (19) responses were submitted for Service Area 1. The evaluation team determined that prequalifying nine (9) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Benesch, Civiltech, Cole & Associates, HDR, Kimley-Horn, Oates, Psomas, TY Lin, and Vitruvian Planning.

Several of the firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated impressive experience and approaches to developing ADA transition plans but did not receive as high an overall average score as the top-scoring nine firms.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
-----------	---------------	------------

Recommended for prequalification

Oates	97.3	Experienced firm with a proven track record of developing ADA PROW TPs.
Vitruvian Planning	97.3	Firm with extensive and proven experience successfully completing ADA PROW TPs.
Benesch	91.7	Firm has extensive experience developing ADA PROW TPs nationwide.
Civiltech	90.7	Firm demonstrates intimate familiarity with CMAP processes and ADA PROW TPs.
Cole & Associates	77.0	Firm has documented expertise as an ADA PROW expert and demonstrates they can successfully complete an ADA PROW TP.
TY Lin	76.2	Firm with strong project approach, including in-depth explanation of TP project engagement.
HDR	75.7	Firm with long-rooted experience and thorough, clear understanding of approach to TPs, with inclusion of real-world estimates.
Kimley-Horn	74.3	Experienced firm with comprehensive data-driven approach to TPs.
Psomas	74.3	Firm with solid staff experience and strong project examples, with innovative ideas to improve on project approach beyond expectations.

Not recommended for prequalification

Baxter & Woodman	73.7	Firm has baseline experience and understanding of doing ADA PROW TPs, with limited explanation of integration of public engagement.
Atlas	69.3	Firm has experience but is limited to designing and planning for ADA compliant infrastructure as part of larger roadway projects.
LCM Architects	68.7	Architecture firm with limited experience assessing and planning for PROWs but may translate to transportation infrastructure given their deep accessibility knowledge.
EXP	67.7	Multi-disciplined firm that has a lot of transportation engineering experience; however, they did not demonstrate experience developing ADA PROW transition plans.
Jensen Hughes	62.8	Accessibility consultants with significant facilities assessment experience that may translate to PROW, but limited explanation of project approach and public engagement strategy.
InNova Consulting	60.8	Engineering firm with familiarity with ADA infrastructure design but no experience developing a full ADA PROW transition plan.
MKSK	60.7	Design firm with experience mainly in park accessibility.
Globetrotters	59.7	Engineering firm that primarily focuses on Phase I and II engineering. While they have familiarity assessing and designing ADA-compliant ramps, they appear to lack experience developing a full ADA PROW transition plan.
Primera	59.7	Engineering firm with more limited experience developing ADA plans.

GRAEF	58.3	While they have familiarity assessing and designing ADA-compliant ramps, they appear to lack experience developing a full ADA PROW transition plan.
-------	------	---

SERVICE AREA 2: Bicycle and pedestrian-focused transportation plans / supplemental support

Service Area 2 description:

These plans address local transportation needs to improve and increase safe and efficient access to destinations via a variety of modes, with a primary focus on walking and biking.

The planning process will involve:

- Community outreach and engagement
- Convening of local expertise through a steering or advisory committee
- Analysis of existing conditions, including:
 - Analysis of crash history and appropriate countermeasures, with a focus on vulnerable roadway users
 - Route planning and infrastructure
 - Safe routes to schools and other destinations
 - Streetscapes and furnishings
 - Access for people with disabilities
 - Connections to transit (if applicable)
 - Past plans and policies
- Use of a Safe System approach to propose recommended policies, programs, and infrastructure changes to improve safe and connected travel for people on foot, bicycle, and other low-speed mobility devices
- Identification of planning level cost estimates for infrastructure as well as estimated level of difficulty or complexity

Service Area 2 recommendations for pre-qualification summary:

Forty-three (43) responses were submitted for Service Area 2. The evaluation team determined that prequalifying ten (10) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Arcadis, Benesch, Epstein, Foursquare ITP, Jacobs, Lochner, NN Engineering, Parametrix, Toole Design, and TY Lin for prequalification.

Many of the firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated exceptional experience and thoughtful approaches to developing bicycle and pedestrian-focused transportation plans but did not receive as high an overall average score as the top-scoring ten firms. The evaluation team noted that some firms received lower scores due to insufficiently demonstrating experience working with smaller communities, effective public engagement strategies, integration of Safe System approaches, or understanding of working with CMAP.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Toole Design	88.7	Firm has deep expertise in planning and design for biking and walking. Proposal demonstrates the firm has a thoughtful and thorough approach to planning, and experience with all of the tasks of Service Area.
Lochner	88.0	Firm demonstrates expertise in the tasks of the Service Area and shows innovative approaches in outreach. Team and project examples demonstrate broad experience with transportation planning and design.
NN Engineering	88.0	The firm demonstrates a strong project portfolio and level of expertise directly related to both this Service Area and CMAP's scale of work. They have a strong focus on excellent design and a deep expertise in the Service Area.
Epstein	87.3	Strong proposal showing thoughtfulness, passion, experience, and a range of skills. The firm showcases innovative but practical approaches to public engagement; project examples demonstrate their ability to deliver and shows clear understanding of working with CMAP and related entities.
Benesch	85.7	The firm demonstrates expertise and a thoughtful approach to bicycle and pedestrian planning. The submittal fully addressed evaluation criteria as well as Service Area tasks and showed how the firm would approach tasks in an innovative and effective way based on past experience.
Foursquare ITP	85.0	The firm focuses on sustainable transportation, with demonstrated expertise in bicycle and pedestrian planning, VRU safety, and connections to transit. The firm has worked with other MPOs and has worked on local plans developing bicycle and pedestrian networks.
Jacobs	83.7	The firm has deep expertise in bicycle and pedestrian analysis and design. The firm also has experience with traffic safety analysis and broad experience relevant to the Service Area.
Parametrix	83.5	Firm has broad transportation planning experience, including working with MPOs. Specialized knowledge of IDOT processes is a highlight of the application, along with demonstrated experience with implementation.
Arcadis	83.0	The firm has an innovative and data driven approach to bicycle and pedestrian planning. The team has broad and deep experience.
TYLin	83.0	The firm has broad and deep expertise, and the team has a strong focus on bicycle and pedestrian planning. The firm possesses extensive familiarity and demonstrates success working with CMAP. Additionally, the firm has expertise in engineering and safety.
Not recommended for prequalification		

Smith Group	80.7	Firm has a strong approach to planning processes and a strong, community-centered approach to engagement. Though firm has extensive trail design experience, the firm did not demonstrate extensive experience with developing on-street bicycle and pedestrian networks.
Buro Happold	79.3	Firm has strong transportation design experience. However, they did not demonstrate specific expertise in local bicycle and pedestrian planning.
Civiltech	77.3	The firm's experience is a strong highlight, both in terms of the team and the projects completed. However, the approach to public outreach, especially in regard to how it is integrated into project management, lacks detail.
Vitruvian Planning	77.3	Though the firm did not indicate understanding or experience in Safe System, its principled approach and expertise in innovative outreach are impressive. They have several unique skills, including public health analysis, low-cost demonstration projects, and night-time audits.
MKSK	77.0	The firm's project approach, understanding of community engagement, and thoughtfulness around project management are exemplary. The firm has strong streetscape design skills and a commitment to creating more human scale streets. However, their attention to safety for VRUs felt insufficient.
High Street	76.5	The firm has impressive expertise with data management and analysis, which is one aspect of the Service Area. Firm does not demonstrate breadth of experience covering some important aspects of the Service Area.
SRF	76.3	Firm has deep expertise in bicycle and pedestrian design, and a broad range of relevant experience. Proposal included insufficient explanation of public engagement strategies and incorporation of Safe System approaches.
Mead & Hunt	76.0	Firm has strong technical design skills and relevant experience detailed in the project examples and team resumes. Direct responses in the firm capability and project approach sections would have helped the firm to better highlight their skills.
CDM Smith	74.7	The team's experience and technical expertise are strong highlights for this firm. Additional information about project management and public outreach philosophy would have been useful.
WSP	73.7	The firm has broad experience in transportation planning and design. The community outreach process is a highlight, and the firm has some relevant bicycle and pedestrian planning experience.
RS&H	72.0	Firm has strong experience in planning and designing for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Firm also has experience with Vision Zero planning and Safe System approaches. Public engagement approach seemed insufficient as did explanation of working with CMAP.
Stantec	72.0	Firm demonstrates impressive, nationally recognized leadership in the field. However, firm does not demonstrate deep experience

		with producing local plans or sufficient familiarity with CMAP's role.
CMT	71.7	Strong proposal demonstrating local planning experience and understanding of bicycle and pedestrian design. Most team members possess five or less years of experience and engagement approach was not fully aligned with CMAP approach.
Oates	71.7	Oates has relevant local experience in addition to design experience. The firm is focused on feasibility and implementation. Firm does not provide sufficient specific examples of work and does not address Safe System approaches.
EXP	70.7	The firm has some strong qualifications in design and in project management and delivery. The team resumes and selected projects suggest the firm uses a transportation planning framework centered on motor vehicle movement and accommodation, with bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure accommodated where possible.
LJC	70.3	Firm has extensive experience in landscape architecture and design. Firm has strong commitment to equitable processes and bicycle and pedestrian planning. The submission lacks direct bicycle and pedestrian planning experience.
GRAEF	69.3	The firm has strong technical skills including design. It would have been helpful if firm had demonstrated more relevant experience and deeper expertise in local bicycle and pedestrian planning, as well as effective public engagement approaches and coordination with CMAP.
Cambridge Systematics	68.7	The firm is highly qualified for regional and state planning, with strong qualifications in data analysis. The firm appears to lack experience in small-scale local planning where a variety of outreach techniques are needed to reach a broad range of participants, and data is often limited.
GFT Infrastructure	67.7	The firm has extensive experience, especially in transit planning, corridor planning, and engineering. Does not demonstrate expertise in bicycle and pedestrian planning for local agencies. The team's focus seems more geared to transit and corridor engineering rather than bike/ped planning.
Antero Group	65.7	The firm is well-acquainted with CMAP and meets baseline expectations for each evaluation factor but did not go above-and-beyond in areas such as incorporating Safe System approaches or offering unique approaches to achieving VRU safety. The proposal includes innovative outreach.
Stanley Consultants	65.7	Firm has deep experience and expertise in safety analysis focused on crash history and countermeasures. The team has broad experience, and a focus on VRUs. However, the team does not appear to have strong experience in local bicycle and pedestrian planning.
Muse	64.3	This firm offers very strong skills and expertise in engagement and public involvement in projects related to the Service Area. However, the depth of their experience in the other aspects of the Service Area is unclear.

