



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

### **Schedule and Management**

#### **Schedule:**

##### **A. Project Phase Submittals**

- Several phase submittals needed to be resubmitted, including Phase II, Phase III, and component sets that needed additional resubmittals beyond the main project set. Phase submittals were consistently late.
- Phase submittals were routinely pushed past original scheduled dates.

##### **B. Project Milestones**

- Phase submittals were late (phase III, IV, Final), causing lead project to be late. Needed accelerated reviews to make production date.

##### **C. Status Reports/Schedule Updates**

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

##### **D. Other Project Deliverables**

- 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.

#### **Management**

##### **A. Administration of Contract**

- 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 in 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**

- Subconsultant was inexperienced and submittals unacceptable in quality. Many staff changes on this project. Many QA reviewers 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

- 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.

### D. Execution of Work

- 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.
- Schedule was revised numerous times and still had difficulty meeting deadlines.

## Quality: Work Group 3 - Controlled Access Highway Design

### 1. Compliance with Project Scope

- 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.

### 2. Typical Section Package

- Draft and final packages were submitted and required significant FTE involvement. The packages showed the lack of coordination between disciplines.
- Document required considerable unwarranted Department assistance.
- Document was not completed before the project milestones established in the TDH and Project scope.

### 3. Phase submittal

- 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.



#### 4. Variation and Exceptions

- Document was not completed before the project milestones established in the TDH and project scope.
- Document required considerable unwarranted Department assistance.

#### 5. Geometrics/Engineering Reports

- 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.

#### 6. Pavement Design Package

- After submitting Final Pavement Design, still several design elements not complete requiring several follow up pavement design meetings and requiring considerable department assistance.
- After Phase II Consultant still has significant work on pavement design. Required above average department assistance.

#### 7. Roadway Drainage Design

- 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 count of drainage comments. The comments focused on things that should have been identified during the QC process.

#### 8. Stormwater Management Facility Design and WMD Permitting

- 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.

#### 11. Earthwork and Soils

- 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.
- Apparent QC issue on submittal completeness by the Prime consultant.
- "Monitor of Existing Structures" aspects of the project had been brought up by the reviewer since Phase II submittal and was not resolved until after the Final Plans submittal.

#### 14. Traffic Control Plans/MOT

- TCP was not thoroughly coordinated with the adjacent job.

#### 15. Misc. Structures Plans

- The consultant failed to submit all required documentation with each submittal. Previous comments were frequently not addressed in subsequent submittals. Consultant interdisciplinary coordination was lacking.
- Failed to address several comments between phase II and phase III plans. Failed to include plan details and documents that are required for a phase III submittal.



## 18. Pay Items and Quantities

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

## 19. Overall Content, Format and Assembly of Roadway Plans

- Leading up to Production, repeat plans processing comments from Ph III (rejected) to Ph III (re-submittal). PH IV submittal- minimum QA/QC for plans processing elements (ex: many instances of incorrect EOR listed on sheet and in consistent index of sheets).
- Plans Processing reviewer identified many issues that should have been discovered during consultant QA/QC effort. Ex: Incorrect consultant contract number referenced. Standard plans + specs referenced on component key sheets. Incorrect FPID in sheet borders. Index of plans on key sheet does not match plan sheets submitted.

## 21. Specifications

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

## 22. Electronic Delivery

- To avoid Production Date delays, digital signatures must be established one month before Production Date. (Prime and subs EORs)
- Many instances of incorrect and/or non-verifiable digital signatures on plans + design docs. Re-submittals required for Department to accept quality deliverables.
- Re-submittal of production deliverables was required due to issues with digital signatures. One of the issues was provided as a comment in "final" ERC submittal and still not addressed in Production submittal.

## Quality: Work group 7 - Signing and Pavement marking and 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 in 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.