

EURC 3rd party Proposal Score Sheet Notes - Project Team  
August 19, 2020

Evaluation Criteria	SWCA	Tetra Tech
1. Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PM appears to have limited experience in managing BLM EIS projects and lacks BLM experience in Utah; it appears he will rely heavily on Deputy PM, who has mostly BLM EA-level experience*</li> <li>• High availability (70%) of proposed PM/Deputy PM to EURC project</li> <li>• Large PM team (5 persons), which may be driving costs</li> <li>• Availability of Principal in Charge (PIC) and Sr. NEPA Advisor on PM team not provided (these members have the most relevant experience e.g., working on North Corridor project, also a BLM ROW project, other major EISs, and BLM RMP revisions)*</li> <li>• Org chart misrepresents the reporting structure under a third-party EIS arrangement</li> <li>• Resumes demonstrate experienced staff for key resources relevant to EURC project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong PM team experience (two persons: Sr. PM and PM); both have managed major BLM EIS projects; PM experience includes BLM ROW projects in Utah</li> <li>• Sr. PM and PM also proposed as Sr. NEPA Specialist/NEPA Specialist</li> <li>• Specific availability (%) of proposed PM/Sr. PM to EURC not provided (rather, a general commitment made to prioritization and meeting schedule)*</li> <li>• Proposal demonstrates understanding of role of third-party NEPA contractor</li> <li>• Resumes demonstrate experienced staff with Utah experience for key resources relevant to EURC project</li> <li>• Some resource staff proposed for more than one resource*</li> </ul>
2. Capability of Consultant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North Corridor project is a similar project (proposed PM supported comment response; managed by proposed PIC; same Sr. NEPA Advisor – however, need to ascertain the availability of the two latter for EURC)*</li> <li>• Other recent plan-level RMP amendment experience in other BLM field offices (PIC and Sr. NEPA Advisor)</li> <li>• Proposal demonstrates experience with BLM document streamlining requirements (unclear if PM/Deputy PM have this experience)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note eight NEPA projects completed by PM/Sr. PM under BLM streamlining requirements</li> <li>• Proposal demonstrates understanding of role of third-party NEPA contractor</li> <li>• Project qualifications are presented for proposed PM team and resource staff</li> </ul>
3. Approach to the Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates solid understanding of the scope of work and NEPA process</li> <li>• Proposes to incorporate Resource Reports and other previous studies by reference per BLM streamlining requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates solid understanding of the scope of work and NEPA process</li> <li>• Proposes to incorporate Resource Reports and other previous studies by reference per BLM streamlining requirements</li> </ul>

EURC 3rd party Proposal Score Sheet Notes - Project Team  
August 19, 2020

Evaluation Criteria	SWCA	Tetra Tech
4. Local Knowledge and Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deputy PM is located in Utah (point person).</li> <li>• Recent firm experience with the BLM District Office, although it is unclear if the core team has relationships with the BLM Moab Office (the BLM ranking should provide some indication)</li> <li>• North Corridor project (see Section 1 and 2 notes)</li> <li>• Visual resource lead has experience in Book Cliffs with previous firm</li> <li>• Firm has extensive biological resources experience in Uinta Basin (unclear if specific team members do)</li> <li>• Supporting Coalition on Uinta Basin Railway project (resource data collection and cultural inventory)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PM is located in Utah (point person)</li> <li>• Firm experience with BLM Moab and Vernal field offices, although it is unclear if the core team has relationships with these field offices (the BLM ranking should provide some indication); also, no detailed project quals in these field offices were provided.*</li> <li>• Cultural lead has extensive experience in Uinta Basin and Book Cliffs</li> </ul>
5. Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimated level of effort and cost seem higher than expected (e.g., Task 4, EIS Preparation, 2,300 labor hours)*</li> <li>• Total bid approx. \$675k</li> <li>• Estimated total labor hours 4,976</li> <li>• Average labor rate \$132/hour</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimated level of effort and cost for some tasks seem lower than expected (e.g., Task 2, Public Scoping; Task 7, Preparing Record of Decision; Task 8, Decision File)*</li> <li>• Total bid approx. \$312k</li> <li>• Estimated total labor hours 2,297</li> <li>• Average labor rate \$132/hour</li> </ul>
6. Schedule Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates good record of meeting project schedules</li> <li>• The requirements of BLM's PIM 2018-016, BLM's Document Clearance Process, are not reflected in the proposed critical path schedule; thus, it's not possible to ascertain SWCA's understanding of BLM revised clearance process at each phase of EIS development or their ability to meet EURC target schedule.*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates good record of meeting project schedules</li> <li>• The requirements of BLM's PIM 2018-016, BLM's Document Clearance Process, are not reflected in the proposed critical path schedule; thus, it's not possible to ascertain Tetra Tech's understanding of BLM revised clearance process at each phase of EIS development or their ability to meet EURC target schedule.*</li> </ul>

	<b>SWCA</b>	<b>Tetra Tech</b>
*Suggested Interview Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Section 1 – Project Team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Summarize the proposed PM’s BLM EIS management experience, particularly ROW projects or projects with similar issues? Please discuss how you envision filling any gaps in experience on your PM team?</li> <li>○ What is the percent availability of the PIC and Sr. NEPA Advisor? These two PM team members have the most relevant experience to this project e.g., working on North Corridor project (also a BLM ROW project/EIS) but their availability is not noted in Section #2.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Section 3 – Approach to the Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Does your proposed team have experience with project-level RMP amendments? If an amendment is required, describe how you would address in the EIS.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Section 5 – Cost <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Please break down the cost considerations behind the estimated 2,300 labor hours for Task 4.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Section 6 – Schedule Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The requirements of BLM’s PIM 2018-016, BLM’s Document Clearance Process, are not reflected in the proposed schedule. Please summarize your understanding of this process, including associated critical path items that omitted from the proposed schedule, and clarify if this has an impact on the proposed schedule.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Section 1 – Project Team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What is the percent availability of the PM and Sr. PM for the EURC project?</li> <li>○ Some resource staff proposed for more than one resource. Explain how this will be managed to avoid schedule or quality impacts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Section 3 – Approach to the Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Does your proposed core team team have experience with project-level RMP amendments? If an amendment is required, describe how you would address in the EIS.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Section 4 – Local Knowledge and Expertise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Your proposal cites firm experience with the BLM Moab and Vernal field offices. How recent is this experience? Do your proposed PM team or resource staff have experience in these field offices? If so, please summarize.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Section 6 – Schedule Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The requirements of BLM’s PIM 2018-016, BLM’s Document Clearance Process, are not reflected in the proposed schedule. Please summarize your understanding of this process, including associated critical path items that omitted from the proposed schedule, and clarify if this has an impact on the proposed schedule.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>