Estolano Advisors	59.3	The firm has a deep expertise in community outreach and a truly exceptional skill set and level of commitment. The firm did not demonstrate a commensurate experience in local bicycle and pedestrian planning.
V3 Companies	56.5	The firm has broad experience in landscape architecture, planning, and design. They have some experience with bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure but do not have a strong focus on local planning for bicycle and pedestrian networks.
Primera	54.7	The firm demonstrates experience with designing and constructing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. However, the firm does not demonstrate deep expertise in local planning or innovative bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.
Borderless Studio	46.3	The firm is exceptionally strong in outreach and process. But the firm lacks key experience and technical skills around bicycle and pedestrian planning and design, including understanding of the Safe System approach.
Design Workshop	46.0	The firm demonstrates its commitment to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and strong urban design. More local bicycle and pedestrian plans, along with more attention to detail on how CMAP differs from the City of Chicago, would be helpful.
InNova Consulting	45.8	The firm has transportation planning and design experience. However, the submittal does not demonstrate the firm has sufficient expertise in the range of required tasks of the Service Area, including the projects typical in CMAP's work.
Baxter & Woodman	45.7	The firm has relevant engineering work but does not demonstrate sufficient relevant experience, as well as a deep knowledge of local bicycle and pedestrian planning, including Safe System approaches.
EFK Moen	40.7	Firm demonstrates strong civil engineering experience, including some bicycle and pedestrian design, but firm does not show sufficient relevant bicycle and pedestrian planning experience for local plans.
McKenna	40.7	The firm brings a unique land use and development perspective to active transportation planning, and their proposal layout displays their visual communication skills. However, the firm did not directly address some questions and did not demonstrate deep expertise in bicycle and pedestrian planning and design.
Atlas	29.8	The firm has strong qualifications and experience in other disciplines but does not demonstrate needed experience in bicycle and pedestrian planning. This submittal provided insufficient explanation of how the firm will complete the work.
Vega Impact Group	25.7	Firm has expertise in communications, engagement, and project management. Firm did not demonstrate relevant skills for the Service Area.

SERVICE AREA 3: Capital improvement planning

Service Area 3 description:

This Service Area includes assisting communities with:

- Capital asset inventories

- Prioritization of future capital improvements based on importance, budget, and condition
- Asset management planning
- Creation of Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs) that include multiple categories of community assets and infrastructure systems (such as water supply, stormwater, and transportation)

Firms will also assist with:

- Capital program planning
- Financial analysis
- Asset rehabilitation and replacement costs
- Revenue projections
- Public engagement
- Potential efficiencies
- Capacity-building training for relevant staff and officials on elements of capital program planning and ongoing implementation
- Related tasks

Work under this Service Area may include assistance with:

- Infrastructure condition assessment (condition, age, service history, design life, useful life, level of redundancy)

Service Area 3 recommendations for prequalification summary:

Twenty (20) responses were submitted for Service Area 3. The evaluation team determined that prequalifying nine (9) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending AECOM, Antero Group, Baxter & Woodman, Gewalt Hamilton, High Street, HR Green, Jacobs, Parametrix, and WSP for prequalification.

The evaluation team noted that some firms, including firms with other impressive qualifications, received lower scores due to insufficiently demonstrating CIP experience at the municipal scale which is typical for CMAP projects in this Service Area.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Parametrix	95.7	Parametrix has experienced staff with well-documented experience working on CIPs, municipal partners, and with CMAP. The approach is ideal and very clearly described.
Jacobs	93.0	Very experienced in exactly the scope desired for this Service Area. Project approach is clearly articulated.
Antero Group	79.7	Clear understanding of capital improvement planning technical assistance, with good examples documenting approach to delivering desired service to municipalities.

Gewalt Hamilton	75.0	Strong team qualifications, including relevant experience with CMAP and municipalities. Strong, thoughtful approach that includes all tasks as described in the Service Area description and includes additional innovations.
AECOM	71.7	AECOM presents a solid team, wealth of experience, and thought leadership in this work. Good qualifications for expert analysis and asset management, particularly pavement and road infrastructure.
WSP	69.2	The firm presented a sound approach and understanding of CIPs, with examples showing application for larger agencies but also applicable on a municipal scale. Strong engagement approach and good qualifications indicated on team.
HR Green	67.8	Strong experience creating and administering capital improvement programs. The firm presented a thoughtful and experienced approach to capital improvement planning. Project examples included past work on tasks within the Service Area with local municipalities. The firm's submission lacked discussion of training for staff needed for CIP maintenance.
High Street	64.7	Approach description is solid. Project examples and team experience show work performed on a larger scale than tasks to be completed in this Service Area but it appears scaling would not be an issue for firm.
Baxter & Woodman	61.7	Firm is experienced working for and with municipalities, demonstrating its qualifications to create CIPs, conduct asset management planning and financial analysis. Work examples include previous CIP projects with lower capacity communities in the CMAP region. However, most of the highlighted experiences in the team resumes focus on water/sewer infrastructure planning.
Not recommended for prequalification		
Arcadis	60.0	Impressive qualifications of team staff and larger-scale projects but demonstrated less experience at the municipal scale that is the focus of CMAP projects in this Service Area.
Stantec	57.0	Response includes many relevant qualifications from national firm, with solid approach. However, project examples did not directly demonstrate needed service of municipal CIP delivery.
Psomas	55.3	Team resumes show extensive experience as municipal staff engaging in capital programming. But project examples did not evidence relevant experience for Service Area.
Strand	53.5	Strong experience of firm providing technical assistance to in-region municipalities to analyze assets and plan for capital improvements. Resumes and project examples seemed to be missing some key tasks outlined in the Service Area description. Firm did not demonstrate sufficient consideration of training and capacity building
MKSK	46.3	Project approach and engagement approach are good, however firm appears to lack sufficient team experience in the necessary tasks of the Service Area.

Buro Happold	43.7	While the team staff has some impressive experience and qualifications, it appears to have insufficient CIP experience at the scale and scope of CMAP projects in this Service Area.
Cambridge Systematics	39.2	Good expertise in some needed project components, but firm does not demonstrate experience and familiarity with the range of tasks required for this Service Area.
Dama	39.0	Response does not demonstrate experience in delivering the necessary components of this Service Area. Project examples focused on larger scale transportation analysis and traffic studies.
KPMG	39.0	Interesting approach, heavier on financial analysis of capital planning. Good qualifications on team, but lack of engineering/public works experience on team and lack of municipal CIP specific experience.
Jack Faucett	35.7	Response does not effectively demonstrate experience or capabilities to complete all necessary components of municipal CIPs. Qualifications are shown, but not the coverage needed for the tasks in this Service Area.
RLE	15.7	Team experience and project examples don't demonstrate necessary experience with relevant project tasks for municipal CIPs.

SERVICE AREA 4: Consensus-based stakeholder communications and engagement strategy development and management

Service Area 4 description:

This Service Area includes collaborating with CMAP staff to develop strategies for policy development through stakeholder consensus building activities to realize more equitable and resilient outcomes for all. Work may include:

- Identifying key stakeholders
- Assessing stakeholder interests and potential for reaching consensus-based agreements
- Designing a consensus-based process with clear goals, ground rules, work plan and timeline
- Message mapping “story maps”
- Preparing for meetings, and conducting pre-meeting research
- Communicating with stakeholders via email, phone, and engagement platforms
- Resolving stakeholder questions
- Meeting facilitation and drafting meeting summaries
- Managing the consensus building process to maximize success in reaching agreements that are technically sound and politically acceptable
- Promoting consensus agreements where possible and enabling near-consensus alternatives when full consensus is not feasible
- Event planning, marketing, branding

Service Area 4 recommendations for prequalification summary:

Forty-one (41) responses were submitted for Service Area 4. It was decided that prequalifying eleven (11) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Antero Group, Borderless Studio, Estolano Advisors, Foursquare ITP, Greenprint Partners, Horizon 54, Jacobs, Jасulca Terman, Morreale, Muse, and R.M. Chin for prequalification.

Most of the firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated strong experience and exceptionally thoughtful approaches for achieving successful consensus-based communication and engagement with stakeholders but did not receive as high an overall average score as the top-scoring eleven firms. CMAP hopes to have the opportunity to work with many of these talented firms as subconsultants/subcontractors on larger project teams.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Jacobs	95.5	Large firm with clear capability and capacity to complete project work. Dedicated engagement team, extensive experience with CMAP and other agencies.
Estolano Advisors	93	Strong proposal from firm that showcases their stakeholder engagement process and portfolio. Project examples show an understanding of working toward shared goals in difficult environments.
Muse	93	Strong proposal with a strong approach to projects and public engagement. Firm has an extensive and nuanced understanding of the work and needs of CMAP.
Morreale	92	Strong proposal from a firm with extensive experience in transportation communications. Extensive partner experience. Quality approach to engagement and communications strategy.
Greenprint Partners	91.5	Strong proposal that shows a commitment to community co-design and thorough project approach. Firm demonstrates full capability to deliver all Service Area tasks with exceptional examples demonstrating inclusive, innovative public engagement. The firm's expertise in communications, engagement, and marketing is apparent.
R.M. Chin and Associates	89	Firm has good experience leading the engagement portions of larger planning and engineering initiatives. Good project approach, Good staff qualifications, and work examples completing similar work.
Foursquare ITP	87.5	Firm understands what it means to work within a regional entity and convene stakeholders with differing levels of familiarity with planning concepts. Good proposal with a strong approach to projects.

