

DESIGN CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

Wisconsin Department of Transportation
DT1558 12/2005 Ch. 84 Wis. Stats.

State Project ID 1410-63-00	Master Contract ID – If Applicable --	Work Order No. – If Applicable --
Region / Bureau Southeast	County Ozaukee	Construction Year 2007
Highway CTH I	Project Name CTH I	
Consultant Project Manager Thomas Lanser	Area Code - Telephone Number 920-924-5720	Subconsultant(s) NRC River Valley Testing GJ Miesbauer & Associates
Consultant Name and Address Gremmer & Associates, Inc. 93 South Pioneer Road Suite 300 Fond du Lac, WI 54935		<input type="checkbox"/> Resurface <input type="checkbox"/> Recondition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reconstruct <input type="checkbox"/> Pavement Replacement <input type="checkbox"/> Major <input type="checkbox"/> Bridge Maintenance <input type="checkbox"/> Brg Rehab <input type="checkbox"/> Bridge Replacement <input type="checkbox"/> SHRM <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Description of Work Performed by Consultant Preliminary & Final Roadway Design, Reports, Environmental Documentation, PS&E		
Description of Work Performed by Subconsultant Environmental services, Soil Borings, Real Estate Cost Estimate		
Evaluation Period From 2/05 To 2/06	Percent of Project Complete Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Post Construction	
DOT Supervisor/Team Leader Jay Neider	DOT Project Manager Kathy Labisch	Project Complexity <input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low

CONTRACT DATA

Type of Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Party <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 Party with Ozaukee County (Municipality)	Number of Amendments 1
Date Contract Approved 4/14/05	Original Contract Completion Date 5/07
Date Actual Completion 5/07	

Rating of Structure Plans by CO Bridge (Maximum 5) N/A

Average Design Consultant Rating - To nearest tenth 4.2
--

EVALUATION

1 = Unacceptable 2 = Below average 3 = Satisfactory 4 = Above average 5 = Outstanding

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- * Performance evaluation should be completed at least on an annual basis, more often if needed and upon contract completion.
- * Rate each of the five performance items on the following pages based on the evaluation criteria (1-5) listed above.
- * Indicate performance level by checking one of the options: exceeds, satisfactory or needs improvement. Consider the questions listed below each performance item and any unique issues where applicable.
- * Comments pertaining to each item shall be entered in the space provided below each item.
- * General comments or suggestions and comments from other specialty areas should be considered and attached if needed.
- * A post-construction evaluation should be made when necessary for design projects. Adjustments to scores and ratings if necessary could be made based on the results and experience encountered during construction.
- * Evaluation scores are recorded and kept on file in the Bureau of Financial Services for use in future selection processes.
- * Evaluation of subconsultant should be considered and completed as needed.
- * If project had a structure, contact Central Office Bridge for rating score.

EVALUATION

1. PROJECT MANAGEMENT - Check as appropriate.

Exceeds	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Note: Rate the consultant's representative you contact.

Was the consultant project manager/leader in control of the services provided to WisDOT?

Did the consultant project manager/leader assign appropriate staff to the services?

Was the communication between the consultant project manager/leader and the Department staff adequate?

Was the coordination with subconsultants and others involved in the project adequate?

Considering the above questions the overall **Rating is: (Maximum 5)**

4.25

Comments/Unique issues

County Comment: This project had very difficult environmental issues to deal with, including the Hines-Emerald Dragonfly, and most recently, the Butler's Garter Snake. The project was originally conceived 20 years ago, but was not built due to public reaction. **Gremmer was hired to bring the project back and they had to deal with difficult environmental issues, as well as funding problems. Tom Lanser did an outstanding job managing this project.**

County Rating = 5.0

DAAR Rating = 3.5

2. HUMAN RELATIONS - Check as appropriate.

Exceeds	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Was consultant responsive to requests from the Department and other reviewing agencies?

Was consultant cooperative?

Did consultant react well to criticism?

Was it easy to work with consultant?

Was consultant courteous and helpful in dealing with the general public and agencies?

Did the consultant effectively develop the Public Involvement Plan?

Did the consultant properly represent WisDOT?

Considering the above questions the overall **Rating is: (Maximum 5)**

4.25

Comments/Unique issues

County Comment: **In all cases, Gremmer was responsive, cooperative and conducted themselves well in dealing with the public, County staff and DOT staff.**

County Rating = 5.0

DAAR Rating = 3.5

EVALUATION

3. ENGINEERING SKILLS, Other - Check as appropriate.

Exceeds	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did consultant's services reflect good engineering practice?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Were good engineering thought and sound judgment applied?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Were innovative or original concepts proposed where the opportunity presented itself?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was the evaluation of alternatives and trial solutions adequate?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did the consultant work well independently, without significant help from Department staff?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Were routine details properly utilized on this project?

Considering the above questions the overall **Rating is: (Maximum 5)**

4.0

Comments/Unique issues

County Comment: **The end result for this project was a well engineered, practical solution to a dangerous intersection.**

County Rating = 5.0

DAAR Rating = 3.0

4. QUALITY OF WORK - Check as appropriate.

Exceeds	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the product reflect compliance with FDM procedures and requirements?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was a quality control plan in effect and is there evidence it was followed?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Were studies and reports complete and accurate? This includes surveys, quantities, estimates and special provisions.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was work well organized, properly presented, clear and concise?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Were all PS&E submittal items (including plans) complete, accurate, and in compliance with DOT procedure in the FDM? (Make comments.)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Were errors or omissions, numerous, serious, significant or costly?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did project result in the expenditure of reasonable time by Department staff?

Considering the above questions the overall **Rating is: (Maximum 5)**

4.5

Comments/Unique issues

County Comment = The plan preparation resulted in a product that is in compliance with FDM requirements. All reports were accurate and complete

DAAR Comment = **Final PS&E plan preparation showed exceptional attention to detail.**

County Rating = 5.0

DAAR Rating = 4.0

EVALUATION

5. TIMELINESS - Check as appropriate.

Exceeds	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did consultant keep the Department informed of project work and schedule status?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did consultant meet final contract time requirements?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did consultant meet intermediate submittal dates?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did consultant make timely requests for amendments?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did the consultant submit PS&E items (including final plans) with agreed upon lead time to meet PS&E dates?

Considering the above questions the overall **Rating is: (Maximum 5)**

4.0

Comments/Unique issues

County Comment: **Given the issues that were dealt with, Gremmer did a good job of communicating and keeping all parties informed. All key deadlines were met.**

DAAR Comment: Managed within contract timeframes.

County Rating = 5.0

DAAR Rating = 3.0

Would you have reservations selecting this firm again for this type of project? No

Describe strengths/weaknesses and provide suggestions for improvement.

County Comment: **The greatest strength I recognize is the ability to communicate. More than anything else, that was the key to success in this project. I would highly recommend Gremmer and Associates for complex environmental/funding projects such as this one.**

DAAR Comment: **Strong interaction with project stakeholders including DOT, DNR and Ozaukee County staff. Practical application of engineering judgement to produce a workable planset.**

Was this evaluation done at a face-to-face meeting? No



 (Evaluator - WIDOT Signature)



 (Reviewer - Consultant Signature)

6-18-07

 (Date)

6-28-07

 (Date)