

CONSULTANT TECHNICAL EVALUATION

TYPE OF WORK: Environmental

☒ Prime Consultant ☐ Sub Consultant

Consultant Name :

_Consultant Example

Project Number :

Rating Number : 1

P.O. / Contract :

Project Description :

Consultant Rating Example Form.

Type of Work :

Environmental
N/A

Subject Rated :

Comments :

Example of the "Environmental" Consultant Rating Form.
NOTE: Example Only - Questions Subject To Change.
NOTE: Contract Management Components Issued Only When Prime Consultants Are Selected For Rating.

Rating Score:

0.0

Rating Score Summary:
Contract Management : 0.0 (No Criteria Rated In This Section)
NEPA : 0.0 (No Criteria Rated In This Section)
Natural Resources : 0.0 (No Criteria Rated In This Section)
Cultural Resources : 0.0 (No Criteria Rated In This Section)
Air Quality and Traffic Noise : 0.0 (No Criteria Rated In This Section)
Public Involvement with NEPA : 0.0 (No Criteria Rated In This Section)

PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE

- 5

Outstanding Performance

Consistently Exceeded Expectations
- 4

Above Satisfactory Performance

Often Exceeded Expectations
- 3

Satisfactory Performance

Met Expectations
- 2

Marginal Performance

Occasionally Below Expectations
- 1

Unacceptable Performance

Consistently Below Expectations

TOTAL RATED SCORE FOR ALL QUALITY CRITERIA

Note: An overall score of 3 is considered satisfactory performance. The maximum score attainable is 5.

STATE OF LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DEVELOPMENT

CONSULTANT TECHNICAL EVALUATION

TYPE OF WORK: Environmental

Instructions:
For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale : 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

| Contract Management - Administration of Contract | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|--|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Effectively and proactively controlled the Contract. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 2 | Administered the Contract in an organized manner and was proficient in applying administrative, procedural and technical skills to Contract. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 3 | Effectively coordinated with Department personnel to ensure effective Contract management, with required submittals made timely, in the subscribed format, with no material errors. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 4 | Submitted properly documented invoices; contract funds were tracked and reported as requested to avoid rush amendments, out-of-fund conditions or supplemental agreements | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 5 | Complied with established DBE commitment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 6 | FOR TASK DRIVEN CONTRACTS ONLY: Responded to the Department in a timely manner regarding tasks requests. For accepted tasks, promptly developed an understanding of the assignment, prepared and submitted an accurate time/fee package, and efficiently initiated the assignment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | |

| Contract Management - Management of Issues and Resources | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|--|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Effectively resolved issues; made decisions based on solid logic and sufficient supporting detail. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 2. | Effectively minimized the unnecessary involvement of Department staff. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 3. | Effectively managed resources. Continuously provided experienced staff as proposed; was responsive to Department staffing requests; if personnel changes occurred, the credentials of replacement staff were equal to or exceeded the qualifications of the original staff approved, and Department approval was received. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 4. | FOR PROJECTS INVOLVING PERMITS: Sufficiently identified, analyzed and verified that all permit conditions were addressed. Thoroughly documented and proactively worked to resolve permitting issues in a timely manner. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 5. | FOR PROJECTS INVOLVING UTILITIES: Sufficiently verified that utilities were coordinated properly and shown in the plans/schedules including providing a summary of changes at subsequent phase submittals. ADDITIONALLY, FOR PROJECTS INVOLVING CONSULTANT UTILITY COORDINATION: succeeded in getting the utility agencies to accept the schedule, and consistently tracked and communicated with the utility companies so they complied with the schedules. Took appropriate action when schedules were not met. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | |

CONSULTANT TECHNICAL EVALUATION

TYPE OF WORK: Environmental

Instructions:

