Arizona Department of Transportation
Intermodal Transportation Division
206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Janice K. Brewer
Governor

John S. Halikowski
Director

Jennifer Toth
State Engineer

August 10, 2012

INFORMATION BULLETIN NO. 13-03

TO: ADOT Project Managers
Resident Engineers
Consultant Engineering Firms

FROM: Engineering Consultants Section (ECS)

SUBJECT: **STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS (SOQ) PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERION**

ECS Information Bulletin No. 10-02, issued June 28, 2010, established and implemented revised guidelines for the consultant evaluation program for new contracts with a Notice to Proceed date after July 1, 2010. The guidelines indicated that final consultant evaluations scores for contracts executed after July 1, 2010 will be used as one factor or criterion in the selection process for ECS contracts.

Contracts executed after July 1, 2010 are now being completed and will continue into the future. Therefore, **effective immediately**, all SOQs will include a Past Performance criterion score that will relate to a firm's past performance as indicated by its final evaluation scores on ECS contracts.

Attached are the Consultant Evaluation Program Guidelines issued with Information Bulletin No. 10-02. Items 15 and 16 have been added to the guidelines to help encourage firms to resubmit completed evaluations to ADOT and to provide a mechanism for appeal of final evaluation scores of 1 or 2. Also attached is a document containing the questions and scoring criteria used to evaluate consultant performance on ECS contracts. The same questions and criteria are used for annual and final consultant evaluations.

If you have any questions regarding this bulletin, contact the Engineering Consultants Section at (602) 712-7525.

Vivien Lattibeaudiere, Ph.D.
Director
Engineering Consultants Section

Arizona Department of Transportation
ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS SECTION (ECS)

CONSULTANT EVALUATION PROGRAM GUIDELINES

Introduction & Purpose

The Consultant Evaluation Program is a program administered by ECS as a means for ADOT to monitor and evaluate the quality of work performed on engineering consultant contracts. A positive approach to the program assures that project schedule, cost and quality of design and construction are attainable. This assures that potential problems which may impact other projects or the 5-Year Construction Program are identified and resolved in a timely manner.

All engineering consultant contracts shall be evaluated annually based on the Notice to Proceed (NTP) anniversary date by the ADOT staff assigned to the contract, including the ADOT PM, other technical groups, ECS staff, etc., in accordance with applicable contract provisions. In addition to annual evaluations, a final consultant evaluation must be conducted at the end of all engineering consultant contracts.

Implementation Timeline

This evaluation program will be effective for all ECS contracts with a Notice to Proceed (NTP) date of July 1, 2010 or later. Annual evaluation using this program will be conducted on contracts which were NTP'd before July 1, 2010, but the results will not affect consultant selection.

Uses for Consultant Evaluation

Consultant Evaluations will be used for the following purposes:

1. To identify consultant performance strengths and weaknesses, as well as help identify, document and resolve performance issues, as needed.

2. As one factor or criterion in the selection process for subsequent contracts. Final evaluations for contracts executed after **July 1, 2010** will be used as part of the selection process. Up to 5 points may be deducted from a consultant's score during the selection process for **final** evaluation ratings of less than 3 (average performance) on performance factors of evaluation for projects a firm has completed for ADOT over a three year time period.

   Evaluation history to be used for selection will include evaluation scores encompassing the most current three-year period at any given time. The three-year evaluation history will be maintained for firm contracts executed after July 1, 2010. For example, a firm's evaluation history in FY 2013 would include scores from FY 2011 through FY 2013 and in FY 2014, the evaluation history would include FY 2012 through FY 2014.