Antero Group	87	Antero Group demonstrates a clear methodology, project experience and community engagement philosophies that would result in a quality project. Innovative approach to engagement that is cognizant of barriers to the planning process.
Horizon 54	86	Firm has a good approach to projects that would make them successful in completing activities within the Service Area description. Demonstrated experience working with public agencies (local, state, regional, federal) as well as experience in consensus-based engagement. Highlights existing connections with our local partners.
Borderless Studio	85	Strong proposal highlighting the firm's commitment and experience with the activities described in the Service Area. Strong approach to firm-client relationship with phased process to support coordination.
Jasculca Terman	85	Firm shows extensive experience in public affairs and engagement. "Neighborhood dialogues" suggests a unique proactive approach to approaching issues of potential contention. Solid understanding of northeastern Illinois context.
Not recommended for prequalification		
NSP & Company	84.5	Firm demonstrates good experience and qualifications, as well as a clear interest in informing change management practices through public engagement.
3X3	84	Firm demonstrates a strong understanding and level of experience in engagement, project execution, and consensus building. It also demonstrates extensive experience with CMAP and similar organizations.
Teska Associates	83.25	Firm has clear experience creating and executing quality engagement efforts as a part of larger planning efforts. Experience with most of the tasks in the Service Area.
Metro Strategies	83	Good proposal showing experience in working with CMAP and similar agencies, as well as good staff qualifications. Strong approach to project work but could have provided a clearer plan for coordination with CMAP.
V3	83	Firm demonstrates good ability to complete projects under the Service Area description. Engagement as a standalone contract and as part of broader planning efforts. Shows connection between their engagement and policy development.
Vega Impact Group	82.5	Firm demonstrates ability to complete projects with tasks relating to the Service Area. It is unclear if the firm regularly is a subconsultant or prime on contracts. Good experience and good staff qualifications.
Delta Institute	82	Firm shows good experience in convening community partners and engagement to create high quality projects. Firm mainly focuses on environmental work.
Conlon Public Strategies	80.5	Good proposal that highlights extensive experience in organizational management and strategic planning. Firm shows ability to convene partners, but firm experience is mainly with nonprofits instead of government agencies.

McKenna	79.5	Firm highlights good experience and approach to community engagement that is deeply rooted in the communities they work with. Particularly skilled in contentious local issues. Roles and responsibilities between consultant and client could be more clear.
Perkins & Will	79	Proposal demonstrates firm has experience in completing projects that include tasks listed in the Service Area description. Demonstrated engagement experience is part of larger planning efforts.
Epstein	77	Good proposal showcasing the firm's ability to provide quality, creative engagement with the public in the pursuit of larger policy development initiatives. Project examples and firm capability sections show that community engagement is a part of their larger transportation planning projects. Engagement philosophy in action is unclear.
Community Allies	76	Firm demonstrates a strong approach to public engagement with proposed activities that reflect this approach and the activities listed in the Service Area description. However, firm experience is mainly nonprofit organizations rather than government agencies similar to CMAP.
ECT	75.5	Large firm with a dedicated engagement team and extensive experience. Primarily an environmental planning firm where engagement is a part of larger projects or initiatives.
LJC	75	This is an architectural and design firm that also prepares engagement activities. Project examples and team resumes do not highlight extensive experience in public engagement, but the firm has worked with many organizations similar to CMAP and understands client relationships. The consultant/client relationship is described as collaborative but is not clear in terms of roles.
MK Corona	75	Small firm that specializes in engagement and brings a thoughtful approach to convening stakeholders and building coalitions for policy development. Project approach framework is not clear.
Design Workshop	74	Strong proposal for a firm with extensive experience in using community engagement to lead to policy development. Strong approach with innovative ideas for public engagement. Missing descriptions of some activities listed in the Service Area description.
Primera	73.5	Firm demonstrates experience in completing tasks with the Service Area description as part of larger planning and engineering projects. Clear connection between stakeholder engagement and policy development. Firm capability emphasizes visual communication expertise.
RS&H	71.5	Good proposal that shows the firm has experience completing public engagement tasks as parts of overarching planning efforts. It's unclear whether they have been contracted specifically to provide engagement efforts. Firm's experience working with agencies similar to CMAP is not clearly demonstrated.
MKSK	71	Proposal does not highlight staff experience and project examples that are relevant to many of the tasks within the Service Area. Firm shows good capacity in policy development and urban design,

		and firm has worked with many local partners. However, project examples do not sufficiently specify the firm's contribution relevant to this Service Area.
Jack Faucett	69	Good proposal that showcases the firm's commitment to understanding place as a key component of policy development. Firm focuses on research and anthropological context to inform engagement activities. Submission appears to advocate for firm's methodology more strongly than it demonstrates a commitment to meeting client needs.
Anderson Smith	67	This firm has a strong approach to client management, change management, and project work. The project examples highlighted in the application show a strong focus on internal engagement for change management within organizations, and do not highlight extensive experience working on projects with an external or public facing result or focus.
NIU	66.5	Proposal demonstrates experience in completing community engagement activities to inform policy development decisions. However, submission is difficult to read due to typos and passive voice. Submission does not address or demonstrate importance of visual communication.
Cambridge Systematics	65	Firm has extensive experience creating plan documents for projects that involve public engagement as a component of their finished deliverable. Project examples show extensive experience in engaging agency and government level officials, but less experience engaging with the public. Proposal does not expand much in the activities listed in the Service Area.
WSP	65	Large firm with experience with CMAP and similar entities. Good approach that could result in good engagement with partners.
Collabo	61	Firm demonstrates a commitment to engagement guided by ten core principles. Team resumes don't highlight the ways in which firm staff have experience in the activities listed in the Service Area description, and project examples do not provide relevant experience.
InNova Consulting	61	Firm demonstrates a strong approach to project initiation and management but does not provide many examples of experience working within the Service Area and on activities related to community and stakeholder engagement. Firm submitted 1 of 3 required project examples.
A5 Digital Branding	59	Firm has strong experience in marketing and branding campaigns for state agencies and neighborhood organizations. However, project examples did not address specific examples of project work within the Service Area description related to coalition and consensus building.
Latent	54.5	Architectural firm with a solid public engagement strategy. Staff resumes did not provide any descriptions of tasks related to the Service Area. Project examples did not extensively highlight community engagement experience.
GTI Energy	50.5	Firm demonstrates extensive experience in energy-related project work, and engagement is a part of their process. Partnerships with

		other organizations is outlined but their plan for working with CMAP staff is unclear.
EcoVidalDesign, Inc.	28.25	Overall, firm has limited experience in providing the services listed in the Service Area description and provides limited examples of projects and qualifications to provide services in consensus-based community engagement.

SERVICE AREA 5: Land use plans

Service Area 5 description:

The land use plan Service Area includes the development of comprehensive community plans as well as downtown, neighborhood, corridor, subarea, and site-specific land use plans. Firms may be asked to lead full planning processes or provide targeted technical support for comprehensive plans, downtown, neighborhood, corridor, subarea, site plans, and other forms of land use planning.

- **Comprehensive plans** establish a long-term vision for a community and provide a policy framework intended to help the community achieve its goals.

Comprehensive plans generally address:

- Land use
- Housing
- Environment
- Transportation

Comprehensive plans may include other topics relevant to individual communities such as:

- Stormwater and flooding management
- Public Health
- Historic preservation
- Sustainability and climate resilience
- Natural resources
- Agricultural preservation
- Water resources
- Community character and branding

- **Downtown, neighborhood, corridor, and subarea plans** typically address specific areas, topics, or challenges rather than the all-inclusive approach used for comprehensive plans. These types of plans may focus on:

- Flooding and storm water
- Capital improvements
- Housing supply and conditions analysis
- Retail or commercial analysis
- Industry
- Zoning and regulatory strategies
- or a combination of topics for a defined area of a community

- **Site plans** identify appropriate land uses and concepts for locally controlled

redevelopment sites. These plans are based on previous planning work, local zoning regulations, and existing market data and analysis.

Service Area 5 recommendations for prequalification summary:

A total of thirty one (31) firms submitted responses for Service Area 5. It was decided that prequalifying eleven (11) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Antero Group, Design Workshop, Egret & Ox Planning, LJC, MIG, MKSK, Muse, Smith Group, Stantec, Teska Associates, and Urban Works for prequalification. Firms that were not selected for prequalification demonstrated strong capabilities but did not score as high as the firms selected for prequalification. Many of these had valuable experience in related fields such as environmental planning, engagement or engineering, but did not show the full breadth of experience required for prequalification in this Service Area.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Design Workshop	90.3	The firm has extensive experience producing comprehensive, corridor, and downtown plans. Project approach is extensive and covers a lot of bases. The firm has a multidisciplinary team and prior experience working with MPOs.
Teska Associates	87.7	The firm demonstrated an excellent project approach, and a well-structured engagement approach. Their experience across comprehensive, downtown, corridor, and subarea plans aligns with Service Area needs, and application demonstrates wide breadth of relevant skills.
Smith Group	87.3	The firm has extensive capabilities across land use, zoning, transportation, and environmental planning. The firm also demonstrated familiarity with CMAP’s regulatory context and role in the region.
MKSK	86.0	The firm demonstrates deep experience in comprehensive, corridor and downtown planning across the Midwest. The firm’s integration of fiscal sustainability and data-driven decision-making is well-suited for projects in this Service Area.
LJC	83.7	The firm shows extensive regional planning experience in the Service Area, and strong multidisciplinary capacity. Project approach and project examples demonstrated good focus on implementation. The firm also showed good understanding of CMAP’s role and has experience working with MPOs.
Antero Group	83.3	Strong proposal with a well-structured project approach and excellent project examples. Also demonstrated key skills and technical capabilities. Strong understanding of municipal capacity.
Muse	83.0	Firm offers a highly community-centered planning approach and demonstrates capabilities in comprehensive, corridor, and TOD

		planning. Public engagement was a strong suite and project approach factored in accessibility.
Stantec	82.2	Demonstrates extensive experience with comprehensive, neighborhood and corridor plans across the Midwest. The firm demonstrated a strong analytical approach and multidisciplinary team. The firm’s experience reflects consistent high-quality planning work.
MIG	79.3	The firm’s project history demonstrates the ability to produce robust, data-driven, community-centered plans. Its public engagement approach was notable, with forty different methods of engagement in one example. Experience in trail-oriented development and evaluating public benefits of investment were seen as additional skills valuable to Service Area projects.
Urban Works	78.0	Design-oriented firm with demonstrated experience in producing corridor, site, and neighborhood-scale plans. While some highlighted projects have an emphasis on architecture, the firm’s portfolio shows clear ability to deliver the types of plans required in the Service Area.
Egret & Ox Planning	77.3	The firm has a strong portfolio of comprehensive and corridor plans. The firm has the ability to handle projects at multiple scales and is familiar with CMAP’s regional context.
Not recommended for prequalification		
GRAEF	75.7	Offers multidisciplinary team and demonstrated municipal planning experience, with skills in design and placemaking. However, there are gaps in depth of experience in land use planning, and the firm’s approaches and examples did not cover the full range of tasks required by the Service Area.
Collabo	74.5	The firm provided a solid proposal with strengths in community-responsive planning and tailored engagement approaches. However, there are gaps in expertise relevant across all tasks in the Service Area. Their capabilities align with engagement roles more than core tasks in this Service Area.
Borderless Studio	73.8	The firm demonstrates strong design and engagement capabilities, with a community centered approach. However, their expertise would be more closely aligned with more engagement-focused or design-oriented Service Areas.
V3	73.5	The firm shows strong multidisciplinary expertise and experience with municipal-level plans. However, land use planning experience was secondary to infrastructure engineering or fiscal analysis experience. The submission did not clearly demonstrate alignment with the needs of the Service Area.
Buro Happold	72.3	The firm shows strong capabilities in sustainability, environmental planning and high-level master-planning. Project examples and capabilities leaned toward large scale or specialized planning rather than comprehensive or corridor plans.
Perkins & Will	68.5	The firm demonstrates overall solid planning and design capabilities. Compelling engagement and planning philosophy.