For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale : 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

| Contract Management - Communication, Documentation and Coordination | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|---|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Provided the necessary project information to the Department and all project stakeholders in a timely manner. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 2 | Scheduled, conducted and documented meetings in a timely manner. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 3 | Immediately notified the Department of issues impacting schedule and costs; acted proactively by working with various stakeholders to minimize impacts; and resolved issues in a timely manner. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 4 | Prepared thoroughly organized and completed project documentation including calculations, emails, memoranda, etc. and clear documentation of oral communications. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 5 | Effectively tracked and monitored comment resolution and other action items to ensure timely resolution. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 6 | Properly and efficiently logged, documented, tracked and took appropriate action on all public initiated inquiries from first contact through disposition or resolution. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | |

| Contract Management - Execution of Work | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Ensured project schedule submittals were submitted and reviewed in accordance with the Contract. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 2 | Reviewed the schedule monthly or as appropriate with the Department. Took appropriate action to reallocate resources if the work items fell behind schedule in accordance with the critical path to minimize impact to the overall schedule. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 3. | Consistently met project milestone dates within the overall project schedule | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 4. | Provided project status updates in a timely manner | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 5. | Effectively managed the budget and if applicable, was reasonable regarding claims for and negotiations of supplemental agreements. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 6. | Developed a Quality Control/Quality Assurance Plan, and adhered to the plan throughout the project. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 7. | Successfully met the scope and objectives of the project. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | |

CONSULTANT TECHNICAL EVALUATION

TYPE OF WORK: Environmental

Instructions:

For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale : 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

| Contract Management - Post-Design Activities | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|--|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Effectively and proactively controlled the contract, including submitting properly documented invoices and reports, and prompt execution of task authorizations as applicable; successfully met the scope and objectives of the project. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 2 | Minimized the unnecessary involvement of the Department; effectively managed resources, including providing appropriate staff. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 3 | Provided necessary project information in a timely manner; effectively tracked, monitored and documented actions taken during post-design activities; effectively communicated with the Department's construction support personnel during construction activities. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 4 | Resolved issues arising during construction in a timely manner. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 5 | Tracked, monitored and responded quickly and efficiently to shop drawing reviews and construction Requests for Information (RFI's). | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | |

| |
|--|
| Contract Management Section Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) |
|--|

| |
|-----|
| 0.0 |
|-----|

CONSULTANT TECHNICAL EVALUATION

TYPE OF WORK: Environmental

Instructions:

For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale : 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

| NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 Quality of NEPA Document | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Superior Rating: Documents require no revisions to content; all substantive information and analyses included; reader friendly document; exhibits of high quality, legible, pertinent, and correctly labeled.Very Good Rating: Documents require minor revisions, but no revision to substantive content or analyses; all necessary information and data included; document written in manner easily understood by public; very good exhibits.Good or Average Rating: Documents require revisions; information/data missing or not fully explained in document; errors minor and related mostly to grammar or spelling; no major errors as to substantive content; exhibits of average quality.Poor Rating: Documents require many revisions; analyses not complete; important data or information not included; many errors as to spelling, grammar, and sentence structure; exhibits poor, irrelevant to discussion, mislabeled, etc.Unacceptable: Documents require many revisions; analyses incorrect, incomplete, or missing; substantive content missing; data incorrect; exhibits missing, incomplete, mislabeled, irrelevant, or illegible. | | | | | | | |
| 2 Managing the NEPA Process | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Superior Rating: No guidance needed; project manager understands the NEPA process extremely well and handles atypical situations without any guidance; proactive in handling issues; anticipates issues before they arise and makes plans in advance to address; keeps all parties well informed of project issues and progress; monitors schedule and work performance and takes necessary measures to ensure project is timely; deliverables are on time or ahead of schedule and within budget; excellent coordination between prime and subs; invoices timely and accurate; project management is stable throughout the project.Very Good Rating: Little guidance needed; project manager understands NEPA process; project manager is able to handle and coordinate issues that arise and provides updates; deliverables are on time and within budget; invoices and progress reports are accurate; monitors schedule and makes adjustments as needed.Good or Average Rating: Project manager has basic understanding of NEPA and seeks guidance on a number of issues prior to acting; project manager handles basic issues as they arise and adjust schedule as needed; most deliverables are on time and project is close to being within budget;; basic coordination takes place; invoices are submitted regularly.Poor Rating: Project manager does not fully understand process and does not manage process correctly; project manager does not seek guidance as needed; project manger does not monitor progress of subs; project manager does not properly monitor schedule; coordination is poor; most deliverables are late and project not on time or within budget; information provided by project manager is incomplete.Unacceptable: Project manager does not understand process; coordination is very poor or nonexistent; project manager does not follow scope of work; project manager does not manage subs; project manager provides incorrect or incomplete information or analyses to agencies or officials; project manager is not moving project forward in acceptable manner; project deliverables considerably late or project not within budget; project manager does not follow guidance given. | | | | | | | |
| 3 Communication with DOTD, Agencies, and Public | | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Superior Rating: Communicates with DOTD on regular and timely basis; information provided is up to date, accurate, concise, relevant, and informative; issues that may affect schedule or other work are identified along with possible solutions; communications are open, frequent and easily understood by all; meetings are timely and productive, data and information is communicated to agencies in advance of meetings; meeting notes clearly identify issues, actions needed, responsible parties and time frames for completion; public involvement events are timely, well organized, well attended, and provide relevant, timely, and accurate information; presentations and other information provided at public involvement events are of high quality, reader friendly, easily understood by the public and accessible to all in a concise and user friendly format; staff handle public inquiries in a professional and respectful manner, answer questions, and provide pertinent informationVery Good Rating: Communication with DOTD on regular basis; clarifications are needed infrequently; progress reports are regular; overall quality of written communications such as meeting notes, handouts and email are very good; material is informative and accurate and convey the message; staff conduct at public involvement meetings is professional; represents the DOTD very well at meetings and public involvement events; able to answer most questions on the spot; information presented to the public is informative and accurate | | | | | | | |