   ECS will deduct points from the final composite average score of submitted Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) for each firm based on performance rating as follows:

Performance rating of 1 or 2 on 1-2 evaluation factors	-1 Point
Performance rating of 1 or 2 on 3-4 evaluation factors	-2 Point
Performance rating of 1 or 2 on 5-6 evaluation factors	-3 Point
Performance rating of 1 or 2 on 7-8 evaluation factors	-4 Point
Performance rating of 1 or 2 on 9 or more evaluation factors	-5 Point

3. As documentation to justify disqualification of a prime consultant or subconsultant from submitting Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) proposals. In order for ECS to take action that could lead to

consultant disqualification from submitting SOQs, the ADOT PM or staff shall complete a Consultant Evaluation by initiating the process through the ECS Contract Specialist. When an evaluation form is used to document issues which could lead to consultant disqualification from submitting SOQ proposals (as outlined in Section 2.02 of the ECS Rules and Procedures), the ECS Specialist will select "Other" as the Evaluation type in eCMS.

4. As documentation to justify the declaration of a breach of contract for a consultant's failure to fulfill terms of the contract or to address problems identified by ADOT in the performance of the contract. In order for ECS to take action that could lead ADOT to declare a breach of contract, the ADOT PM or staff must complete a Consultant Evaluation by initiating the process through the ECS Contract Specialist. When an evaluation form is used to document issues which could lead to a breach of contract being declared (as outlined in Section 4.17 of the ECS Rules and Procedures), the ECS Specialist will select "Other" as the Evaluation type in eCMS.

Procedure

ECS Contract Specialist will initiate the completion of consultant evaluation forms for contracts annually on their NTP anniversary date.

Since evaluations will be used as a factor in the consultant selection process, it is important for ADOT PMs, Resident Engineers or other applicable staff to complete evaluations in a timely manner.

Please adhere to the following general guidelines in completing the consultant evaluation electronically in eCMS:

1. All consultant evaluations (annual, final or otherwise) shall be initiated by the ECS Specialist. ADOT PMs, who wish to conduct a consultant evaluation outside of the normal annual or final cycle, should contact the ECS Specialist to initiate the evaluation process.

2. Section I (Items 1-4) of the evaluation form shall be completed by ECS staff in eCMS and forwarded to the ADOT PM through automatic email notification.

3. The ADOT PM shall confer with other ADOT Project Team members involved in the contract and complete Section II of the evaluation form (Items 5-12) in eCMS. The ADOT PM shall forward the fully completed evaluation to the consultant electronically through eCMS within 14 calendar days from the receipt of notification from the ECS Specialist.

   If the ADOT PM is a Supplemental Services (SS) consultant, the PM portion of the evaluation must be completed in eCMS by the SS consultant's Supervisor or Manager.

4. Section II, Item 12 (Post-Design) will be forwarded to the ADOT Resident Engineer (RE) by the ADOT PM for completion, as applicable. The ADOT RE shall confer with the ADOT PM and other ADOT project team members involved in the project and shall complete Section II, Item 12 within 5 calendar days.

5. When totally completed, the ADOT PM shall discuss the evaluation with the consultant (telephonically or in-person) and "publish" it to the consultant through eCMS. The consultant shall complete Section III by indicating the firm's agreement or disagreement with the ratings, type comments and "publish" the evaluation back to ADOT through eCMS within 10 calendar days, with the goal of completing the entire evaluation process within 30 calendar days.

ADOT PMs should encourage consultants to share the results of the subconsultant portion of the evaluation with their subconsultants.

General Guidelines

1. Each individual line item in the evaluation constitutes a performance factor.

2. ECS will assign negative points based on individual factor scores, not on an overall composite score.

3. Each individual performance factor and category on the form will be treated equally.

4. General comments are highly recommended to support scores in each major performance category.

5. Documentation and specific comments **must** be included to justify any performance factor receiving a score of 2 or less.

6. The ADOT PM, ECS and other applicable ADOT staff are encouraged to take timely and appropriate steps to resolve performance issues with consultants as they arise and to document these issues in the eCMS Evaluation tab for that particular contract. This information will be used as a means of documenting issues for future evaluation ratings.

