

1. Contractor Name, Address & Phone Number: Ted Hoefer Vice President of Operations Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc. 421 21st Ave. Suite 8 Longmont, CO 80501 ph: 303-772-8881 fax: 303-772-8892 cell: 720-201-4364 thoefer@crai-ky.com		2. Contract Number(s): C06B003-003	
		3. Contract Value (Base plus Options): \$247,827.00	
		4. Period of Performance: 08/01/2006 – 07/31/2011	
5. Type of Contract(s) Used: (Check all that apply)			
<input type="checkbox"/>]FP	<input type="checkbox"/>]T&M	<input type="checkbox"/>]Sealed Bid	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]Competitive
<input type="checkbox"/>]FPI	<input type="checkbox"/>]Labor Hour	<input type="checkbox"/>]Negotiated	<input type="checkbox"/>]Non-Competitive
<input type="checkbox"/>]CR	<input type="checkbox"/>]8(a)	<input type="checkbox"/>]TO/DO	<input type="checkbox"/>]Requirements
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]SB Set-Aside	<input type="checkbox"/>]Supplies/Equipment <input type="checkbox"/>]Services <input type="checkbox"/>]Commercial Items Acquisition
6. Description of Requirement: Archaeological inventory and report of US Government (Reclamation) lands at Pueblo Reservoir. Survey is in progress.			
7. Ratings: After commenting, score, in column to the right, using 1 for <u>U</u> nsatisfactory, 2 for <u>M</u> arginal, 3 for <u>S</u> atisfactory, 4 for <u>V</u> ery <u>G</u> ood and 5 for <u>E</u> xceptional. (See page 4 for explanation of rating scale.) (Circle)			
Quality	Comments: Cultural Resource Analysts has proven highly competent in scheduling, keeping me informed, providing weekly reports, coordinating with local agency contacts and interested public, and providing adequate billing records. Contractor has shown flexibility while adhering to contract specifications.	1-U	
		2-M	
		3-S	
		4-VG	
		5-E	
Cost Control	Comments: Contractor has efficiently scheduled crew time to maximize time in the field and has organized to minimize errors. As a result, the contractor has accomplished all tasks within budget.	1-U	
		2-M	
		3-S	
		4-VG	
		5-E	
Timeliness of Performance	Comments: All operations have been conducted within the contractual time frames. Contractor has been very informative as to work schedules and activities, and has accomplished these as planned.	1-U	
		2-M	
		3-S	
		4-VG	
		5-E	
Business Relations/Customer Satisfaction	Comments: Contractor has been highly responsive to our concerns and informative as to his activities. Hoefer has been open and transparent in all aspects of the contract.	1-U	
		2-M	
		3-S	
		4-VG	
		5-E	
	Total Score (Sum of scores from each area)	20	
	Mean Score (Sum of scores divided by total number of areas)	5	

CAQ070013

8. Subcontractors, Teaming and Joint Venture Partners. List major subcontractors, teams and joint venture partners, by names, with a brief description of work and names of key personnel.

Subcontractor, Team or Joint Venture	Description of Work	Key Personnel
None		

9. Would you select this firm again? [X]Yes []No

Comments: Nothing but positives on this contractor and the performance.

10. Was the contractor committed to customer satisfaction? Yes

Comments: Intent on doing a good job and meeting needs.

11. Respondent's Identification:

Name: Robert J. Burton
Position/Title: Archaeologist
Address & Phone Number: Bureau of Reclamation, 11056 W. CR 18E, Loveland, CO 80537 970.962.4361
Relationship and Time Involved with Program/Contract: Archaeologist for Eastern Colorado Area Office. Initiated contract and represent CO on technical matters.
Date of Evaluation: Mar. 26, 2007

CAQ070013

- Block 1: Name, address and phone number of the contract being evaluated. Identify the specific division being evaluated if there is more than one.
- Block 2: Contract number(s) used to evaluate performance.
- Block 3: Contract value, including option periods. The value in this block should reflect any increases or decreases affected during the life of the contract.
- Block 4: Dates in which the contractor being evaluated performed work for the evaluator.
- Block 5: Check all blocks that apply to contracts with the contractor being evaluated.
- Block 6: Brief description of the work performed by the contractor.
- Block 7: Indicate the contractor's rating in the far right column. In the comment areas, provide rationale for the rating. Indicate the contract requirements that were exceeded (when a value of 5 is given) and those that were not met (when a value of 1 or 2 is given) by the contractor. Also calculate the total and mean scores for the ratings.
- Block 8: Identify major subcontractors, team partners and joint ventures and include their work responsibilities. List key personnel employed during the contract that played a major role in the performance rating. Do not list key personnel not employed long enough to effect performance. In some cases, more than one individual may have served in a key position.
- Block 9: Explain why you would or would not select the contractor for this contract again.
- Block 10: State your opinion as to whether or not the contractor is committed to customer satisfaction.
- Block 11: Provide your vital information as requested.

RATING GUIDELINES

Use the following instructions as guidance in making evaluations.

	QUALITY	COST CONTROL	TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE	BUSINESS RELATIONS/CUSTOMER SATISFACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Compliance with contract requirements -Accuracy of reports -Appropriateness of personnel -Technical excellence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Within budget (over/under target costs) -Current, complete and accurate billings -Relationship of negotiated costs to actuals -Costs efficiencies -Change orders issued 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Met interim milestones -Reliable -Responsive to technical direction -Completed on time, including wrap-up and contract administration -No liquidated damages assessed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Effective management -Business-like correspondence -Responsive to contract requirements -Prompt notification of problems -Reasonable/cooperative -Flexible, pro-active, effective -Recommended viable solutions -Effective small/small disadvantaged business subcontracting program
1-UNSATISFACTORY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Most performance requirements are not met; recovery not likely 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Significant cost overruns; not likely to recover cost control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Many late deliveries; negative cost impact/loss of capability for Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Delinquent responses -Lack of cooperative spirit -Unsatisfied user; unable to improve relations -Significantly under subcontracting goals -Excessive, unnecessary change proposals to correct poor management -Significantly untimely definitization of change proposals
2-MARGINAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Some performance requirements are not met; performance reflects serious problem -Ineffective corrective actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Did not meet cost/price estimates -Inadequate corrective action plans -No innovative techniques to bring overall expenditures within limits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Some late deliveries; no corrective actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Unprofessional -Low responsiveness -Low user satisfaction; no attempts to improve relations -Unsuccessful in meeting subcontracting goals -Unnecessary change proposals -Untimely definitizations
3-SATISFACTORY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Met all performance requirements -Minor problems with satisfactory corrective actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Met overall cost/price estimates while meeting all contract requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -On-time deliveries -Minor problems which did not effect delivery schedule 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Professional and responsive -Met expectations -Adequate user satisfaction -Met subcontracting goals -No untimely change proposals
4-VERY GOOD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Met all performance requirements and exceeded them by 5% or more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Reduction in overall cost/price while meeting all contract requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -On-time delivery/some early deliveries to the Government's benefit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Professional and responsive -Exceeded expectations and user satisfaction -Exceeded subcontracting goals -Timely response to change proposals
5-EXCEPTIONAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Met all performance requirements and exceeded them by 20% or more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Significant reductions while meeting all contract requirements -Use of value engineering or other innovative management techniques which facilitated cost reductions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -On-time deliveries with many early deliveries to the Government's benefit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Highly professional, responsive and proactive -Significantly exceeded expectations -High user satisfaction -Significantly exceeded subcontracting goals -Timely response to change proposals