



Example Consultant Evaluation Comments for Scores of “1” (Unacceptable Performance) & “2” (Below Satisfactory Performance)

Schedule and Management

Schedule:

A. Project Submittals (70%)

- Several submittals needed to be resubmitted, including Phase II, Phase III, and component sets that needed additional resubmittals beyond the main project set. Submittals were consistently late.
- Submittals were routinely pushed past original scheduled dates.
- Phase submittals were late (phase III, IV, Final), causing the lead project to be late. Needed accelerated reviews to make production date.
- Design exceptions, variations and Tech Memos were all pushed at Final and S&D stages. Per scope, S&S, Typical section package was required to be in for approval prior to Phase II, was not received until after Phase II.
- Schedule was revised numerous times and still had difficulty meeting deadlines.

B. Status Reports/Schedule Updates (30%)

- Schedule updates were timely, but schedule continued to slip. Meeting agendas for progress meetings were sent with insufficient notice prior to meetings.

Management

A. Administration of Contract (30%)

- Submittals were late, sometimes of poor quality and required resubmittals. Supplemental agreement documentations were late, causing delay. Contract budget was maximized. Invoices frequently needed resubmission.
- Consultant can improve the response time to Department’s needs. FTE had to send reminder emails and follow up multiple times to get responses from the consultant.

B. Management of Issues and Resources (35%)

- Subconsultant was inexperienced and submittals unacceptable in quality. Many staff changes on this project. Many QA reviewers are not included in QA plan.
- Supporting details needed to resolve issues was at times lacking.
- Department staff involvement was excessive, and consultant responses sometimes added to the level of involvement.
- Lacking consistent coordination with subs, missed sub’s calculations on Phase IV.
- Several Roadway items/issues required heavy Department involvement.



- Consultant needs to be more proactive in resolving the issues that arises during course of the project. FTE PM had to follow up with multiple reminders to get responses and resolution on time sensitive issues such as bid questions, resolving ERC comments in time before each submittal. If the resolution takes time, consultant can respond to FTE by acknowledging the issue and providing timeline on the response.

C. Communication, Documentation and Coordination (35%)

- Documentations of design decisions was at times lacking, resulting in a larger effort for Department Design staff during reviews.
- Comment resolution often required extensive involvement with Department. Although some issues required this involvement, many comments could have been resolved with less.
- Consultant should work on documenting meetings within two weeks of the meeting by providing meeting notes for FTE's review within the two-week period.
- FTE had to follow up with consultant to effectively resolve the comments. Consultant should take the lead in resolving proactively.

Quality: Work Group 3.3 - Controlled Access Highway Design

A. Geometric/Engineering Reports and Design Documentation

- Design did not incorporate the complete recommendations of the Traffic Report until it was pointed out to them by an ERC review comment. This omission caused late changes to the intersection.
- Variation and Exceptions Document was not completed before the established project milestones.
- Variation and Exceptions Document required considerable unwarranted Department assistance.
- Draft and final typical section packages were submitted and required significant FTE involvement. The packages showed the lack of coordination between disciplines.
- Document required considerable unwarranted Department assistance.
- After submitting Final Pavement Design Package, several design elements were not complete requiring several follow up pavement design meetings and requiring considerable department assistance.
- After Pavement Design Package Phase II, Consultant still has significant work on pavement design. Required above average department assistance.
- The geotechnical report was not submitted for the first time to the Department until the original due date of Phase IV submittal after FTE requesting it.
- FTE was forced to cancel the advertisement and re-advertise due to bid questions that were received. The bid questions indicated a lack of coordination between disciplines during project development.



B. Phase Submittals

- Phase submittals were consistently late and several times of poor quality, requiring resubmittal. Some component sets needed subsequent resubmittals.
- Phase II submittal had missing items, which may have been avoided with more coordination with Department personnel.
- There were several phase submittals that required resubmittals due to poor quality. Phase submittals were late, and project required accelerated reviews to meet production date. Delays and quality issues required meetings with FTE management.

C. Roadway Drainage Design and Overall Stormwater Management Analysis/Documentation

- QA/QC was deficient for the Phase II Drainage Design. There were missing calculations, missing inlets, and several inconsistencies such as conflicting information between roadway and drainage cross sections. This resulted in a very high number of drainage comments. The comments focused on things that should have been identified during the QC process.
- QA/QC was deficient for the initial stormwater management facility design. There were several initial incorrect assumptions (approach to compensation, misunderstanding of existing conditions, etc.) that a thorough QA/QC should have identified.

D. Environmental Permitting Services (Water Management District, Corps. Of Engineers, USCG, Local Permits, ETC.)

E. Utility Coordination/Adjustments and Utility Agreements and Work Schedules

F. Traffic Control Plans/MOT

- TCP was not thoroughly coordinated with the adjacent job.

G. ROW Requirements and Coordination Analysis/Documentation

H. Pay Items and Quantities

- Considerable involvement required for identifying appropriate pay items and relevant specification in lieu of plan notes, pay item notes, etc.

I. Maintain and Update Construction Cost Estimates and Overall Project Funding Needs (TIP/STIP, Local Agencies, UAOS, ETC.)

J. Specifications

- TSP was completed very late in the project schedule.
- Considerable involvement required for identifying relevant specification in lieu of plan notes, pay item notes, etc. Considerable reviews/resubmittals of proposed specification language.



Quality: Work group 7.1 - Signing and Pavement Marking & Channelization

- It appeared that google earth was used to perform the field review prior to phase 2 submittal. There were signs shown in the plans that were labeled as existing, that had been removed 5-6 years ago.

Post Design Services

- The drilling required to install additional guardrail posts on the slop pavement was not addressed in the plans.
- The cores used to establish existing pavement thickness were not representative of the existing pavement thickness on the Turnpike. Additional coring was required to mitigate the potential for hitting existing base and the cross-slope of R3 was modified to address the potential, which resulted in the need for additional milling and asphalt on the shoulder and R4/R5.
- Overhead Electric utility conflicts were not adequately addressed despite several utility plan review comments.
- The removal of 2 streetlights required de-energizing that was not included in the UWS. Mast Arm was shifted to minimize the OE impact during construction, however, the removal of the existing mast arm also required de-energizing not in the UWS, due to the diagonal line directly over the arm.
- A design error resulted in a significant cost to the contract and premium costs to the designer that could have been minimized.