MONTANA
Department of Transportation

Malcolm D. Long, Director

2701 Prospect ▪ PO Box 201001
Helena MT 59620-1001

SOQ/TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Each voting member of the Technical Review Committee (TRC) will review and evaluate the SOQ or Technical Proposal received. Individual TRC members will provide a ranking for each criterion based on a 0 to 10 scale, with 10 being best. The Scoring Weight assigned each criterion will be multiplied by the TRC member Ranking and added together providing a maximum possible Total Score of 10,000 points per member per SOQ/Technical Proposal. The SOQ or Technical Proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide and SOQ Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table.

SCORING GUIDE

(9.0-10.0): Response will be a highly comprehensive, **excellent** reply that meets all of the requirements of the areas within the specific criteria. In addition, the response covers areas not originally addressed in the RFQ/RFP evaluation criteria and includes additional information and recommendations that would prove both valuable and beneficial to MDT. This response is considered to be an excellent standard, demonstrating the Proposer's superior knowledge and understanding of the project.

(7.5-8.9): This response demonstrates an **above average** performance with few minor deficiencies noted. Response will provide useful information, while showing experience and knowledge within the evaluation criteria. The response is well thought out and addresses most of the requirements set forth in the RFQ/RFP. At the discretion of the reviewers, minor omissions in the requirements may be waived but considered in the assigned scores. The Proposer provides insight into their expertise, knowledge and understanding of the subject matter outlined in the criteria.

(6.0-7.4): This response demonstrates an **average** performance, with minor deficiencies noted. Response meets the majority of the requirements of the RFQ/RFP.

(4.0-5.9): This response demonstrates a **below average** performance, with numerous deficiencies noted. Response minimally meets the requirements of the RFQ/RFP. This section of the Statement of Qualifications or Technical Proposal is considered responsive with minor requirements missing.

(0.0-3.9): This response demonstrates an **inadequate** performance, with numerous deficiencies noted. Response does not meet the requirements of the RFQ/RFP. The Proposer has not demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter outlined in the RFQ/RFP, fails to address one or more requirements of the RFQ/RFP, or has proposed a deviation from the RFQ/RFP requirements.

MDT may waive minor informalities or irregularities in proposals received where such is merely a matter of form and not substance, and the correction or waiver of which is not prejudicial to other Proposers. Minor irregularities are defined as those that will not have an adverse effect on MDT's interest and will not affect the price of the proposals by giving a Proposer an advantage or benefit not enjoyed by other Proposers.