7. If performance issues arise, ADOT PMs and ECS Contract Managers should expeditiously inform consultants in writing that they are performing unsatisfactorily (using the Issues Resolution form located in eCMS) and provide them the opportunity to take corrective action to cure the deficiency before they are formally evaluated. The following steps must be taken if there are performance issues with a consultant, which could potentially lead to an evaluation score of less than 3 (average):

    a) If communicating to resolve the matter with the consultant informally does not resolve the issue, the ADOT PM, ECS Contract Specialist, Manager or other appropriate ADOT employee shall notify the consultant, in writing, of the deficient performance, identify required solutions and establish a deadline to resolve issues. The Consultant Performance Issues Resolution Form in eCMS must be completed by the appropriate ADOT staff and forwarded to the consultant for further action, as needed.

    b) If the consultant does not respond within ten (10) business days or other timeframe specified on the form and/or the matter is still unresolved after the deadline set for the cure, it is appropriate for the ADOT staff to rate the consultant a 2 or less on the applicable evaluation criteria on the consultant evaluation form.

8. Consultants should take the initiative to expeditiously contact the ADOT PM or ECS, if they are experiencing difficulties which could result in a score of less than 3 on a performance factor. The consultant should identify any problems, state proposed resolutions and specify dates the firm expects to resolve issues.

9. Subconsultant performance will affect the scores of the prime consultant as it relates to performance factors in item #9 (Utilization of Key Subconsultants). Therefore, it is important for prime consultants to closely oversee the work of their subconsultants.

10. Subconsultant scores on Item #10 of the evaluation will not affect the scores of prime consultants. ECS will maintain an evaluation history on subconsultants.

11. If a prime consultant or subconsultant receives 10 or more scores of 2 or less on evaluations, within a two-year time period, these firms may be evaluated for disqualification from submitting SOQs by ECS, and may be deemed ineligible for work as a prime consultant or subconsultant on ECS contracts for a minimum of one year. A list of consultants that are prequalified and disqualified from submitting SOQs will be posted on the ECS website. Individual consultant evaluation scores will not be posted.

12. New consultants with no ADOT contracts or evaluation history will be evaluated according to the criteria outlined in the SOQ Package, and will not be evaluated based on past performance.

13. Consultants' ratings will not be adversely affected if ADOT reduces the scope of work, or in some way delayed or impacted the ability of the consultant to reasonably meet a performance factor.

14. Upon review of evaluation, a firm may agree or disagree with evaluation scores and provide comments regarding the evaluation. If a consultant believes that the firm has been unfairly rated in an evaluation, the firm can indicate its points of disagreement on the evaluation form itself before submitting it back to ADOT.

15. Firms should resubmit completed evaluations to ADOT within 10 calendar days of date published by ADOT in eCMS (PM Publish Date). Within 30 calendar days, ADOT will send one reminder to firms that have not submitted their evaluations back to ADOT. Evaluations not submitted to ADOT within 45 calendar days will be deemed by ADOT as "Reviewed and Approved" by the firm and will automatically become a part of the firm's evaluation history.

16. A firm may appeal **FINAL** evaluation scores of 1 or 2 only. Final Evaluation scores of 3, 4, or 5 as well as Annual Evaluations are not subject to protest. To protest a score of 1 or 2, the firm must:
    a) Submit a protest in writing to the ECS Director within 14 calendar days of receipt of evaluation for Items 1-4 detailing reasons why scores do not reflect consultant performance for the contract.
    b) Submit protest in writing to the ADOT Group Manager within 14 calendar days of receipt of evaluation for Items 5-12 detailing reasons why scores do not reflect consultant performance for the contract.

    The ECS Director or Group Manager will review the disputed issues and discuss or meet with the firm to resolve the matter. The ECS Director or Group Manager will issue a written decision to the Consultant within 21 calendar days. If the firm disagrees with the decision of the ECS Director or Group Manager, the matter may be escalated to the State Engineer's Office within 14 calendar days of the ECS Director or Group Manager's decision. The State Engineer's Office will review the disputed issues and make a determination on the matter. The decision of the State Engineer's Office is final. The outcome of the appeal will be documented in the firm's evaluation history.

