

DESIGN CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

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

State Project ID 4110-01-00	Master Contract ID – If Applicable	Work Order No. – If Applicable
Region / Bureau Northeast Region	County Fond du Lac	Construction Year 2004
Highway USH 45	Project Name USh 151 - North County Line	
Consultant Project Manager Thomas Lanser	Area Code - Telephone Number (920) 924-5720	Subconsultant(s) GLARC
Consultant Name and Address Gremmer & Associates, Inc. 93 South Pioneer Road, STE 300 Fond du Lac, WI 54935		<input type="checkbox"/> Resurface <input type="checkbox"/> Recondition <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> SHRM <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Description of Work Performed by Consultant The work under this contract consisted of preparing plans and documents for a preventive maintenance project consisting of grading, base aggregate dense, concrete curb and gutter, pipe culverts, HMA Pavement Type E-1, and steel plate beam guard energy absorbing terminals.		
Description of Work Performed by Subconsultant Archeological investigation.		
Evaluation Period From June 2004 To June 2008	Percent of Project Complete 100 Final	Post Construction
DOT Supervisor/Team Leader Mike King	DOT Project Manager Matt Haefs	Project Complexity <input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low

CONTRACT DATA

Type of Contract <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 Party <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Party with (Municipality)	Number of Amendments 2
Date Contract Approved 6-2-2004	Original Contract Completion Date 7-1-2007
Date Actual Completion 2-1-2008	

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

Average Design Consultant Rating - To nearest tenth 5
--

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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)**

5

Comments/Unique issues

2. HUMAN RELATIONS - 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 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 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)**

5

Comments/Unique issues

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

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

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

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

Describe strengths/weaknesses and provide suggestions for improvement.

Gremmar has excellent staff that are always willing to go the extra mile and process every request quickly.

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

Matthew W. Haefs, PE

(Evaluator - WIDOT Signature)

02/26/08

(Date)

(Reviewer - Consultant Signature)

(Date)