		However, there are gaps in land-use specific experience aligned with the needs of the Service Area.
Michael Baker	66.8	Firm demonstrates strong multidisciplinary expertise and experience working with agencies like CMAP. However, land use experience was limited, with a stronger emphasis on stormwater, engineering, and transportation.
Epstein	66.3	The firm brings strong experience in transportation engineering and demonstrates knowledge of CMAP's role in the region. Project approach was standard, and examples were transportation focused. Capabilities did not fully align with the broader range of tasks in the Service Area.
Houseal Lavigne	66.2	The firm has extensive experience producing high-quality comprehensive, downtown, and corridor plans. The firm's technical capabilities were strong. Links to resumes were inaccessible and could not be evaluated.
Sightline	64.0	The proposal demonstrates strong zoning and regulatory experience and an understanding of CMAP's role in the region. Submission was strongest in zoning-focused tasks and did not fully meet the breadth required for the Service Area.
Baxter	63.3	The firm provides solid engineering and planning capabilities, but their submission relied on boilerplate language and did not demonstrate a strong understanding of CMAP's role in the land use planning context. Evaluators found the firm's project examples to be focused more on engineering than community land use planning
Greenprint Partners	58.0	The firm demonstrated strong environmental and green infrastructure expertise, with meaningful community engagement. However, there are gaps in core planning competencies and subject matter expertise required for this Service Area.
Ramboll	56.3	The firm brings strong climate resilience and policy experience but shows limited evidence of full land use plan development capabilities aligned with the Service Area. Their examples emphasize hazard mitigation and resilience rather than land use planning.
Latent	49.3	Firm offers design and corridor planning experience but did not sufficiently demonstrate capabilities in the full range of services required in the Service Area. The firm has an emphasis on architecture and design and has limited planning examples that are not design-oriented.
Jack Faucett	36.5	This firm does not have the experience or expertise to effectively prepare land use plans as detailed in the Service Area description.
ECT	35.3	The firm has experience in environmental planning and green infrastructure. The firm's focus is stormwater and natural resource planning, and did not include the range of services required in the Service Area.
Eco Vidal Design, Inc	26.5	The firm shows experience in sustainability and architectural design, but lacks demonstrated experience delivering land use plans. Evaluators found their examples limited or outside the scope of modern comprehensive planning practice.

Delta Institute	26.3	The firm specializes in environmental work and community engagement but does not demonstrate experience producing land use plans. The firm’s capabilities align better as subconsultants supporting sustainability components.
Geosyntec	23.3	The firm specializes in engineering, stormwater, and climate resilience, with limited land use planning experience. While technically strong, the firm did not sufficiently demonstrate its capacity to lead or deliver plans in line with the needs of the Service Area.
NIU	N/A	This submission was intended for Service Area 4 and was evaluated under that Service Area.

SERVICE AREA 6: Local road safety plans/ Safety action plans / supplemental support

Service Area 6 description:

A local road safety plan (LRSP) provides a process for identifying and prioritizing potential safety improvements on local roads.

The planning process will involve:

- Engage local stakeholders and a steering committee with a focus on engaging hard-to-reach residents
- Analyze crash data to develop a high injury network using a Safe System approach
- Identify the most common causes of fatal and serious injury crashes and develop recommendations for countermeasures

The process results in a plan that:

- Assesses crash risk
- Prioritizes the most important actions including capital improvements as well as broader safety programs
- Lays out implementation steps with planning level cost estimates, level of difficulty, primary implementor and support entities

The geographic scope of the project and number of locations evaluated will depend somewhat on resources and extent of safety problems, but it is expected that an LRSP could be developed for a smaller municipality or a section of a larger one.

Service Area 6 recommendations for prequalification summary:

A total of thirty-one (31) firm submitted responses for Service Area 6. It was decided that pre-qualifying ten (10) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending AECOM, Cambridge Systematics, Jacobs, NN Engineering, Smith Group, SRF, Stanley Consultants, Stantec, Toole Design, and TY Lin for prequalification.

Several additional firms offered valuable skills in engineering, traffic operations, or data analysis but did not demonstrate the full range of competencies required by this Service Area. Common gaps included limited Safe System Approach integration, insufficient

examples of completed SAP and LRSP projects, or heavy reliance on conventional or reactive engineering methods.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
TY Lin	95	The firm submitted an excellent package, demonstrating clear expertise and directly relevant experience with safety action planning. Their innovative outreach and implementation approaches, strong staff qualifications, and familiarity with CMAP processes indicate they would deliver strong projects.
AECOM	91.5	The firm is highly qualified, with deep national experience in safety planning and demonstrated subject matter expertise that will result in strong projects. The firm’s project approach is thoughtful, analytical, and proactive, and is supported by robust engagement.
Toole Design	91.5	An excellent national firm that brings strong safety expertise and demonstrates a clear understanding of CMAP values and work. The submission was regarded as thoughtful and technically strong, with demonstrated safety action planning experience.
Smith Group	86.5	The firm offers qualified staff, strong mobility and corridor planning experience and solid understanding of the Safe System Approach. Their approach and technical skills reflect strong capability in this Service Area.
Cambridge Systematics	82	The firm offers extensive MPO experience, a highly qualified team, and a data-driven, Safe System-aligned approach. They pair strong engagement practices with clear, implementable deliverables across multiple scales. Firm demonstrates a compelling project approach and extensive, relevant experience.
Stantec	80.5	A highly qualified firm with extensive and relevant safety planning experience. They offer strong expertise gained from leading Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) and Vision Zero plans nationwide, along with a proactive, analytically driven planning approach that aligns with Safe System approaches.
Stanley Consultants	79.5	The firm is highly qualified, with strong project experience and a thoughtful approach. While their staff experience skews engineering-heavy, they are still well positioned to lead successful projects within the Service Area.
Jacobs	78.5	The firm shows strong familiarity with CMAP’s role in the region, and has a qualified team, a clear approach to data, engagement, and process management. The firm demonstrates capability to handle the full range of tasks expected in this Service Area.
NN Engineering	78.5	The firm has a strong portfolio of projects, deep technical expertise and high-quality project experience. The firm is well placed to lead a project of the type and scale expected in this Service Area.

SRF	78.5	The firm is highly qualified, with strong experience working on safety action plans and local road safety plans, as well as related initiatives at the regional and county levels. They propose a proactive and thoughtful approach and are highly capable of the technical aspects of this Service Area.
Not recommended for prequalification		
Horizon 54	77.5	The firm brings strong community- and equity-focused safety planning, with Safe System expertise, experience working with MPOs, and comprehensive engagement strategy. However, their past involvement has been as equity advisors on safety action plans, and in policy and engagement. The firm’s capabilities do not demonstrate ability to lead LRSPs and SAPs in totality.
Mead & Hunt	76	The firm demonstrates good experience and skills related to safety action planning and related services but scored lower than firms recommended for prequalification.
Psomas	74.5	The firm brings strong experience in Safety Action Plans and a clear, well-structured approach that incorporates Safe System principles and robust engagement. However, the submission lacked a required project manager résumé, which hindered full evaluation of the proposed team.
Kimley Horn	73.5	The firm provided a clear and concise submission that demonstrated a solid understanding of CMAP’s safety work along with strong technical expertise and national experience. However, the application of Safe System approaches was limited.
Antero Group	72.5	The firm brings good experience with planning processes in this Service Area. Their team brings strong regional experience and multidisciplinary expertise. Project examples show good capability across tasks like systemic risk analysis, engagement, and implementation. However, the firm scored lower due to limited experience with safety action plans compared to recommended firms.
Epstein	69.5	The firm’s submission conveyed strong qualifications and good alignment with requirements in the Service Area. Safe System understanding is present but limited, and the firm’s core strengths align with reactive rather than proactive safety planning.
Lochner	69	The firm offers solid experience on projects within the Service Area. However, the project examples and methodology have limited application of Safe System approaches.
WSP	69	The firm brings experience working in similar roles and has demonstrated capacity to deliver many tasks within the Service Area. However, engagement strategies and project examples in which the firm served as a prime consultant were limited.
HDR	67	The firm offers strong engineering-focused safety expertise and local experience, with organized engagement and implementable recommendations. However, the proposal had unclear integration of public feedback and the firm’s work leans toward reactive safety practices rather than proactive, systemic approaches.

High Street	65	The firm is technically qualified, with strong MPO experience and good Safe System understanding. They excel in analysis and implementation but appeared less well-equipped to oversee the whole LRSP or SAP process, particularly in engagement and engineering tasks.
Benesch	64	The firm brings strong multimodal safety experience, data capabilities, Safe System expertise and a familiarity with the region. However, they lack directly related LRSP and SAP experience.
RS&H	62	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications and Vision Zero experience, but limited LRSP and SAP experience. They present a highly technical, engineering focused approach, with less emphasis on engagement and community buy-in.
Arcadis	59.5	The firm offers strong analytical tools, good experience, and thorough engagement methods. However, their approach leans toward conventional safety planning and shows limited alignment with Safe System approaches.
Civiltech	58	A highly competent firm with strong engineering and data capabilities. However, the proposal had limited reference to Safe System approaches and did not directly cite a SAP or LRSP in project examples.
CMT	58	The firm has relevant planning and engineering experience. However, they have limited Safe System expertise. They are capable but not strongly aligned with proactive SAP and LRSP methodologies.
Oates	44.5	The firm is a solid transportation planning firm with MPO experience. However, their approach remains engineering-focused and used conventional safety frameworks rather than holistic safety planning approaches.
Primera	43.5	The firm is highly skilled in the engineering and technical aspects of the Service Area, but does not offer the level of Safe System approaches and local safety planning necessary for this Service Area.
EFK Moen	37.2	The firm offers strong engineering expertise and a data-driven approach. They demonstrate good engagement practices and MPO experience. However, work is heavily engineering-oriented with limited Safe System alignment.
Atlas	33.5	The firm has traffic engineering competency but lacks experience with several critical tasks in this Service Area. Their submission showed a limited understanding of the Safe System Approach.
InNova Consulting	26.25	The firm has experience supporting safety initiatives and offers a project approach that covers required tasks, though it makes limited use of Safe System approaches. While they show strengths in public participation and engineering services, their team and project examples demonstrate limited expertise in the specific safety planning needs of this Service Area.
Dama	20.5	The firm has traffic engineering skills but no evidence of LRSP or SAP experience. Their safety work aligns with conventional,

		reactive methods, not the proactive Safe System approach required.
--	--	--

SERVICE AREA 7: Market and demographic analysis

Service Area 7 description:

CMAP often requires assistance with market and demographic analysis to enhance projects during various phases of the planning process or undertake new demographic policy research in the region.