Arizona Department of Transportation
ENGINEERING CONSULTANT SECTION
Consultant Evaluation Questions & Scoring Criteria

1. CONTRACT DOCUMENTS

1.1 Were contract documents submitted complete, accurate and in accordance with ECS guidelines (e.g. cost proposals, insurance certificates, key personal changes, audit related information, closeout documents, etc)?

Score Definition for Question: 01.1

N/A Not Applicable
01 Contract documents/forms consistently incomplete; major revisions needed most of the time
02 Contract documents/forms frequently incomplete; revisions needed more than 50% of the time
03 Contract documents/forms adequately complete; some revisions needed
04 Contract documents/forms complete; minor revisions needed
05 Contract documents/forms always complete; no revisions needed

1.2 Were contract documents submitted on time (e.g., cost proposals, insurance certificates, key personnel changes, audit related information, closeout documents, etc.)?

Score Definition for Question: 01.2

N/A Not Applicable
01 Contract documents/forms always submitted late
02 Contract documents/forms often submitted late
03 Contract documents/forms usually submitted on time
04 Contract documents/forms submitted on time
05 Contract documents/forms always submitted on time; sometimes early

1.3 Did the Consultant comply with audit requirements (i.e., is responsive to audit information requests including timely submission of overhead/pricing information, has compliant accounting system, and submits overhead/pricing information in compliance with applicable Federal Acquisition Regulation including Cost Accounting Standards and ADOT Policy)?

Score Definition for Question: 01.3

N/A Not Applicable
01 Contract documents/forms always submitted late
02 Contract documents/forms often submitted late
03 Contract documents/ forms usually submitted on time
04 Contract documents/ forms submitted on time
05 Contract documents/ forms always submitted on time; sometimes early

1.4 Did the Consultant notify ECS on an annual basis of the overhead charges as required in the contract?

Score Definition for Question: 01.4

N/A Not Applicable
01 Did not notify ECS as required
02 Sometimes notified ECS as required
03 Notified ECS 50 % of the time as required
04 Notified ECS more than 75% of the time as required
05 Always notified ECS as required

2. CONTRACT MODIFICATIONS

2.1 Were contract modifications and task orders submitted accurate, complete (including Financial details and summary), sufficiently documented (with required documentation and backup) and in accordance with ECS guidelines?

Score Definition for Question: 02.1
N/A Not Applicable
01 Contract documents/forms consistently incomplete; major revisions needed most of the time
02 Contract modification documents/forms frequently incomplete; revisions needed more than 50% of time
03 Contract modification documents/forms adequately (75%-80%) complete with cost proposal & justification; some revisions needed
04 Contract modification documents/forms complete with cost proposal & justification; minor revisions needed
05 Contract modification documents/forms always complete with cost proposal & justification; no revisions needed

2.2 Were contract modifications and task orders submitted on time?

Score Definition for Question: 02.2
N/A Not Applicable
01 Contract documents/forms always submitted late
02 Contract documents/forms often submitted late
03 Contract documents/forms usually submitted on time
04 Contract documents/forms submitted on time
05 Contract documents/forms always submitted on time; sometimes early

3. PAYMENT REPORTS

3.1 Were submitted progress payment reports accurate, properly substantiated (correct back-up documents), all costs are allowable, and monthly progress payment report included financial details and summary?

Score Definition for Question: 03.1
N/A Not Applicable
01 Progress Payment Reports consistently inaccurate with unallowable costs and/or does not follow ECS procedures
02 Majority of Progress Payment Reports inaccurate; frequent unallowable cost submitted and/or does not follow ECS procedures
03 Progress Payment Reports accurate most of the time (75%); some unallowable cost submitted and/or adequately (75%-80%) follows ECS procedures
04 Progress Payment Reports accurate; few unallowable cost submitted and/or follows ECS procedures most of the time (90%)
05 Progress Payment Reports always accurate; no unallowable cost submitted and/or consistently follow ECS procedures

3.2 Were progress payment reports submitted on time or early?

Score Definition for Question: 03.2
N/A Not Applicable
01 Progress Payment Reports consistently submitted late
02 Progress Payment Reports often submitted late
03 Progress Payment Reports usually submitted on time
04 Progress Payment Reports submitted on time
05 Progress Payment Reports always submitted on time; sometimes early

3. PAYMENT REPORTS - (continued)

3.3 Were payments to Subconsultants made timely by Prime Consultants based on contractual requirements and the Arizona Prompt Payment Law (A.R.S. § 28-411)?

