

# DESIGN CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

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

State Project ID 3823-01-00	Master Contract ID – If Applicable	Work Order No. – If Applicable
Region / Bureau SE Region	County Fond du Lac	Construction Year 2006
Highway Local Road	Project Name Vielbig Road Bridge, .7 west of CTH Y, Town of Oakfield, Fond du Lac County	
Consultant Project Manager Thomas Lanser, P.E.	Area Code - Telephone Number (920) 924-5720	Subconsultant(s) Midwest Engineering Services, Inc Natural Resources Consulting, Inc. PEP Environmental
Consultant Name and Address Gremmer & Associates 93 South Pioneer Road Suite 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bridge Replacement <input type="checkbox"/> SHRM <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Description of Work Performed by Consultant Design replacement bridge and approaches.		
Description of Work Performed by Subconsultant Subsurface Investigations, Wetland delineation, Phase I		
Evaluation Period From 1/25/05 To 6/13/06	Percent of Project Complete 100%    Final    Post Construction	
DOT Supervisor/Team Leader Neider/Liptack	DOT Project Manager DAAR Engineering, Inc. - MC Local Program	Project Complexity <input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low

## CONTRACT DATA

Type of Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Party <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 Party with Town of Oakfield (Municipality)		Number of Amendments 0
Date Contract Approved 1/25/05	Original Contract Completion Date 6/25/06	Date Actual Completion 6/13/06

Rating of Structure Plans by CO Bridge (Maximum 5) 3.2
---

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
---------	--------------	-------------------

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)**

4.2
-----

Comments/Unique issues

Gremmer and Associates followed the design process and submittals were timely and complete. Tom Lanser, project manager, exhibited very good project management skills.

### 2. HUMAN RELATIONS - Check as appropriate.

Exceeds	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
---------	--------------	-------------------




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)**

4.3
-----

Comments/Unique issues

The consultant exhibited very good human relations skills.

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

<b>4.2</b>
------------

Comments/Unique issues

This project is a basic local bridge project Gremmer & Associates used good engineering judgement for this type of project.

---

### 4. QUALITY OF WORK - Check as appropriate.

Exceeds	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the product reflect compliance with FDM procedures and requirements?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Was work well organized, properly presented, clear and concise?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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)**

<b>4.1</b>
------------

Comments/Unique issues

The quality and completeness of the final plans were very good making my review much easier.

---

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

**4.1**

Comments/Unique issues


The consultant delivered the project in a timely manor.


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


Describe strengths/weaknesses and provide suggestions for improvement.


The staff is very familiar with the DOT process and did an excellent job of producing a design package to be let to construction.

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

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Evaluator - WIDOT Signature)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Reviewer/Consultant Signature)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)