- Good or Average: Communication with DOTD is adequate; some clarifications needed to ensure proper understanding; progress is reported when requested; written communications need to be reviewed for accuracy and content prior to use; conduct at public meetings is professional; follow-up communication provided to agencies or public as needed.
- Poor Rating: Communication with DOTD is inadequate; communications are not clear and are often misunderstood; progress is seldom reported even after requests are made; written communication require major edits before submittal to agencies or public; communications contain misleading information; information provided to public at meetings is incomplete or lacking of substance; meetings are often non productive; meeting notes require edits to ensure accuracy.
- Unacceptable: Communication with DOTD is difficult or nonexistent; staff unresponsive to inquiries; communications are negative, inaccurate, irrelevant, misleading, or often misunderstood; written communications require major revisions before submittal to agencies or public; does not represent DOTD well at public or agency meetings; presents incorrect or inaccurate information; takes information out of context; inappropriate use of email and other mediums; does not appropriately document important meetings or public and agency comment

4 Cooperation and Team Work



- Superior Rating: Extremely cooperative with DOTD; staff are team players that work well with others and are proactive in all phases of the project; builds team work through trust, professionalism, and work ethics; adapts to changes in project issues through innovation; cooperates with all parties and creatively works within scope of services to resolve issues.
- Very Good Rating: Excellent cooperation with DOTD staff; team players; reacts well to changing issues and actively listens to others before taking actions; overall very little guidance needed; works towards successful completion of the project;
- Good or Average Rating: Cooperation with DOTD is adequate; does what is necessary to complete the project; more reactive than proactive, but responds adequately; follows basic team principles; guidance needed on atypical situations;
- Poor Rating: Does not cooperate well with DOTD; little or no team work; guidance needed regularly; does not handle atypical situations well and is not willing to work within scope to find solutions; often does not follow through on requests or follow guidance given; reacts to issues only after being requested to do so by DOTD.
- Unacceptable: Cooperation is basically nonexistent; consultant does not work well with DOTD staff; does not follow instructions or guidance; does not apply the team concept; major disconnect between prime and subs; lack of cooperation or disconnect causes major delays with project delivery; consultant regularly claims that tasks are outside of scope when these tasks are normally part of the NEPA process; not proactive or reactive to issues.

Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated)

0.0

Comments:

CONSULTANT TECHNICAL EVALUATION

TYPE OF WORK: Environmental

Instructions:

For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale : 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

| Natural Resources: Wetlands and T&E Species, including Permits | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|--|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | <p>Knowledge of laws and regulations related to wetlands and other natural resources such as the Clean Water Act, Threatened and Endangered Species Act, and EPA's 404b1 guidelines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Superior Rating: Considerable knowledge of procedures for field surveys and/or permitting process; very familiar with the different types of surveys and/or permits and their associated laws and regulations; works independently; able to handle complex situations without guidance from DOTD.Very Good Rating: Knowledgeable of procedures for field surveys and permitting process; needs little to no guidance from DOTD; understands the regulations and how they apply to DOTD projects.Good or Average Rating: Good understanding of the laws and regulations pertaining to biological surveys and permitting; understands our procedures and adapts to performing the work after initial guidance.Poor Rating: Poor understanding of the laws and regulations that apply; difficulty producing a survey or applying the regulations to the permitting process.Unacceptable: No knowledge of the laws and regulations as they apply to DOTD projects; cannot produce a sufficient biological survey; does not understand the permitting process. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 2 | <p>Quality of Work and Analyses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Superior Rating: No assistance required; proactively handles field work and follows appropriate protocol; handles atypical situations without assistance providing DOTD with recommendations; complete and accurate analyses presented during informal consultation with agencies; analyses requires no revisions and includes recommendations for moving forward; permits are issued without any assistance from DOTD.Very Good Rating: handles resource surveys with little or no assistance required; protocol is very good; documents require minimal revisions and permits are issued with little assistance from DOTD.Good or Average Rating: Some assistance is required from DOTD, regarding survey protocols or permit applications; surveys are adequate but require revisions prior to submittal to permitting agencies; permits are issued with minimal request for revisions from the permitting agencies.Poor Rating: Poor field work done for surveys; protocol not properly followed; work and analyses requires major revisions; permitting agencies return application several times before issues are addressed.Unacceptable: Major problems with field work and/or protocol; incorrect identification of endangered species or wetland areas; work does not adhere to standards of resource or permitting agencies; permit applications returned due to incompleteness. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 3 | <p>Quality of Documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Superior Rating: Documents required no revisions to content or analyses; all substantive information and analyses included; exhibits were of high quality, legible, pertinent, and correctly labeled. Documents accepted by permitting or resource agencies upon initial submittal.Very Good Rating: Documents submitted for review required only minor revisions; all substantive information and analyses were included; exhibits were of high quality, legible, pertinent, and correctly labeled. Documents receive very few comments from resource or permitting agencies.Good or Average Rating: Documents required revisions; information or data missing or not fully explained in document; errors corrected; exhibits were of average quality. The documents receive several comments from the resource or permitting agencies on exhibits or content.Poor Rating: Documents require many revisions; analyses not complete or inaccurate; important data or information not included; exhibits poor, irrelevant, mislabeled, etc. Documents go through several rounds of comments with the DOTD, resource or permitting agencies.Unacceptable: Documents require many revisions; analyses incorrect, incomplete, inaccurate or missing; substantive content missing; data incorrect; exhibits missing, mislabeled, irrelevant, illegible, and unacceptable. Documents are deemed unacceptable by the resource or permitting agencies. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 4 | <p>Communications and Cooperation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Superior Rating: Communicates with DOTD on a regular and timely basis; information provided is current and accurate; notification of fieldwork given in advance; expected permit | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <p>issuance dates and other milestone dates updated frequently; DOTD made aware as problems arise; responds immediately to information requests from DOTD; proactive with consultation issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Very Good Rating: Communicates with DOTD on a regular basis; clarifications needed infrequently and progress reports current and accurate; notification of field work given prior to going into the field; responds to information requests in a timely manner; permit issuance dates and other milestone dates given to DOTD regularly; represents DOTD well during consultation with resource agencies.• Good or Average Rating: Communication with DOTD adequate; adequate representation of DOTD during consultation; notice of fieldwork given; progress reports are generally on time and current; projected milestone and permit issuance dates given periodically; responses to information requests are handled adequately.• Poor Rating: Communication with DOTD inadequate; Poor representation of DOTD during consultation; no advance notice is given for fieldwork; progress reports are infrequent or unavailable; DOTD is not kept current on expected milestone or permit issuance dates; responses to DOTD requests for information are untimely.• Unacceptable: Communication with DOTD almost nonexistent; no notice of fieldwork given; progress reports are not provided; proposed milestone and permit issuance dates are not provided to DOTD; does not respond to requests for information from DOTD; incorrect or misleading information carelessly, or with intent, given to resource or permitting agencies during consultation. | |
| Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) | 0.0 |
| Comments: | |