Score Definition for Question: 03.3
N/A Not Applicable
01 Subconsultants are consistently paid late
02 Subconsultants are often paid late
03 Subconsultants are usually paid on time
04 Subconsultants are paid on time
05 Subconsultants are always paid on time; sometimes early

4. CONTRACT COMPLIANCE & COMMUNICATION

4.1 How did the Consultant respond to written and verbal requests from ECS, Audit or other ADOT Staff?

Score Definition for Question: 04.1
N/A Not Applicable
01 Poor correspondence, communications and response to request; often does not return phone calls
02 Correspondence, communications and response to request prompt less than half of the time
03 Correspondence, communications and adequately responds (75%-80%) to requests
04 Correspondence and communications prompt most of the time (90%); addressed most requests
05 Promptly responded to correspondence and all verbal request from ECS, Audit or other ADOT staff

4.2 Did the Consultant comply with all contract terms and conditions and/or follow ECS/ADOT procedures?

Score Definition for Question: 04.2
N/A Not Applicable
01 Non-compliance with contract terms and conditions and/or consistently does not follow ECS/ADOT procedures
02 Non-compliance with contract terms and conditions and/or frequently does not follow ECS/ADOT procedures
03 Adequately complies with contract terms and conditions and/or follows ECS/ADOT procedures
04 Complies with contract terms and conditions and/or follows ECS/ADOT procedures
05 Complies with all contract terms & conditions and follows ECS/ADOT procedures

5. COOPERATION AND COMMUNICATION

5.1 How did the Consultant respond to written and verbal requests?

Score Definition for Question: 05.1
N/A Not Applicable
01 Poor correspondence, communications and response to requests; often does not return calls
02 Correspondence, communications and response to requests is prompt less than half of the time
03 Correspondence, communications and response to requests is adequate.
04 Correspondence and communications prompt most of the time (90%); addressed most requests
05 Promptly responded to correspondents and all verbal request from ADOT, public, and/or other constituencies

5. COOPERATION AND COMMUNICATION (continued)

5.2 What kind of rapport and working relationship did the Consultant have with stakeholders?

Score Definition for Question: 05.2

N/A Not Applicable
01 Poor rapport with ADOT, public and/or other constituencies
02 Below average rapport and working relationship with ADOT, public and/or other constituencies
03 Good rapport and working relationship with ADOT, public and/or other constituencies
04 Very good rapport and working relationship with ADOT, public and/or other constituencies
05 Excellent rapport and working relationship with ADOT, public and/or other constituencies

5.3 How prepared, cooperative, flexible, open to suggestions was the Consultant's team?

Score Definition for Question: 05.3

N/A Not Applicable
01 Team often uncooperative, unprepared and resists changes
02 Team sometimes uncooperative, unprepared and less open to suggestions
03 Team cooperative, prepared and willing to change when necessary
04 Team cooperative, generally prepared and open to suggestions
05 Team very cooperative, well prepared, flexible and very open to suggestions

5.4 How effective was the Consultant at dispute resolution?

Score Definition for Question: 05.4

N/A Not Applicable
01 Major disputes occurred that needed to be resolved through informal or formal dispute resolution
02 Multiple time consuming disputes to resolve; some resolved at the second dispute resolution level
03 Average number of disputes that were handled at the Team or Project Manager level
04 Very minor disputes that were resolved well at the Team or Project Manager level
05 Little or no disputes

6. TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE

6.1 How did the Consultant meet the project requirements (e.g., scope, schedule, budget, other terms of agreement, etc.)?

