

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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