- Market analysis may be used to inform existing conditions analysis or plan recommendations based on:
 - Site-driven analysis
 - Use-driven analysis
 - Fiscal impact analysis
 - Economic impact analysis
- Market analysis may be used for implementation steps, such as:
 - Identifying partner organizations
 - Specific funding mechanisms
- Market analysis must include both qualitative and quantitative approaches to understanding market area conditions, including asset-based analysis.
- Storytelling as qualitative research can complement more conventional quantitative research/data, offering a different understanding of lived experience and subjectivity to effect change in public knowledge, attitudes, and behavior.
- Demographic analysis may be used to inform existing conditions analysis or plan recommendations but may also be used for higher level regional policy research.
- In addition, a firm may be asked to assist municipalities with limited staff or resources, which may include:
 - Preparing RFQs
 - Acting as the community’s representative in interactions with potential developers

Service Area 7 recommendations for prequalification summary:

A total of twenty three (23) firms submitted responses for Service Area 7. It was decided that prequalifying nine (9) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending AECOM, Buro Happold, Canete Medina, EBP, ESI, KPMG, MIG, SB Friedman, and Stantec for prequalification.

Firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated partial but incomplete alignment with the Service Area requirements. Many firms showed strong capabilities in some areas such as local market analysis, or community-centered planning but did not

demonstrate capabilities in the full range of tasks required for Service Area 7.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
AECOM	91.2	The firm demonstrates significant experience and strong qualifications across all desired services in the Service Area. The proposal includes a strong project approach, robust data methods, and a multi-disciplinary team. Project examples illustrate both local and regional applications. Submission exceeded expectations.
SB Friedman	87.7	The firm demonstrates extensive technical expertise and experience with tasks in the Service Area. The response showed strong quantitative research, excellent understanding of local and regional context, and consistently high-quality project examples. Project examples illustrate ability to understand local context and the ability to render regional analytical services.
KPMG	82.3	The firm has significant experience with regionally significant real estate and policy work. The proposal demonstrated that the firm has a well-equipped staff team and specific, relevant approaches. More detail in selected project resumes would have further strengthened the submission, but overall, the firm demonstrated strong alignment with CMAP needs in this Service Area.
ESI	82.2	The firm demonstrates significant experience and strong qualifications related to the desired services. The work experiences and project examples provided demonstrate experience with regionally significant projects that utilize market, demographic, fiscal, and/or economic analysis, as well as related policy development efforts.
Canete Medina	82.0	The firm demonstrates significant experience and strong qualifications related to most of the desired services. The work experiences and project examples demonstrate experience with both local and regional projects, indicating capability to perform the desired services for a variety of projects.
MIG	81.8	The firm demonstrates technical expertise and experience providing most of the services that fall within the scope of the Service Area. The project examples demonstrate ability to use market and demographic analysis to work at local and regional scales, and support regional policy development. Combines strong modeling and economic analysis capabilities with intentional community coordination.
Buro Happold	79.8	Demonstrates solid experience with local market, demographic, and labor market analysis, along with strong understanding of CMAP context and consideration of client role. The experiences and examples provided demonstrate capability to support regional policy efforts.
Stantec	79.7	The firm demonstrates technical expertise and experience providing the services within the scope of the Service Area. The

		experiences and project examples included in the proposal demonstrate the firm's ability to work in both local and regional contexts.
EBP	79.2	The firm demonstrates significant experience and strong qualifications related to the desired services. The response provides detailed approaches to several types of analysis and illustrates strong forecasting and modeling expertise. While the firm does not provide project examples of specific local market analyses, the resumes illustrate that firm has these capabilities.
Not recommended for prequalification		
Teska Associates	76.5	The firm has extensive experience providing local market and demographic analysis, with strengths in community-centric approaches and coordination with local partners. However, the proposal does not provide sufficient evidence of qualifications or expertise related to other projects and/or tasks included in the Service Area.
Egret & Ox Planning	76.2	The firm has extensive experience providing local market and demographic analysis but does not provide sufficient evidence of qualifications or expertise related to other projects and/or tasks included in the Service Area.
WSP	75.7	The firm demonstrates technical expertise that could adequately support the projects and/or tasks identified in the Service Area description. Project approach demonstrates robust data capabilities, illustrating specific tools and proven workflows. However, the resumes and project examples provided, despite illustrating high quality experience, only demonstrate qualifications for some of the projects and/or tasks.
LJC	73.3	The firm has extensive experience providing local market and demographic analysis but does not provide sufficient evidence of qualifications or expertise related to other projects and/or tasks included in the Service Area.
Cambridge Systematics	70.7	The firm demonstrates technical qualifications and expertise, especially related to transportation-adjacent market efforts. Staff has experience and familiarity with MPO-level work and CMAP's role. However, the proposal did not adequately demonstrate experience with the projects and tasks identified in the Service Area description.
Goodman Williams Group	69.5	The firm has extensive experience providing local market and demographic analysis but does not provide sufficient evidence of qualifications or expertise related to other projects and/or tasks included in the Service Area. The experiences and examples provided demonstrate some experience supporting higher level regional policy development.
Design Workshop	67.7	The firm has experience providing local and subarea analyses but does not provide sufficient evidence of qualifications or expertise related to other projects and/or tasks included in the Service Area.

		The proposal does not provide a sufficient understanding of CMAP context and specific needs.
Jack Faucett	67.7	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications and technical expertise — especially for economic impact analysis — but their proposal does not speak to, nor sufficiently demonstrate experience with, the full suite of projects and tasks identified in the Service Area description.
3X3	64.3	The firm demonstrates experience conducting qualitative data collection and synthesis for public agencies but does not provide evidence of qualifications or experience with the other projects and/or tasks identified in the Service Area description.
Anderson Smith	64.0	The firm demonstrates experience providing labor market analysis and fiscal assessments. The firm’s emphasis on pairing qualitative and quantitative data with implementation-oriented methods is notable. However, they do not provide evidence of qualifications or expertise related to other projects and/or tasks included in the Service Area description. The experiences and examples provided demonstrate some capabilities to support regional policy efforts.
The 1861 Group	61.8	The project approach and project examples provided demonstrate the firm's understanding of regional planning and the types of projects and/or tasks that could fall within the Service Area. However, the project team resumes do not provide in-depth information on individuals’ project experiences, and the project examples are high-level summaries.
Foursquare ITP	58.7	The firm demonstrates strong technical expertise and experience with regional analysis but does not provide sufficient evidence of qualifications related to the desired services.
McKenna	55.8	The firm has extensive experience providing local market and demographic analysis but does not provide sufficient evidence of qualifications or expertise related to other projects and/or tasks included in the Service Area description. Proposal does not provide a concrete proposed approach or illustrate relevancy to past work with similar agencies.
InNova Consulting	47.2	Although the firm demonstrates technical expertise related to transportation analysis and planning, the proposal does not demonstrate experience with the projects and tasks described in the Service Area description. Project examples do not illustrate robust experience with Service Area tasks.

SERVICE AREA 8: Pavement management planning

CMAP will not be moving forward with contracting through this RFQ for pavement management.

SERVICE AREA 9: Planning renderings, illustrations, drawings, and graphic design

Service Area 9 description:

CMAF often requires assistance enhancing projects visually to improve the understanding and accessibility of the content for potential users. These services cover general graphic designer support, to include:

- Renderings, illustrations, and drawings to demonstrate the visual impact of planning or policy directions in specific areas using:
 - Hand-drawn mediums
 - Computer-generated mediums
 - Comparing current and future conditions, this work often includes:
 - Oblique aerial views
 - Street-level renderings
 - Street-level photo simulations
- To ensure that content is visually appealing, easy to understand, and accessible to users, additional services may include:
 - The design and layout of planning documents
 - Infographics
 - Icons/logos, and other deliverables in final published reports
- Visual storytelling through video and audio design and production may also be required

Service Area 9 recommendations for prequalification summary:

A total of twenty-nine (29) firms submitted responses for Service Area 9. It was decided that pre-qualifying ten (10) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Borderless Studio, Civiltech, Collabo, Design Workshop, Greenprint Partners, LLC, Muse, Psomas, Toole Design, and Urban Works for prequalification.

Several firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated valuable skills and partial strengths, such as strong architectural renderings, unique technical capabilities, or solid experience in related design fields. However, they did not score as highly as the recommended firms due to common gaps, including insufficient breadth across required visualization types, limited alignment with CMAF’s planning context and insufficient project examples.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Greenprint Partners	93.0	The firm’s submission demonstrates outstanding quality, strong alignment with CMAF’s work, and impressive graphic examples. The submission highlights the firm’s diverse graphic skills across multiple mediums, prior work with local governments, and explicit attention to accessibility in graphic production.

Borderless Studio	89.5	The firm offered an exceptionally strong submission, featuring high-quality renderings, a visually compelling submission, and a clearly articulated design and project workflow.
LJC	88.8	The firm has highly experienced staff and has demonstrated successful work with government agencies like CMAP. The firm has in-house graphic designers with high-quality visual and storytelling capabilities, and strong technical skills to produce quality illustrations.
Civiltech	88.3	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications in its capabilities, approach, team resumes, and project examples. They have solid experience working with agencies like CMAP, and their renderings and design work align well with the requirements for this Service Area. Having a drone pilot on staff is a unique asset.
Psomas	87.8	The proposal demonstrated deep expertise and a wide range of graphic capabilities, including video, audio, and interactive media. The firm’s submission stands out as comprehensive, detailed, and well-aligned with the Service Area’s needs.
Muse	86.3	The proposal demonstrates a strong project approach, high-quality visual and storytelling capabilities, supported by a well-structured design team. An excellent proposal that included strong work examples and a well thought out process for working with CMAP.
Toole Design	85.9	The firm clearly meets all requirements to execute the deliverables for the Service Area. The proposal is strong across all criteria, featuring high-quality, diverse examples and familiarity working with agencies like CMAP.
Collabo	84.9	The firm provides relevant experience and a solid approach, resulting in a strong overall score. The firm demonstrated strong design capabilities, fun and unique graphic style, hand-drawing skills, and well-structured examples of engagement materials.
Design Workshop	83.6	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications in its capabilities, approach, team resumes, and project examples. They have solid experience working with agencies like CMAP, and their renderings and design work align well with the requirements for this Service Area. Notably, the firm cites their ongoing research aimed at remaining at the cutting-edge of graphic work.
Urban Works	82.3	The firm submitted a strong submission and demonstrated capability to produce high-quality work within the Service Area. The submission demonstrates outstanding quality, with strong alignment to the project and well-supported examples. The firm’s approach is both thoughtful and highly effective.
Not recommended for prequalification		
Houseal Lavigne	81.5	Strong visualization skills and high-quality graphics. However, resume links were inaccessible, preventing full evaluation of team qualifications.
Perkins & Will	81.4	The firm demonstrated high-quality work and strong project approach. However, the submission showed limited experience working with agencies like CMAP.