Score Definition for Question: 06.1

N/A Not Applicable
01 Significant variation from scope of work and terms of agreement
02 Scope of work and terms of agreement followed with major changes
03 Scope of work and terms of agreement followed with some changes
04 Scope of work and terms of agreement followed with minor changes
05 Scope of work and terms of agreement followed very well with no changes required

6.2 How was their technical competency (e.g., documentation, ideas, technical assumptions, strategy, reports, etc.)?

Score Definition for Question: 06.2

N/A Not Applicable
01 Consistently lack of documentation and justification of strategy, designs and/or reports
02 Periodically lacks documentation and justification of many strategies, designs and/or reports
03 Adequately documented and justified technical assumptions for strategy, design and/or reports
04 Well documented and justified technical assumptions for strategy, design and/or reports
05 Very innovative ideas; creative solutions with excellent documentation and justified technical assumptions for strategy, design and/or reports

6.3 What was the quality of their work (i.e., did they follow ADOT engineering or industry specs, standards, etc.)?

Score Definition for Question: 06.3

N/A Not Applicable
01 Work not according to ADOT, engineering or industry specifications /standards; revisions always required
02 Work often not according to ADOT, engineering or industry specifications/standards; revisions frequently required
03 Work meets ADOT, engineering or industry specifications/standards; some revisions required
04 Work often meets or exceeds ADOT, engineering or industry specifications/standards; very few revisions required
05 Work exceeds ADOT, engineering, and/or industry specifications/standards; no revisions required.

7. DELIVERABLES

7.1 Were deliverables submitted as expected (i.e., error free, complete and properly documented)?

Score Definition for Question: 07.1

N/A Not Applicable
01 Deliverables repeatedly submitted with multiple problems
02 Review comments resolved during second/third round of review
03 Review comments resolved during first round of review
04 Minor corrections required for some deliverables
05 All deliverables submitted were error-free, complete and properly documented.

7.2 Were deliverables and schedules on time?

Score Definition for Question: 07.2

N/A Not Applicable
01 Consistently late with deliverables and schedule
02 Sometimes late with deliverables and schedule
03 Generally on time with deliverables and schedule
04 Always on time with deliverables and schedule
05 Always on time with deliverables and schedule; sometimes early

7.3 Did negotiations adhere to ADOT guidelines (e.g., fees, schedule, etc.)?

Score Definition for Question: 07.3

N/A Not Applicable
01 Contract negotiations did not meet ADOT guidelines on fee; well beyond negotiation schedule
02 Contract negotiations did not meet many of ADOT guidelines on fee; moderately beyond negotiation schedule
03 Contract negotiations generally met ADOT guidelines on fee; slightly beyond negotiation schedule
04 Contract negotiations adhered to ADOT guidelines on fee; met negotiation schedule
05 Contract negotiations well within ADOT guidelines on fee; ahead of negotiation schedule

7.4 Were deliverables within and/or under the budget?

Score Definition for Question: 07.4

N/A Not Applicable
01 Consistently over budget
02 Often over budget
03 Usually within budget
04 Always within budget
05 Always within budget; sometimes under budget

8. CONSULTANT PROJECT MANAGER/TEAM

8.1 Was the Consultant's leadership professional; did they create a cohesive team?

Score Definition for Question: 08.1

N/A Not Applicable
01 Ineffective team lacking cohesiveness
02 Below average leadership and team interactions
03 Adequate leadership and team interactions
04 Good leadership; strong team
05 Excellent leadership; very professional cohesive team

8.2 Did the Consultant anticipate and resolve issues and was he/she prepared?

Score Definition for Question: 08.2

N/A Not Applicable
01 Many unresolved issues; unorganized; duplication of effort; lack coordination and delegation efforts.
02 Resolved issues slowly and usually ineffectively; frequently unprepared for contingencies; inconsistent coordination and delegation efforts.
03 Adequately resolved issues and learned from mistakes; adequately prepared for contingencies; adequate coordination and delegation efforts.
04 Resolved issues well; prepared for most contingencies; effective coordination and delegation efforts.
05 Took the initiative; regularly anticipated and resolved issues very well; very prepared for contingencies; excellent coordination and delegation efforts.

