

DESIGN CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

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

State Project ID 4822-06-00	Master Contract ID – If Applicable N/A	Work Order No. – If Applicable N/A
Region / Bureau Southeast	County Ozaukee	Construction Year 2009
Highway Local Road	Project Name North Spring Street	
Consultant Project Manager Tom Lanser	Area Code - Telephone Number 920-924-5720	Subconsultant(s) River Valley Testing GLARC PEP Environmental
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 Roadway design/plans		
Description of Work Performed by Subconsultant Geotechnical borings, Hist/Arch survey, Hazmat investigations		
Evaluation Period From 11/06 To 9/08	Percent of Project Complete Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Post Construction	
DOT Supervisor/Team Leader Jason Roselle	DOT Project Manager Mark Wilfert (DAAR)	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 City of Port Washington (Municipality)	Number of Amendments 0
Date Contract Approved 11/30/06	Original Contract Completion Date 11/11/08
	Date Actual Completion 11/11/08

Rating of Structure Plans by CO Bridge (Maximum 5)

Average Design Consultant Rating - To nearest tenth

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	Note: Rate the consultant's representative you contact.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was the consultant project manager/leader in control of the services provided to WisDOT?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did the consultant project manager/leader assign appropriate staff to the services?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was the communication between the consultant project manager/leader and the Department staff adequate?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was the coordination with subconsultants and others involved in the project adequate?

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

5

Comments/Unique issues

Tom Lanser and his team did an outstanding job leading the project, listening to the City's inputs, and designing the improvements accordingly.

2. HUMAN RELATIONS - Check as appropriate.

Exceeds	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was consultant responsive to requests from the Department and other reviewing agencies?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was consultant cooperative?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did consultant react well to criticism?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was it easy to work with consultant?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was consultant courteous and helpful in dealing with the general public and agencies?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did the consultant effectively develop the Public Involvement Plan?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did the consultant properly represent WisDOT?

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

5

Comments/Unique issues

Gremmer and Assoc. is extremely easy to work with. They communicate well with the public at PIM's, with elected officials, with the DOT, and with the City's representatives. They listen to the client's direction and provide what is requested with absolutely no problem.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Were innovative or original concepts proposed where the opportunity presented itself?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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)**

5

Comments/Unique issues

Gremmer was innovative in their design, balancing the needs to move traffic while safely accomodating pedestrians, and serving the needs of the people living on the project street. They provided thoughtful direction when it was needed.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Were errors or omissions, numerous, serious, significant or costly?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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)**

5

Comments/Unique issues

Outstanding design. Only one small change order which was well-handled. Plans were detailed and construction was problem-free as a result.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Did consultant meet intermediate submittal dates?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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)**

5

Comments/Unique issues

Project was designed expeditiously and exactly according to the City's request. Everything was completed on schedule.

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

Describe strengths/weaknesses and provide suggestions for improvement.

Gremmer is extremely accomodating, they have tremendous people skills, their plans are of high quality, and they provide their product at a very reasonable price.

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

(Evaluator - WIDOT Signature)

(Date)

(Reviewer - Consultant Signature)

(Date)