V3	81	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications in its capabilities, approach, team resumes, and project examples. However, pixelated images and lack of experience working with agencies like CMAP lowered confidence in consistency.
Foursquare ITP	80.5	The submission demonstrates good quality, with well-supported examples. However, the submission did not demonstrate capabilities across the full range of services required in the Service Area.
Parametrix	78.4	The firm meets the basic requirements for the Service Area, has relevant design experience, and a solid project approach. The overall score reflects a functional but limited response.
R.M. Chin & Associates	71.3	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications in its capabilities, team resumes, and approaches that address many key requirements. However, submission had limited detail and alignment with the scope of work in this Service Area.
RS&H	70.6	The firm meets the basic requirements for the Service Area and has relevant design experience and a solid project approach. While the proposal demonstrates a foundational understanding of the project it lacks clarity and specificity in execution.
Epstein	70.5	The firm demonstrated strong qualifications in its capabilities, team resumes, and approach. Its proposal could have been strengthened by offering more diverse examples of visualizations.
Mckenna	70.5	The firm shows strong qualifications in its capabilities, team resumes, and project examples. The firm demonstrates strong graphic skills using a variety of mediums. The firm’s submission would have benefitted from more relevant project examples.
MIG	70.4	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications in its capabilities, approach, team resumes, and project examples. The proposal includes a diverse array of graphics and illustrations. However, the lack of depth in experience and approach limits the strength of the firm’s submission.
Stantec	70.0	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications in its capabilities, approach, team resumes, and project examples. The firm shows sufficient qualifications and a workable approach, though several elements feel underdeveloped, suggesting limited confidence in their ability to deliver services required in the Service Area.
GRAEF	69.6	The proposal demonstrated impressive skills in graphics and visualizations using a variety of mediums, including hand drawing and video. The proposal would have been stronger if they shared a third project example relevant to the Service Area and demonstrated more experience working with agencies like CMAP.
Primera	68.9	The proposal meets the basic requirements across most categories. While the firm demonstrates the ability to complete the work, their approach and supporting materials do not strongly differentiate them.
JGMA	68.5	The firm shows strong qualifications in its capabilities, team resumes, and project examples. Its submission demonstrates consistent strength across categories. But highlighted work is

		architecture focused and does not demonstrate strong alignment with Service Area needs.
MKSK	67.9	The firm shows strong qualifications in its capabilities, team resumes, and approach. However, the firm’s project examples for rendering, illustrations, and drawings services were missing from the submission.
Latent	67.8	The proposal meets the basic requirements across most categories but lacks depth in several areas. While the firm demonstrates the ability to complete the work, their approach and supporting materials do not strongly differentiate them.
Baxter	66.3	The firm shows strong qualifications in its capabilities, team resumes, approach, and project examples. However, the presence of pixelated images and non-functioning QR codes limit confidence in the firm’s ability to consistently deliver quality services.
Globetrotters	53	The firm’s submission demonstrates a foundational understanding of the project but lacks clarity and specificity in execution. It does not clearly demonstrate the firm’s capabilities, approach, project team structure, or relevant experience in rendering and design services.
Eco Vidal Design, Inc.	32.4	While the firm demonstrates general experience in the planning and design field, the proposal does not demonstrate sufficient skills or experience necessary to perform the work in the Service Area.

SERVICE AREA 10: Regional policy analysis

Service Area 10 description:

These analyses would involve collaborating with CMAP to answer discrete questions raised through the regional planning, programming, and policy development processes. These analyses are intended to supplement CMAP staff capacity and provide specialized expertise to inform decision-making, evaluate tradeoffs, and support implementable strategies.

Assignments may range in scale, duration, and topic and will be closely coordinated with CMAP staff. Work may include qualitative and quantitative analysis, policy evaluation, scenario testing, and synthesis of complex information for technical and non-technical audiences.

Policy Categories

Consultant work under this Service Area may include, but is not limited to, the below policy categories CMAP anticipates that the most competitive (outstanding) responses will demonstrate experience across multiple policy categories, ideally all four. However, firms with strong expertise in one or more categories are encouraged to submit a response and clearly identify their areas of focus and experience.

Transportation policy, finance, and system performance

- Transit policy, including fare policy, service planning options, capital planning, governance approaches, supportive land use strategies, and alternative revenue strategies
- Tolling policy and road pricing policy, including toll rate structures, regulatory environments, tolling technologies, customer service considerations, and road usage charging concepts
- Transportation system funding, including identification of revenue options, evaluation of the suitability of revenue options across generally accepted tax policy principles, exploration of regulatory constraints and opportunities, and commentary on implementation considerations
- Planning-level financial forecasting and modeling, including spreadsheet-based analyses for various potential transportation funding options across various implementation scenarios
- Transportation system asset management, including approaches to optimize conditions for both highway and transit facilities

Economy and regional competitiveness

- Economic development and regional competitiveness, including labor markets, access to jobs, industry clusters, freight and logistics, and global economic positioning
- Workforce and employment trends, including implications for transportation access, land use, and regional investment strategies
- Market and real estate analysis related to infrastructure investment, redevelopment, and regional growth patterns

Land use, housing, and community development

- Land use and development policy, including growth patterns, redevelopment strategies, and coordination between land use and infrastructure investment
- Housing supply, affordability, and market dynamics at regional and subregional scales
- Community-scale planning and policy analysis that supports reinvestment, infill development and sustainable growth

Environment, climate and natural resources

- Water resource policy, including water supply, water quality, and stormwater management
- Climate adaptation and resilience strategies, including integration into planning and investment decisions
- Emissions reduction strategies, including transportation and land use related approaches
- Natural resource protection and open space systems
- Environmental policy analysis related to regional planning and infrastructure investment

Expected deliverables may include:

- Best practice/peer scan memos
- Demographic and socioeconomic analysis
- Data-driven analysis to support scenario planning and policy development at regional and subregional scales
- Recommendation memos
- Technical memos
- Legislative/regulatory reviews
- Maps/spatial analysis
- Charts/infographics
- Plans
- Dashboards
- StoryMaps
- Live models detailing analysis (for example, in Excel)
- Presentation materials
- Meeting support (for example, polling, discussion questions, facilitation, subject matter expertise)

Service Area 10 recommendations for pre-qualification summary:

Twenty-seven (27) responses were submitted for Service Area 10. staff determined that prequalifying fourteen (14) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Arcadis, Buro Happold, Cascadia, CDM Smith, Conlon Public Strategies, Design Workshop, Geosyntec, ICF, Jacobs, KPMG, MK Corona, NN Engineering, SB Friedman, and TY Lin for prequalification.

The evaluation team found that many firms were highly skilled but did not score as highly as the firms recommended for prequalification. Additionally, many firms demonstrated capable analysis skills but did not demonstrate ample experience on projects at the regional level, as described in the Service Area description.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
CDM Smith	93.5	CDM Smith has strong capabilities in the tasks outlined in the Service Area description and a history of working successfully with agencies like CMAP. Their work examples show they can manage complex assignments and translate technical findings into strategies that fit the northeastern Illinois context.
SB Friedman	93.5	SB Friedman has strong expertise in economic development, revenue strategy, transit finance, and value capture and work examples directly reflect the type of regional policy evaluation and funding analysis CMAP anticipates.

KPMG	90.75	KPMG brings strong advisory experience in infrastructure finance, economic analysis, feasibility assessment, and market evaluation. Their examples show involvement in complex, multi-agency assignments where financial strategy and policy direction intersect.
Conlon Public Strategies	90.5	Conlon offers highly specialized expertise. Their understanding of CMAP's stakeholder environment, fiscal policy challenges, and legislative dynamics provided value beyond technical analysis.
Geosyntec	89.25	Geosyntec has successfully delivered multiple projects relevant to this Service Area and consistently ties technical environmental work to practical regional policy applications.
MK Corona	87.25	MK Corona offers specialized strengths in community-centered policy development, nondiscrimination analysis, and outcomes-focused implementation methods. Their work reflects a nuanced understanding of regional planning challenges.
Cascadia	87	Cascadia shows strong cross-sector capabilities in different topics with particular strengths in scenario planning and data-driven policy evaluation. Their methods emphasize transparency and adaptability, which align well with CMAP's analytical standards.
Jacobs	86.5	Jacobs indicates policy, modeling, and policy development expertise, and their project examples show experience managing large regional initiatives that require coordination across multiple agencies.
Buro Happold	85.75	Buro Happold demonstrates strong capabilities in climate analysis, sustainability planning, economic strategy, and regional policy frameworks. Their prior work with regional planning organizations demonstrates an ability to produce technical deliverables that fit the northeastern Illinois context.
TY Lin	82.75	TY Lin demonstrates solid experience in transportation systems and financial modeling and understands the work of CMAP and peer transportation agencies, primarily the planning-level analysis and decision-making expected in this Service Area.
Arcadis	81.75	Arcadis demonstrates good experience in policy, infrastructure governance, capital programming, and funding strategy at various levels, including MPO, DOT, and municipal.
Design Workshop	81.5	Design Workshop's proposal indicated a well-qualified planning staff with capability to integrate multi-sector data across land use, transportation, housing and environment.
ICF	81.5	ICF demonstrates strong technical methods and subject-matter expertise with high-quality work.
NN Engineering	80	NN Engineering brings useful experience in transit policy and pricing analysis.
Not recommended for prequalification		
WSP	79.75	WSP offers extensive multidisciplinary capabilities, but the proposal speaks less to how they will develop inferences and takeaways with CMAP staff to support decision-making.
Cambridge Systematics	79.5	Cambridge Systematics brings deep technical transportation expertise, but many of their proposed tools and analyses overlap

