

City of Columbus – Department of Public Service Consultant Performance Evaluation

General Information

Project Name:		Date:	
Project CIP #:		Contract Amount:	
Consultant Firm:		Project Manager:	
List of Subconsultants:			
Evaluation Type:			

Consultant Performance Evaluations shall be prepared after Final Design Plans and after Construction (if applicable) for each contract or project and submitted to the Section Supervisor and reviewed by the Section Manager. Rating scores should be a whole number. Rating guidelines are found on the next page.

Professional Services

Check the box(es) for all services provided that were considered as a part of this evaluation.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Engineering Study | <input type="checkbox"/> Bridge Rehabilitation Design |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Operations Study | <input type="checkbox"/> Electrical/Street Lighting Design |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Signal Installation Improvements | <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering Surveying |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Road Improvements – Major | <input type="checkbox"/> Materials Testing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Road Improvements – Minor
(Streetscape, sidewalk, ADA ramps, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Right-of-Way Design |

*Note to Reviewer: A comment is **required for each** rating provided.

Ratings

Project Approach:	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Category weighted 15%
	<p>4 - Coordinated and contributed creative solutions or alternatives. Technical decisions were clearly documented. Deliverables were accurate and complete. Addressed <u>ALL</u> comments and incorporated responses into a clear report or document.</p> <p>3 - Contributed creative solutions or alternatives. Most deliverables received were accurate and complete. Some rework required.</p> <p>2 - Solutions were provided under significant City guidance. Technical decisions were not accurate. Supporting documents had major or numerous errors and omissions.</p> <p>1 - Contributed no creative solutions. Consistently could not defend or justify technical decisions. Resistant to change.</p>					
Comments:						

Project Management and Coordination:	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Category weighted 20%
---	------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

- 4 - Consultant was in full control of the project and demonstrated a clear understanding of scope expectations. Made efficient use of resources and made timely decisions. Anticipated problems and communicated recommendations to resolve them. All requests were responded to within established time-frame.
- 3 - Followed scope with some guidance from City. Demonstrated follow-through with decisions made at meetings. Most requests were resolved in a reasonable time. Consultant was available and accessible.
- 2 - Excessive time was required to resolve some issues, frequent City involvement was needed, and the Consultant was frequently not available or inaccessible.
- 1 - Consultant was disengaged with project, made frequent mistakes, and was not accessible. Consultant did not respond to emails or telephone calls.

Comments:

Schedule/Progress:	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Category weighted 20%
---------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

- 4 - Fee negotiations were completed within the Department timeframes. The consultant exceeded expectations in anticipating and resolving issues which may have adversely affected the schedule. The consultant resolved problems or changes that were out of their control and avoided a delay to maintain the project schedule.
- 3 - Fee negotiations were completed less than 30 days after the Department timeframes. Most deliverables for major milestones were received on time. Reacted to issues to minimize submission delay that may impact schedule. Overall project development progress met expectations.
- 2 - Fee negotiations were not completed more than 30 but less than 45 days after the Department timeframes. Deliverables for major milestones were not received on time. Project development schedule delays were caused by the consultant. Frequent prompting for timely receipt of deliverables was required.
- 1 - Fee negotiations were not completed more than 45 days after the Department timeframes. Final deliverable milestone date was missed. Significant schedule delays were due to the consultant. Overall unsatisfactory project development progress.

Comments:

Project Development/Quality of Work:	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Category weighted 25%
---	------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

- 4 - Worked to minimize unnecessary City staff involvement. Demonstrated clear understanding and full adherence of City and applicable standards. Deliverables received were accurate and complete, including a thorough disposition of review comments. Identified and implemented value-added design services.
- 3 - Most Deliverables were clear and complete. Mostly adhered to city and applicable standards. Addressed majority of review comments. Followed-through with decisions made at meetings.
- 2 - Did not follow City Standards and manuals. Required frequent City involvement. Deliverables had major or numerous errors and omissions. Did not address previous review comments.
- 1 - Deficient in knowledge and did not follow City standards and manuals. Deliverables were substandard and require excessive resubmittals. Submissions were incomplete and/or unacceptable.

