

### Professional / Technical Contract Evaluation

Once you provide approval on the final invoice, complete this form. E-Mail the completed form to [alice.robbyns@state.mn.us](mailto:alice.robbyns@state.mn.us). Please note, this rating may be used in future consultant selection procedures and all completed Professional/Technical Contract Evaluations are sent to the Contractor for their information. Include comments below. Please be concise with your comments. Attach support documentation as necessary.

**(Please Note – the boxes are clickable. Double click on the box, choose “check” and hit enter on the appropriate boxes)**

#### Department of Administration Evaluation Information

<b>Agency:</b> Transportation	<b>Contractor:</b> PCE	<b>Financial Numbers (as applicable):</b> <b>CFMS No.:</b> XXXXX <b>SWIFT Contract No.:</b> XXXXX <b>SWIFT PO No.:</b> XXXXX
<b>Project Name:</b> TH 210/Pebble Lake Road Improvements		<b>Project Number:</b> (MnDOT Contract No.) 98588
<b>Summarize the purpose of the Contract, including why it was necessary:</b> Detailed Design plans were needed to supplement staffing shortfalls		
<b>Project Start Date:</b> May 2011	<b>Original End Date:</b> February 2012	<b>Actual End Date:</b> February 2012
<b>Did the project finish on time?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<b>Total Billable Hours (if available):</b> 903.25	<b>Did the project finish within budget?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Original Contract Amount:</b> \$71,499.54	<b>Amendment Amount(s):</b> \$0	<b>Contract Total:</b> \$70,607.89
<b>Funding Source (ie Trunk Highway, Bond, Federal etc.):</b> Trunk Highway SRC		<b>Was this contract a Single Source?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>If applicable, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services:</b> N/A		
<b>Project Manager Name:</b> Tom Swenson/Tom Lundberg		<b>Project Manager Email Address:</b> Thomas.swenson@state.mn.us
<b>Evaluate the Contractor’s timeliness:</b> Good		<b>Evaluate the Contractor’s quality:</b> Good
<b>Evaluate the Contractor’s cost:</b> Excellent		<b>Would you engage the Contractor’s services again?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<b>Evaluate the Contractor’s overall performance:</b> They did alright and learned lots which will benefit them in the future		
<b>Please rate the overall experience with the Contractor:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 5 – Very Satisfied <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 – Satisfied <input type="checkbox"/> 3 – Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> 2 – Dissatisfied <input type="checkbox"/> 1 – Very Dissatisfied		
<b>Describe any negative action taken during the Contract (i.e., termination, pursuit of suspension, etc.):</b> None		

**Consultant Services Evaluation Information**

<b>Contract Administrator Name:</b> Tom Lundberg	<b>Contract Administrator Email Address:</b> Thomas.Lundberg@state.mn.us
---	---

**Project Manager, please rate Items 1 to 6 and submit the document as instructed above. Consultant Services will obtain the Contract Administrator’s rating information for Items 7-9.**

<b>Assign a rating score to the following specific areas:</b>				
*NOTE: Comments are always encouraged, but if you provide a Rating of 1 or 2 on any of the rating items below, comments are <b>required</b> (utilize the “Comments” section below).				
<b>PROJECT MANAGER</b>				
	<b>Above Average (4 Points)</b>	<b>Average (3 Points)</b>	<b>Below Average (2 Points)</b>	<b>Poor (1 Point)</b>
1. Product Quality		x		
2. Work Performance		x		
3. Conformance with MnDOT Standards/Requirements		x		
4. Deliverables Complete and On Time		x		
5. Project related Cooperation	x			
6. QA/QC Plan Conformance		x		
<b>CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR / AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE</b>				
7. Contract Administration Cooperation		x		
8. Invoices and Progress Reports		x		
9. Cost estimation/Budget Management	x			
<b>Total Points Possible:</b>	29			
<b>Total Points Received:</b>	36			

**Comments**

This was one of PCE’s first contracts where they took the lead and they learned the Mn/DOT process, CADD file requirements and generalities. For their next project they will have an understanding of how all of that works and will be able to be that much better. They ended up spending more time on the project than budget allowed but did the work within budget without asking for more. Any questions please call Tom Lundberg 218-846-3634.

**Rating Definitions**

<b>ABOVE AVERAGE</b>	<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>BELOW AVERAGE</b>	<b>POOR</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivers products/service correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from MnDOT</li> <li>• Performs beyond expectations</li> <li>• Provides deliverables that exceed standards</li> <li>• Informs MnDOT’s Project Manager of project status regularly</li> <li>• Resolves any problems that occurred</li> <li>• Needs little or no direction</li> <li>• Responsive to requests</li> <li>• Suggests improvements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fulfills terms of Contract (no more, no less)</li> <li>• Provides deliverables that meet standards</li> <li>• Delivers project on time and budget</li> <li>• Informs MnDOT Project Manager of key milestones</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimally or does not meet Contract terms</li> <li>• Provides deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply</li> <li>• Behind schedule or over budget</li> <li>• Requires direction on products/services from MnDOT to produce</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires excessive guidance or direction</li> <li>• Unresponsive to requests</li> <li>• Unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks</li> <li>• Provides deliverables that do not follow standards or do not meet requirements or expectations</li> <li>• Not on time or budget through no fault of MnDOT</li> </ul>