EXAMPLE ONLY
Questions Subject To Change

CONSULTANT TECHNICAL EVALUATION

TYPE OF WORK: Environmental

Instructions:

For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale : 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

| Cultural Resources: Historic and Archaeology | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|--|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | <p>Knowledge of laws and regulations related to cultural resources and tribal coordination such as the National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 regulations, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and the Archeological Resources Protection Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Superior Rating: Considerable knowledge of the laws and regulations and how they apply to DOTD projects; considerable knowledge of SHPO standards for fieldwork and reports; works independently; able to handle complex situations without guidance.Very Good Rating: Knowledgeable about the laws and regulations and how they apply to DOTD projects; knowledgeable about SHPO standards for fieldwork and reports; needs little to no guidance.Good or Average Rating: Good understanding of the laws and regulations and how they apply to DOTD projects; understands procedures and adapts to performing the work after initial guidance.Poor Rating: Poor understanding of the laws and regulations; difficulty producing sufficient work.Unacceptable: No knowledge of the laws and regulations; does not produce sufficient work. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 2 | <p>Quality of Work and Analyses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Superior Rating: Considerable knowledge of cultural resources; proactively handles fieldwork and report writing, following SHPO standards; handles atypical situations without assistance, providing DOTD with recommendations; complete and accurate analyses that require no revisions; proper documentation of fieldwork.Very Good Rating: Knowledgeable about cultural resources; handles fieldwork and follows SHPO survey guidelines with little or no assistance needed; documents require minimal revisions; proper documentation of fieldwork.Good or Average Rating: Some assistance required regarding SHPO standards; survey report adequate but require revisions prior to submittal to SHPO; proper documentation of fieldwork.Poor Rating: Poor fieldwork and report writing done for surveys; SHPO standards not properly followed; work and analyses require major revisions; insufficient documentation of fieldwork.Unacceptable: Major problems with fieldwork and/or report protocol; incorrect identification of cultural resources; work does not adhere SHPO standards; no documentation of fieldwork. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 3 | <p>Quality of Documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Superior Rating: Documents required no revision to content or analyses; all substantive information and analyses included; exhibits of high quality, legible, pertinent, and correctly labeled. Section 106 Finding accepted by federal agency, DOTD, and SHPO upon initial submittal.Very Good Rating: Documents submitted for review required only minor revisions; all substantive information and analyses were included; exhibits were of high quality, legible, pertinent, and correctly labeled. Section 106 Finding accepted upon initial submittal;Good or Average Rating: Documents required revisions; information or data missing or not fully explained in document; errors corrected as needed; exhibits of average quality. Documents received comments from federal agency, DOTD and SHPO.Poor Rating: Documents require substantive revisions; analyses not complete or inaccurate; importation data or information not included; exhibits poor, irrelevant, mislabeled, etc. Multiple revisions of documents needed due to comments not being addressed.Unacceptable: Documents require many revisions; analyses incorrect, incomplete, inaccurate or missing; substantive content missing; data incorrect; exhibits missing, mislabeled, irrelevant, illegible, and unacceptable. Documents are deemed unacceptable by federal agency, DOTD, and SHPO. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 4 | <p>Communications and Cooperation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Superior Rating: Communicates with DOTD on a regular and timely basis; information provided is current and accurate; notification of fieldwork given in advance; expected milestone dates updated frequently; DOTD made aware as problems arise; responds immediately to information requests from DOTD; proactive in handling cultural resources issues and coordination with agencies.Very Good Rating: Communicates with DOTD on a regular basis, clarifications needed infrequently and progress reports current and accurate; prior notification of field work given; responds to information requests in a timely manner; milestone dates given to DOTD | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <p>regularly; handles cultural resources issues with some guidance; handles coordination with agencies well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Good or Average Rating: Communication with DOTD adequate; adequate representation of DOTD with agencies; notice of fieldwork given; progress reports are generally on time and current; projected milestone and permit issuance dates given periodically; responses to information requests are handled adequately.• Poor Rating: Communication with DOTD inadequate; Poor representation of DOTD during agency coordination; no advance notice is given for fieldwork; progress reports are infrequent or unavailable; DOTD is not kept current on expected milestone dates; responses to requests are untimely.• Unacceptable: Communication with DOTD almost nonexistent; no notice of fieldwork given; progress reports are not provided; proposed milestone dates are not provided to DOTD; does not respond to requests for information; incorrect or misleading information carelessly, or with intent, given to agencies. | |
| Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) | 0.0 |
| Comments: | |