		with capabilities CMAP already maintains. Proposal appears to rely on leveraging specialist partners or advisors to guide the work.
Kimley-Horn	79.5	Kimley-Horn provides strong planning and modeling capabilities, but the proposal focuses more on project delivery and operational analysis than on the type of policy research CMAP requires.
MIG	77	MIG has broad planning and engagement experience, but much of the work is not the type of projects we'd be looking for firms to assist with in terms of policy development.
Parametrix	76.75	Parametrix shows strong skills in expressway policy and pricing but has a narrower technical focus than is needed for comprehensive regional policy analysis.
AECOM	76.5	AECOM presents strong planning and engineering capabilities, but the proposal emphasizes broader infrastructure and planning work rather than the specific type of regional policy analysis and methods needed for the tasks described in this Service Area.
Estolano Advisors	74.25	Estolano Advisors demonstrates strong policy work in land use, housing, and environmental topics, but their portfolio does not closely reflect CMAP's specific regional policy environment.
Farr Associates	73.75	Farr Associates offers strong sustainable urbanism and decarbonization expertise, but their portfolio centers on design-oriented assignments rather than regional policy analysis.
MKSK	73	MKSK demonstrates strong design and local planning capabilities, but the examples do not reflect significant experience with regional policy work.
EBP	72.5	EBP provides strong economic and accessibility modeling experience, but their examples focus less on regional policy implementation and more on technical analysis.
SRF	71.5	SRF provides strong technical assistance and safety planning experience, but their examples center on modal and corridor work more than regional policy evaluation.
Anderson Smith	68.5	Anderson Smith provides strong analytics and research capabilities, although much of their experience is in education, workforce, and health fields that do not closely match CMAP's transportation policy focus. Limited past work in planning or working with MPOs.
Jack Faucett	64.5	Jack Faucett demonstrates solid economic and transportation policy analysis, but their examples are not closely aligned with CMAP's upcoming regional policy priorities.

SERVICE AREA 11: Transportation modeling and technical analyses

Service Area 11 description:

- Independent review and interpretation of modeling results, anticipated to primarily include regional travel demand modeling
- Specialized modeling services, such as traffic microsimulation and transit ridership modeling, and/or independent review and interpretation of those modeling results

Service Area 11 recommendations for prequalification summary:

Twenty-one (21) responses were submitted for Service Area 11. CMAP staff determined that prequalifying eleven (11) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Arcadis, Cambridge Systematics, Civiltech, DLZ, Kimley-Horn, KPMG, NN Engineering, Parametrix, RSG, SRF, and WSP for prequalification.

While the firms not recommended for prequalification did not receive as high an overall average score as the top-scoring four firms, many demonstrated extensive experience and high-quality project examples. Several firms did not demonstrate sufficient experience interpreting regional travel modeling results.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Cambridge Systematics	94	The firm has deep modeling experience, including with other MPOs, and a strong technical approach.
Arcadis	91	The firm brings significant experience with regional travel demand modeling and specialized modeling.
Parametrix	91	This firm has strong knowledge of MPO models and experience with modeling in the region.
WSP	91	This firm demonstrates significant expertise in modeling tools used by CMAP and relevant experience from other MPOs.
Civiltech	89	The firm demonstrates a strong understanding of CMAP and partner modeling, including demonstrated experience with interpretation.
KPMG	89	This firm brings a strong mix of technical skills and local policy background to support interpretation of model results.
RSG	88	This firm brings significant knowledge of trip based and activity based models to support interpretation.
NN Engineering	87	This firm brings strong experience with MPO travel models and particularly strong experience with transit modeling.
SRF	87	This firm brings a strong project approach and experience with specialized modeling and microsimulation.
DLZ	82	The firm has strong modeling experience and a detailed description of workflow.
Kimley-Horn	80	The firm demonstrates strong experience across the country.
Not recommended for prequalification		
Stantec	78	This firm brings a clear, well laid out project approach and experience with MPOs. This firm also brings experience with regional modeling, corridor modeling, and project modeling. However, staff have mixed experience with regional modeling.
Ramboll	73	This firm has significant experience with modeling in regional policy and planning across the world. However, it's less clear how

		many total years of experience the firm has focusing on interpreting regional travel model results.
RS&H	73	This firm brings significant technical expertise across many modeling and microsimulation tools.
Buro Happold	71	The firm describes strong work flows and great planning principles. Regional modeling is less present in resumes and project examples.
GRAEF	64.5	The firm has experience with traffic analysis and microsimulation, but less with MPO travel demand modeling.
EFK Moen	61	The firm provided a very strong description of the project approach. Project examples do not heavily feature interpretation of regional modeling results.
EXP	57	The firm has strong transportation planning experience. However, the firm’s submission did not sufficiently demonstrate experience interpreting regional travel model results.
Jack Faucett	49	The firm has solid experience with travel modeling at federal and state levels. The submission’s focus on interpreting regional travel demand model results was insufficient.
GTI Energy	15	The proposal shows limited direct experience with interpreting regional travel demand modeling results.
Globetrotters	14	The firm has limited experience relevant to this Service Area.

SERVICE AREA 12: Transportation plans

Service Area 12 description:

These plans may address:

- Assessing existing and future conditions for specific corridors, intersections, districts, or community-wide transportation networks, including roadway, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure
- Evaluating the feasibility and potential performance of proposed transportation infrastructure improvements, including technical, operation, fiscal, and implementation considerations
- Developing graphically driven multimodal concept plans suitable for public engagement and stakeholder review
- Analyzing anticipated impacts of proposed improvements, such as changes in traffic operations, multimodal access, safety outcomes, and budget implications

Work may also include:

- Preparing generalized cost estimates for recommended improvements, including capital, operations, and long-term maintenance considerations
- Drafting high-level scopes of work and corresponding cost estimates for preliminary engineering, final engineering, construction engineering, or related phases to support local budgeting, grant applications, and project programming
- Developing recommendations that are actionable and accompanied by considerations related to phasing, funding eligibility, permitting, and interagency

coordination, as appropriate

CMAA does not anticipate that the firm will be asked to prepare engineering drawings as a part of these activities.

Service Area 12 recommendations for pre-qualification summary:

Thirty-four (34) responses were submitted for Service Area 12. It was decided that prequalifying eleven (11) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending AECOM, Cambridge Systematics, CDM Smith, Civiltech, Epstein, Jacobs, NN Engineering, Parametrix, Smith Group, Stantec, and TY Lin for prequalification.

Several firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated accomplished experience in transportation planning but did not receive as high an overall average score as the other firms. The evaluation team noted that some firms had an inadequate engagement approach, did not have services or staff that fully aligned with the description of the Service Area, or had limited experience with public agencies.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
TY Lin	94	TY Lin's submittal pointed to its comprehensive capabilities and an approach that was likely to result in successful project completion.
Smith Group	93.5	SmithGroup presented a comprehensive suite of transportation planning services and indicated a qualified firm with local project experience.
AECOM	84.5	AECOM showed a range of transportation planning services that seem to be well aligned with this Service Area and demonstrated that the firm has a highly experienced project team.
Civiltech	82	Civiltech demonstrated excellent qualifications for this Service Area, including a flexible approach, effective engagement, and expert staff.
CDM Smith	81.5	CDM Smith presented a qualified team and comprehensive approach well suited to the needs of the Service Area. The firm demonstrated its ability to complete the types of studies included in the Service Area.
NN Engineering	81	NN presented a qualified team and a set of services aligned with the needs of the Service Area. The firm has worked on numerous PAO-type projects for other regions of the country.
Cambridge Systematics	78.5	Cambridge Systematics presented a highly qualified national firm with an excellent range of expertise and experience for this Service Area.

Jacobs	78	Jacobs is a qualified firm with solid transportation skills. The proposal highlighted the tools, staff, and approach necessary to complete the transportation planning work in this Service Area.
Stantec	76.5	Stantec provided information on a qualified team that had experience in a comprehensive array of transportation planning projects.
Parametrix	75.5	Parametrix presented a comprehensive list of services with the capacity to deliver.
Epstein	75	Epstein demonstrated that it is a qualified firm with good experience in transportation planning.
Not recommended for prequalification		
Arcadis	74.5	The Arcadis team is experienced and well qualified. The team's experience includes agency experience in such multimodal focus areas as freight and non-motorized transportation. However, their public engagement lacked specific examples.
Buro Happold	72	Impressive submission with a thoughtful approach and description of qualifications. The project list was not as strong in demonstrating public agency coordination.
Kimley-Horn	72	Kimley-Horn presented a qualified team and a set of services aligned with the Service Area. They provided an adequate approach but didn't incorporate public input.
WSP	71.5	WSP presented a comprehensive approach, but the engagement approach lacked concrete strategies, and their narrative did not provide steps on working with CMAP.
SRF	71	SRF presented a comprehensive approach that would likely result in successful project implementation, but the firm did not show an understanding for CMAP's role and lacked steps for working with CMAP.
Antero Group	69.5	Antero indicated both technical and more community-based capabilities, but the narrative lacked specificity on working with CMAP and the project examples appeared small-scale.
RS&H	67.75	The project team has comprehensive transportation planning experience, but the narrative lacked practical steps for working with CMAP or other MPOs.
CMT	67.5	The CMT submittal presented a very competent firm with a variety of skills and experience, but the engagement plan lacked specific examples.
Psomas	67	Psomas's submittal demonstrated that the firm was a capable transportation planning firm, but they laid out a range of services that seemed to exclude some key tasks needed in this Service Area.
EXP	66	EXP is a global firm with experience on large-scale projects, but didn't sufficiently demonstrate their experience with smaller and municipal transportation projects.
GFT	65	GFT presented a competent team with services aligned with many of the project types included in the Service Area, but the firm did not present a comprehensive approach.