8.3 Was the focus on the big picture and task completion?

Score Definition for Question: 08.3

N/A Not Applicable
01 Frequent mistakes; consistently reactive rather than proactive
02 Focused mostly on problem resolution than big picture and task completion
03 Focused mostly on task completion rather than the big picture
04 Good focus on big picture and task completion
05 Excellent focus on big picture and task completion

8.4 Did the Consultant manage each Subconsultant's milestones/tasks/schedule effectively throughout the project?

Score Definition for Question: 08.4

N/A Not Applicable
01 Schedule & Quantities not managed - no milestones met & many quantity overruns
02 Schedule & Quantities not effectively managed - 75% milestones not met & many quantity overruns
03 Schedule & Quantities managed (50%) of the time - half of milestones not met & some quantity overruns
04 Schedule & Quantities managed (75%) of the time - 25% of milestones not meet & few quantity overruns
05 Schedule & Quantities managed all the time - all milestones met & no quantity overruns

8. CONSULTANT PROJECT MANAGER/TEAM (continued)

8.5 Did the Consultant manage each Subconsultant's progress reports/invoices/payments throughout project?

Score Definition for Question: 08.5

N/A Not Applicable
01 Contract documents consistently incomplete and late
02 Contract documents frequently incomplete and often submitted late
03 Contract documents adequately complete with minor changes and usually submitted on time
04 Contract documents complete and submitted on time
05 Contract documents always complete and always on time; sometimes early

9. UTILIZATION OF KEY SUBCONSULTANTS

9.1 Did the Consultant assign tasks to Subconsultants as proposed in the contract?

Score Definition for Question: 09.1

N/A Not Applicable
01 Did not assign subconsultant tasks as proposed in contract without any justification
02 Assigned less than 50% subconsultant tasks as proposed in contract with or without a plausible explanation
03 Assigned less than 75% sub consultant tasks as proposed in contract with plausible explanation
04 Assigned 75% subconsultant tasks as proposed in contract
05 Assigned 100% subconsultant tasks as proposed in contract

9.2 Did the Prime Consultant meet DBE Goals?

Score Definition for Question: 09.2

N/A Not Applicable
01 Did not meet goals and no effort was made to achieve goals; no justification on file.
02 Did not meet goals, but performed diligent search for DBE firms
03 Met at least 75% of DBE goals
04 Met DBE goals
05 Exceeded DBE goals

9.3 Did the Prime Consultant on a monthly basis report the DBE participation as detailed in the contract?

Score Definition for Question: 09.3

N/A Not Applicable
01 Did not report DBE participation monthly as required
02 Reported DBE monthly participation less than 75% of the time
03 Reported DBE monthly participation 80% of the time
04 Reported DBE participation 90% of the time.
05 Reported DBE participation 100% of the time

9. UTILIZATION OF KEY SUBCONSULTANTS (continued)

9.4 How did the Consultant monitor and manage the performance of the Subconsultant?

Score Definition for Question: 09.4

N/A Not Applicable
01 Unacceptable (Intervention Required)
02 Below expectations (Intervention Required)
03 Meets Expectations
04 Exceeds Expectations
05 Exceptional & Consistent

10. SUBCONSULTANTS

How well did each Subconsultant perform on the contract?

Score Definition for Question: 10.0

01 Unacceptable (Intervention Required)
02 Below Expectations (Intervention Required)
03 Meets Expectations
04 Exceeds Expectations
05 Exceptional & Consistent

11. OTHER (List and provide a general score for any discipline-specific criteria).

Score Definition for Question: 11.1

N/A Not Applicable
01 Unacceptable (Intervention Required)
02 Below Expectations (Intervention Required)
03 Meets Expectations
04 Exceeds Expectations
05 Exceptional & Consistent