Comments:

Contract/Budget and Invoicing:	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Category weighted 10%
---------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

- 4 - Invoices submitted were consistent with work progress. Any additional work was identified and communicated before the work was performed. All invoices were accurate and included necessary documentation with descriptive progress reports. The design was completed within the original contract amount. No unsupported claim requests were submitted for extra work.
- 3 - Invoices submitted were consistent with work progress. Any additional work was mostly identified and communicated before the work was performed. Most invoices were accurate and included necessary documentation with descriptive progress reports. The design was completed within the original contract amount. No unsupported claim requests were submitted for extra work.
- 2 - Invoices submitted were sometimes inconsistent with work progress. Any additional work was sometimes identified and communicated before the work is performed. The majority of invoices was accurate and included necessary documentation with descriptive progress reports. The design was not completed within the original contract amount. Submitted unsupported claim requests for extra work.
- 1 - Many invoices submitted were inconsistent with work progress. Any additional work was not identified and communicated before the work is performed. The majority of invoices was not accurate and did not include necessary documentation with missing or incorrect progress reports. The design was not completed within the original contract amount. Submitted multiple unsupported claim requests for extra work.

Comments:

Subconsultant Management:	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	Category weighted 10%
----------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

- 4 - Participation met the contract utilization rate. Subconsultant submitted work with minimal errors. Subconsultant met all schedule milestones. No issues with subconsultants. Subconsultant roles were clearly defined.
- 3 - Participation met the contract utilization rate. Subconsultant submitted work with minimal errors. Subconsultant met most schedule milestones. Issues with subconsultants resolved without City involvement. Subconsultant roles were defined.
- 2 - Subconsultant participation was slightly lower than the contract utilization rate. Subconsultant submitted work with numerous errors. Subconsultant was behind schedule resulting in some project delays and/or rework. Subconsultant roles were not clear.
- 1 - Subconsultant participation was considerably lower than the contract utilization rate. Subconsultant submitted work with numerous errors. Deliverables did not meet expectations or schedule. Did not demonstrate supervision over the subconsultant. Subconsultant roles were not clear.

Comments:

Final Score Prior to Construction:

Additional Comments

Constructability:	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> -10%	1 <input type="checkbox"/> -20%	2 = 10% deduction 1 = 20% deduction
Comments:	<p>4 - Responded quickly to RFI's and pre-bid questions. Submittal reviews were clear and responsive. Plans documented right-of-way needs for construction. Plans were constructed with few errors. Private utility conflicts were minimal. Project had minimal change orders due to plan errors.</p> <p>3 - Responded to RFI's and pre-bid questions with some City oversight. No additional right-of-way needs were identified during construction. Plans were constructed with few errors. Utility conflicts and coordination were minimal. Project had some change orders due to plan errors.</p> <p>2 - Required City oversight to answer RFI's and pre-bid questions. Additional right-of-way needs were identified during construction. Plans were constructed with error, and it was clear that quantities were not reviewed. Utility conflicts were minimal. Project had change orders that unnecessarily increased the project cost, schedule or scope.</p> <p>1 - Did not respond quickly to RFI's and pre-bid questions. Major right-of-way needs were identified during plan construction. Numerous change orders due to plan errors. Construction had major utility conflicts. Change orders due to plan errors exceeded contract value where modification to budget was required.</p>					
Final Score After Construction:						

Verification of Review

By signing this form, you confirm that you have discussed this review in detail with your supervisor.

Signatures prior to Construction

Rated By Project Manager	Signature	Date	Reviewed By Supervisor	Signature	Date
Section Manager	Signature	Date	If Needed Evaluation Meeting	Date	Date

Signatures after Construction

By signing this form, you confirm that you have discussed this review in detail with the Area Engineer.

Signatures after Construction

Rated By Project Manager	Signature	Date	Reviewed By Area Engineer	Signature	Date
Section Manager	Signature	Date	If Needed Evaluation Meeting	Date	Date