EXAMPLE ONLY
Questions Subject To Change

CONSULTANT TECHNICAL EVALUATION

TYPE OF WORK: Environmental

Instructions:

For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale : 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

| Air Quality and Traffic Noise Studies | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | <p>Knowledge of laws, regulations, guidance and policies related to air quality and traffic noise such as the Clean Air Act, FHWA noise regulations, DOTD's noise policy, EPA's air models, and FHWA's and FTA noise models.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Superior Rating: Considerable knowledge of models and how they are applied; very familiar with laws and regulations and up to date on changes in policy and procedures; considered an expert in the respective fields of mobile source air and noise analyses; needs no guidance and knows DOTD policy well.Very Good Rating: Knowledgeable of models and their applications; familiar with latest DOTD policies and needs little to no guidance.Good or Average Rating: Good knowledge of working models; request information on procedures and policy prior to beginning analysis to ensure following current procedures.Poor Rating: Poor understanding of laws and regulations that apply; poor knowledge of models; need guidance regarding laws and regulations as well as application.Unacceptable: No knowledge of laws, regulations or procedures; no experience with models or their application; has experience but not with the current application; needs constant guidance and assistance. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 2 | <p>Quality of Work and Analyses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Superior Rating: No assistance required; proactively handles field work and follows submitted protocol; handles atypical situations without assistance providing DOTD with recommendations; analyses requires no revisions and follows DOTD's policy.Very Good Rating: Handles routine project with no assistance required; protocol submitted for review is very good; coordinates atypical situations with DOTD; analyses are sound and require only minor revisions.Good or Average Rating: Some assistance is required especially regarding protocol, procedures and policy. analyses are adequate but may require revisions; seeks assistance for atypical situations; compliance with laws, regulations and policy achieved with final analyses.Poor Rating: Poor quality field work, modeling, and analyses; protocol requires major revisions before being acceptable; field work monitoring for noise inadequate to validate model requiring work to be redone; model input data incorrect and redone; analyses incorrect or does not follow DOTD policy.Unacceptable: Major problems with field work, modeling or analyses; consultant does not follow protocol; monitors incorrectly; data collection inadequate; validation not performed; does not use correct model for analysis; analyses inaccurate or incorrect; does not follow DOTD policy or procedures. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 3 | <p>Quality of Documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Superior Rating: Document required no revisions to content or analyses; all substantive information and analyses included; exhibits were of high quality, legible, pertinent, and correctly labeled.Very Good Rating: Document required few revisions, but no revision was to substantive content or analyses; necessary information and data included; very good exhibits.Good or Average Rating: Document required revisions; information or data missing or not fully explained in document; errors corrected; exhibits of average quality.Poor Rating: Many revisions required to the document; analyses incomplete or inaccurate; important data or information not included; exhibits poor, irrelevant, mislabeled, etc.Unacceptable: Many revisions required; analyses incorrect, incomplete, inaccurate or missing; substantive content missing; data incorrect; exhibits missing, mislabeled, irrelevant, illegible, and unacceptable. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | |

TYPE OF WORK: Environmental

For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale : 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

| Public Involvement with NEPA | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
|------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Managing the Public Involvement Process. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Superior Rating: Coordination Plan thorough and designed to obtain meaningful public and agency participation; creative use of methods and technology to achieve effective PI within budget; proactive with planning and scheduling; excellent team work coordinating with all other tasks; proactively manages media and the release of public notices; demonstrates an understanding of the community and an awareness of other events outside of the project that may impact planned PI events; public involve Very Good Rating: Thorough Coordination Plan taking into consideration project constraints; PI and agency meetings are held at appropriate time; works well with other team members; aware of the schedule and the impacts that PI has on the schedule; responsive to media and other requests related to public notices; employs measures to ensure well advertised meeting; staff conduct at public meetings is professional; represents the DOTD very well at public involvement events; information presented t Good or Average Rating: Coordination Plan is adequate; meets minimum requirements for public notices; conduct at public meetings is professional; follow-up communication provided to agencies or public as needed; no major problems with regard to scheduling, organization or conduct of public involvement events; provided adequate documentation of event and results. Poor Rating: Coordination Plan needs major revisions before adequate; consultant does not follow coordination plan; consultant demonstrates lack of understanding of community when organizing, advertising, and scheduling the event; public involvement meetings not adequately staffed; less than adequate notice of event to promote participation; poor coordination with other team members regarding the event; inadequate handouts and exhibits; documentation of event and results lack information or requ Unacceptable: Major revisions needed to Coordination Plan; lack of understanding of procedures and processes; major problems with organization, scheduling, and conduct of events; inadequate staffing of event; inadequate public notice of event; did not represent the DOTD well at event; poor or unacceptable conduct at event; ill prepared for event; little or no documentation of event or results. | | | | | | |
| 2 | Effectiveness of PI process and Coordination Plan | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Superior Rating: Excellent turn out at event; attendance represented most groups impacted by the project; visualization and other tools used to educate and explain project and its impacts; project feedback from the event indicates that the consultant did an excellent job at explaining the project and the desired outcomes; efforts resulted in issues being identified early along with solutions; agency and public participation throughout project is meaningful. Very Good Rating: Attendance at event better than average with a good representation from the community; good visualization and other educational tools employed to assist the public in understanding the project; useful feedback from the public and agencies; consultant took measures to increase participation. Good or Average Rating: Adequate attendance at event; good exhibits and good presentations; comments were encouraged and accepted. Poor Rating: Attendance less than adequate; presentations were inadequate or confusing; environment discourages comments and feedback; lack of effort results in issues being identified much later in the process; does little to encourage comment or participation. Unacceptable: Attendance less than adequate; meeting or event was non productive; feedback not encouraged; consultant not prepared to accept comments or document results; issues identified very late in process due to lack of effort on part of consultant to promote or encourage participation from public or agencies. | | | | | | |
| 3 | Quality of Documentation. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Superior Rating: Presentations and other information provided at public involvement events and agency meetings are of high quality, reader friendly, easily understood by the public and accessible to all in a concise and user friendly format; excellent quality of documents such as public notices, handouts, and transcripts; revisions are not required. Very Good Rating: Overall quality of documentation, such as public notices, handouts and transcripts, very good; material is informative and accurate and conveys the message; only minor errors and corrections required on documentation. Good or Average Rating: Documents are adequate and provide required information accurately; some revisions are required prior to distribution or publication. Poor Rating: Poor quality documents requiring major revision; document is confusing or unorganized; poor quality exhibits incomplete, mislabeled, irrelevant, or illegible. Unacceptable: Major revisions required due to poor quality, inaccurate information, or major omissions; multiple revisions required before documentation can be distributed or published; | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| lack of documentation of public events and related matters; documentation provides misleading, inappropriate, or inaccurate information. | |
| Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) | 0.0 |
| Comments: | |

EXAMPLE ONLY
Questions Subject To Change