Michael Baker	65	Michael Baker presented a team that overall was qualified, with a range of experience, but the narrative didn't clearly lay out an understanding of CMAP's role or concrete strategies for working with CMAP.
LJC	64.5	LJC presented a compelling response to the RFQ. However, the firm had important gaps in transportation planning skills.
Mead & Hunt	62.75	Mead & Hunt provided very good staff and sample project information. However, their engagement approach did not include examples and did not mention incorporating feedback into work.
MKSK	58	MKSK's team appears to have substantial multimodal transportation planning experience, but their submittal was too focused on non-motorized transportation for the needs of this Service Area.
Atlas	57	Atlas's submission showed great technical abilities. Parts of the submission were very strong, but key points like public engagement and working with a multi-jurisdictional agency like CMAP were lacking.
Ramboll	56	Ramboll demonstrated that they could complete transportation planning projects. However, they did not elaborate on how they would complete projects or provide a comprehensive approach to public engagement.
Foursquare ITP	51.5	Foursquare ITP has a strong understanding of data, engagement, and showed many useful tools, but the submittal focused on transit, and CMAP will likely have much wider range of projects.
EFK Moen	43	EFK Moen has strong engineering expertise, but the resumes didn't align with the varieties of transportation planning highlighted in the Service Area and lacked insights into planning, data, and policy.
GRAEF	42.5	GRAEF's submission indicated a capable design firm, but one not well suited for the type of transportation planning services we seek, which can range from modeling to technical assistance projects - neither of which were highlighted.
KPMG	30.5	KPMG is a highly skilled technical infrastructure firm, but their approach as a strategic advisor does not address the need for local transportation planning as described in the Service Area description.
Jack Faucett	20	The submission did not provide sufficient evidence that the firm could complete the transportation planning tasks in the Service Area and lacked resumes.
Lochner	19.5	Capable firm, but they did not provide the project approach for the correct Service Area.

SERVICE AREA 13: Travel activity data capture and processing by camera and other detection devices

Service Area 13 description:

CMAP often requires assistance collecting passenger vehicle, non-motorized, and freight system data (such as volumes, speeds, delay and user behavior) to better understand the regional transportation network in large-scale regional and local area context. This work

supports corridor planning efforts, freight network planning, safety planning, and future project programming efforts. This will include the ability to:

- Capture video footage for defined 24-hour periods.
 - Some video (e.g., at highway-rail grade crossings) will simply be transmitted to CMAP. Other video will be transmitted to commercial services to detect, process, and document vehicle classification, including passenger vehicles, single-unit trucks, multi-unit trucks, pedestrians, and cyclists.
 - This also includes the ability to provide turning-vehicle counts by intersection approach by these classifications, all in 15-minute increments for a defined 24-hour period. Pole-mounted field cameras are commonly used for these purposes. The data collected by these means shall also be capable of being downloaded and formatted into documents and reports supporting CMAP internal and external work activities.
 - Equipment to capture video will be the firm's responsibility, as will engagement of commercial services to process the video into counts.
- Capture vehicle speed distributions for defined periods using radar devices.
- Capture infrastructure condition images and data using location-enabled survey software, such as Survey123, to support CMAP transportation planning activities.
- Obtain data manually, consistent with the procedures laid out in the ITE Manual of Transportation Engineering Studies or as coordinated with CMAP.
 - Such data may include freight studies, saturation flow rates, and occupancy/length of stay for loading zones, truck parking, and other parking studies.
 - In addition, some bike-pedestrian counts may be obtained manually where the installation of pole-mounted video cameras is not feasible in off-street locations.
- As activities are assigned, determine what permits, if any, are necessary from the jurisdiction agency, and obtain the permits, providing proof of insurance as required by the jurisdiction agency.
- Conduct data collection in a manner so as to maximize the safety of workers and travelers, including appropriate attire and setbacks from moving vehicles. Safety training will be the firm's responsibility.

Service Area 13 recommendations for prequalification summary:

Ten (10) responses were submitted for Service Area 13. It was decided that prequalifying five (5) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Civiltech, DLZ, Gewalt Hamilton, Terra, and WSP for prequalification.

Several firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated exceptional experience in data collection but did not receive as high an overall average score as the other firms. The evaluation team found that some proposals did not provide specific examples of how they collected the data or what equipment they have available to conduct the data collection or did not demonstrate adequate experience in collecting multi-model transportation data.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Terra	94.5	Terra’s submission demonstrated the capabilities, staff, and equipment to complete the work outlined in the Service Area, and that their approach would yield high-quality data.
DLZ	93.5	DLZ demonstrated an extensive history of competent project delivery in terms of gathering traffic data and that it has the capacity to cover a large MPO region in a relatively short period of time. The submission also demonstrated that DLZ has experience in integrating ArcGIS in project inventory and work processes.
Gewalt Hamilton	91.5	Firm provides thorough description of client delivery process, including communication throughout project, constant QA/QC and equipment monitoring, and flexibility and timeliness of end product deliverables.
Civiltech	85.8	Civiltech demonstrated their capability and experience to complete CMAP data collection requests. Civiltech's approach matched the needs of the Service Area.
WSP	82.8	As a comprehensive entity, WSP’s submission demonstrated that it is capable of delivering on large scale projects and in doing so competently executes traffic and non-motorized data capture.
Not recommended for prequalification		
Ramboll	70.5	Ramboll demonstrated that they deploy data collection activities as indicated in the Service Area description. However, Ramboll didn't sufficiently indicate that they possessed any equipment or staff dedicated to doing so.
InNova Consulting	66.8	Staff now working at InNova had suitable experience from working at prior firms. However, the submission did not include a summary of equipment capacity or matches of methods/equipment to study types.
SRF	60.3	Staff now working at SRF had suitable experience from working at prior firms. However, SRF did not commit to completing all of the data collection tasks listed in the Service Area description.
Globetrotters	56.0	While Globetrotters laid out their overall capabilities for engineering, they didn't sufficiently demonstrate substantial data collection capabilities. Firm does not provide concrete examples of video-assisted traffic counting devices either in number of units or number of counts.

Locus	40.5	Locus focused on cloud processing of data feeds, not locally collected data as set forth in the Service Area description.
-------	------	---

SERVICE AREA 14: Water quality

This Service Area consists of tasks to assist CMAP with watershed-based planning and water quality technical assistance being conducted in partnership with Illinois EPA.

Service Area 14 description:

This Service Area consists of tasks to assist CMAP with watershed-based planning and water quality technical assistance being conducted in partnership with Illinois EPA. Work may include:

- Development of new or updates of existing watershed-based plans and executive summaries to be consistent with U.S. EPA's nine minimum elements for a watershed management plan, Illinois EPA requirements, and current watershed planning principles. Work may include:
 - Assistance with stakeholder engagement
 - Development or update of a comprehensive watershed resource inventory, including aerial analyses, field data collection, development of GIS-based data collection apps, pollutant load modeling, and preparation of maps and data tables
 - Development or update of a watershed management action plan, including recommended watershed protection measures and associated pollutant load reductions and planning level cost estimates for both site-specific best management practices (BMPs) and watershed-wide BMP scenarios, public education and outreach products and activities, funding and technical assistance resources, implementation schedule, interim measurable milestones, criteria for determining progress, and monitoring to evaluate effectiveness of BMP implementation
 - Development of interactive GIS web maps for public input, display of stream, lake, and detention basin inventory assessment data, and display of final plan recommendations
- Technical assistance, which may include:
 - Water quality modeling, which may include:
 - Identifying point-source pollution sources
 - Modeling to quantify pollutant loading
 - Modeling to estimate pollutant load reductions and planning level costs for urban and agricultural BMPs
 - Developing hydrologic and nutrient budgets
 - Assessing how surface waters will respond to watershed and environmental changes (e.g., land use change, climate change)
 - Developing total maximum daily loads (TMDLs)

- Quantifying benefits of water quality protection policies
- Hydrologic and hydraulic modeling
- Field reconnaissance and provision of general recommendations for best management practices (BMPs) to address nonpoint source pollution and water quality problems
- Development of preliminary designs for BMPs to address nonpoint source pollution and water quality problems
- Assistance with public information, education, and outreach products and activities
- Assistance with grant applications

Service Area 14 recommendations for prequalification summary:

Fifteen (15) responses were submitted for Service Area 14. It was decided that pre-qualifying six (6) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Baxter & Woodman, ECT, Geosyntec, Hey and Associates, HR Green, and Spheros.

Many of the firms not recommended for prequalification submitted strong qualifications relative to the Service Area but did not score as highly as the top-scoring firms. The evaluation team also noted that some firms demonstrated experience in stormwater planning but not watershed-based planning, or they did not provide examples of, or experience with, watershed management plans consistent with U.S. EPA’s nine minimum elements for a watershed management plan, as outlined in the Service Area description.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Baxter & Woodman	86.7	Baxter & Woodman demonstrated outstanding experience in the development of watershed-based plans. They also demonstrated good experience in the technical assistance aspects of the Service Area.
Geosyntec	84.3	Geosyntec provided examples and laid out skills that were exactly aligned with what is being requested in the Service Area. The team has lots of experience and many different skills needed to conduct watershed plans, modeling, engagement, etc.
ECT	79.3	ECT demonstrated that it offers a solid approach, backed by extensive experience, to watershed planning and providing water quality technical assistance.
Hey and Associates	78.7	Hey and Associates exhibited very good experience in the watershed-based planning aspects and outstanding experience in the technical assistance aspects of the Service Area.
HR Green	76.7	HR Green demonstrated solid experience in the watershed-based planning and technical assistance aspects of the Service Area.

Spheros	68.7	Spheros demonstrated extensive experience with watershed-based planning within the EPA's nine minimum element requirements and the ability to carry out water quality monitoring.
Not recommended for prequalification		
GRAEF	63.0	GRAEF offered a solid approach, but the staff selected for this team did not exhibit an understanding of the watershed-based planning skills needed for the Service Area.
Jacobs	62.8	Team has extensive modeling experience, yet it did not demonstrate an adequate level of experience in watershed-based planning. The submission's project examples did not outline a watershed based plan that aligns with EPA's nine minimum element requirements.
Parametrix	52.8	The firm's project approach very closely aligns with the needs of the Service Area, but the resumes and project examples included in the submission do not demonstrate an adequate level of experience in watershed-based planning.
Civiltech	52.2	While Civiltech demonstrated solid experience relevant to several components of the work of this Service Area, the firm's demonstrated experience in the development of nine minimum element watershed-based plans is not adequate for the overall needs of this Service Area.
Michael Baker	52.0	Team has extensive TMDL and modeling experience yet does not demonstrate an adequate level of experience in watershed-based planning.
Arcadis	53.5	Arcadis has extensive stormwater experience yet does not demonstrate an adequate level of experience in watershed-based planning and water quality technical assistance activities.
Greenprint Partners	45.0	Greenprint Partners exhibit outstanding community engagement and green infrastructure planning experience but did not sufficiently demonstrate experience in development of nine minimum element watershed-based plans, WQ and H&H modeling, and agricultural BMP design.
Delta Institute	33.3	Delta Institute exhibited strong community engagement and water infrastructure technical assistance/funding knowledge but did not demonstrate an adequate level of experience in the more technical aspects of the Service Area.
Jack Faucett	29.7	Firm's submission did not demonstrate sufficient experience, qualifications, or project approach to complete the project. No resumes were provided.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval