DIVISION OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE
Procedures Development Office

PROCESS REVIEW 00-01

Consultant Selection

FINAL REPORT

1. Prepared By:	**Original Signed By** EUGENE SHY Process Review Engineer	**9/04/02** Date
2. Recommend Approval:	**Original Signed By** KEVIN POKRAJAC, Chief Office of Procedures Development	**9/04/02** Date
3. Approved:	**Original Signed By** TERRY L. ABBOTT, Chief Division of Local Assistance	**9/04/02** Date

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The goal of this process review is to ensure that local agencies are following the consultant selection and contract procedures outlined in Chapter 10, Consultant Selection, of the *Local Assistance Procedures Manual* (LAPM).

The fieldwork portion of the process review was initiated in late April 2000, following approval of the "Consultant Selection Process Review Plan 00-01." The Process Review Team consisted of: Process Review Engineer; one or more representatives from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); California Division Office; California Department of Transportation's (Department) Office of Structures Local Assistance; and the Department's district whose local agency project was being reviewed. Also, one or more representatives of the local agency were present during the review of each local agency's project to provide project records, information, and answer to questions concerning the PR 00-01 Consultant Selection Survey Form. This form was completed for each local agency's project and was previously approved as part of the Consultant Selection Process Review Plan 00-01.

For this review, the District Local Assistance Engineers (DLAEs) in Districts 8, 10, and 11 were requested to select a cross-section of four consultant selection contracts (per district) that were representative of the typical federal-aid projects in their district. The fieldwork portion of the review consisted of a meeting with each of the 12 local agencies and was completed in June 2000. At this juncture, the Process Review Engineer was temporarily assigned as the DBE coordinator for HQ Local Assistance.

Results showed that 11 of the 12 local agencies used the consultant selection procedures in the LAPM. For these 11 local agencies, deviations were of a minor nature and there were no major or unrecoverable project deficiencies. The one local agency that did not use the consultant selection procedure used a sole source procedure, which is addressed in the findings.

A summary of the findings, observations, recommendations were as follows:

(1) Two and three of the local agencies, respectively, had not completed the *Certification of Consultant* (Exhibit 10-F) and *Certification of Local Agency* (Exhibit 10-G) forms for their consultant selection contracts which were over $100,000.

(2) Three of the local agencies with contracts over $100,000 had not completed a *Consultant Agreement Reviewer's Checklist*. Requiring the submission of this checklist to the DLAE for each consultant contract would help to ensure the completion of this form and Exhibits 10-F and 10-G mentioned previously.

(3) No system existed for reporting DBE participation at the time of contract award or completion for consultant selection contracts. The appropriate forms were to be completed by the consultant selection firms and submitted to the local agencies but there was no requirement to submit the forms to the DLAE.

(4) Five of the local agencies were unable to provide an independent engineer's cost estimate for their consultant selection contracts which were over $100,000. A cost estimate was required per 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 172, Section 172.7(a)(1)(ii).

Chapter 10 of the LAPM states that an independent engineer's cost estimate is to be prepared, but it should also state that an independent engineer's cost estimate is only required for proposed contracts over $100,000. To ensure compliance, the Consultant Agreement Reviewer's Checklist should be revised to include the preparation of an independent engineer's cost estimate for proposed contracts over $100,000 as one of the checklist items.

(5) The federal provision, Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters, in 49 CFR, Part 29 and included as Exhibit 12-E, Attachment E to the LAPM for construction contracts need to also be included in consultant selection contracts as well. The LAPM should be revised accordingly.

(6) One local agency did not include a DBE goal in their contract because the local agency believed no DBE participation was required for consultant selection contracts. After the local agency's attention was directed to the relevant parts of Chapter 10 of the LAPM, it became clear that a DBE goal can be included in a consultant selection contract, if appropriate, (available subcontracting opportunities and DBE sub-consultants) and was needed to meet the agency's overall annual goal. This local agency planned to meet its overall annual DBE goal using future construction contracts.

(7) One County was using a very comprehensive *Consultant Performance Evaluation* form to evaluate their consultant's performance pursuant to 23 CFR, Part 172, Section 172.13(b). A generic version of this form should be considered for inclusion in the LAPM or on the Local Assistance website as an exhibit, so it would be available for use by other local agencies.

(8) Some of the consultant selection contracts reviewed were less than $100,000. The Small Purchase Procedures described in 49 CFR, Part 18, Section 18.36(d)(1) allow relatively simple and informal procurement methods for securing services, including Consultant Selection/Architect-Engineer services for contracts that $100,000 or less. These Small Purchase Procedures should be included in Chapter 10 of the LAPM as they only require a local agency to solicit price or rate quotations from an adequate number of qualified sources without going through the more formal and lengthy consultant selection process.

(9) The one local agency that did not follow the consultant selection process used a sole source procedure. This local agency awarded two contracts in the amounts of $1,167 and $1,500 after requesting and receiving only one proposal for each contract. Based upon the very low dollar value, these two contracts would fall under either a Personal Service Agreement described in the LAPM or Small Purchase Procedures described in the CFR, both of which require adequate competition. Without adequate competition, sole source justification and documentation were needed but had not been provided. This particular project was subsequently cancelled by the local agency as a federal-aid project.

II. PROCESS REVIEW CHRONOLOGY

A. Background:

Process Review Plan 00-01, Consultant Selection, was approved by the Department's Assistant Program Manager, Design and Local Programs (DLP) on April 17, 2000. A process review was to be conducted to four local agency's consultant selection contracts in Districts 8, 10 and 11. The Process Review Team consisted of the Department's Process Review Engineer, FHWA representative from the California Division Office, one representative from the Department's Structures Local Assistance. Also present at the reviews were one or more representatives from District 8, 10 or 11. Representatives from the local agency assisted by providing project records and information about the contract. Each local agency contract review was documented on the Consultant Selection Survey Form, which was approved as part of the Consultant Selection Process Review Plan 00-01. The names of the individuals present at each of the local agency project reviews were listed on the survey form which will be part of the permanent records of this process review.

B. Process Review:

The following consultant selection contracts were reviewed:

1. District 8: three cities and one joint powers authority

. 2. District 10: three counties and one city

3. District 11: three cities and one county

III. PROCESS REVIEW PLAN

A. Goal of Review:

The goal of this review was to assure that local agencies were following the consultant selection and contracting procedures outlined in Chapter 10, Consultant Selection, of the LAPM. Results from the 12 local agencies that were surveyed revealed that there were areas that can be improved to ensure full compliance with the LAPM.

B. Objective of Review:

The objectives of this review were to examine how local agencies were now engaging consultants to perform architectural, engineering, and related services needed to develop a federal-aid project and to look for opportunities to improve upon the procedures now being used. Some of the areas that this review was to examine, along with the answers found, were as follows:

- **Are local agencies using the Consultant Agreement Reviewers Checklist?**

  Answer: Not being completed in every case.

- **Does the selection method match the project's complexity?**

  Answer: In a number of cases, the local agencies should have used the Small Purchase Procedures for contracts under $100,000 which would have been simpler, less time-consuming and less costly.

- **Do consultant agreements/contracts meet Federal requirements?**

  Answer: Yes, with the exceptions: (1) that the federal provision, Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters, was not presently included in the contracts; and (2) that some of the local agencies were not able to provide a detailed cost estimate for their negotiated consultant selection contracts.

- **How does the Contract Administrator ensure that contractual obligations are completed satisfactorily?**

  Answer: By a thorough review of the work products produced at completion.

- **Are local agencies using Personal Service Agreements only for services less than $25,000?**

  Answer: The ceiling for Personal Service Agreements and Small Purchase Procedures has been increased to $100,000. The local agencies should use these procedures for contracts under $100,000, but more details and samples were needed to better implement these procedures.

- **How much additional work is being added to the original consultant personal service agreement, does the additional exceed the $25,000 threshold?**

  Answer: No instances were found.

- **Are local agencies breaking up various activities for a specific phase of work into multiple personal service agreements (i.e. Archeology, biology, document preparation, etc.)?**

  Answer: No, but they were identifying these areas in their consultant selection contracts.

- **Are local agencies using consultants in the Project Manager role? If so, how were they hired?**

  Answer: Yes, they were using consultants in the Project Manager role and hiring under Personal Service Agreements.

- **How are the Consultant Project Managers hiring sub-consultants?**

  Answer: Didn't find instances where sub-consultants were hired.

- **Are DBE consultants utilized where appropriate?**

  Answer: Yes, except in one instance where the local agency believed that the DBE goal was not applicable to a consultant selection contract.

- **How often do local agencies re-advertise for consultants to be on retainer?**

  Answer: This could not be definitively answered.

- **Are pre-award audits being done for consultant contracts over $250,000, $75,000, or $100,000; in accordance with the then applicable LPP 98-02, 99-01, or 00-03; respectively?**

  Answer: Yes.

- **Are consultants hired for a specific phase of work (preliminary engineering – environmental clearance or final design) being used for subsequent phases of work (final design or construction contract administration) without providing an opportunity for other consultants to be hired for the subsequent work?**

  Answer: No instances were found.

- **How can the procedures for consultant contracts be streamlined and made more user-friendly?**

  Answer: By better use of Personal Service Agreements and Small Purchase Procedures for contracts under $100,000.

- **Have local agencies requested the Department to provide oversight of their consultant selection process?**

  Answer: No, but they had requested the Department to assist them in specific areas.

- **What effects, if any, to the consultant selection process have resulted from the Department no longer providing oversight, review, and approval of local agencies' consultant agreements?**

  Answer: Not all of the checklists were being completed since they do not have to be submitted.

In instances where the local agencies are not following the procedures in the LAPM, this review helped to identify what the problems are, what corrective actions need to be taken by the local agency or Department, and why these problems exist.

C. Background:

Prior to reengineering of the Local Assistance Program, the Department provided oversight of local agencies' consultant selection process for federal-aid projects by reviewing and approving consultant agreements. With the issuance of LPP 95-07, Reengineering, and the

subsequent LAPM, the local agencies now complete a consultant selection checklist and document that met federal requirements. The Department now only provided assistance when requested. Since no checklists or other records were provided by the local agencies to the DLAEs for consultant selection contracts, the process review now remained the only oversight.

D. Method & Responsibilities:

This review consisted of spot-checking a cross-sectional sample of local agency's federal-aid contract files using the Consultant Selection Survey Form approved with the Process Review Plan. These completed survey forms will become part of the permanent record of this review. In essence, this review was of the checklists and other documents that the local agency was required to have in its files for each consultant selection contract. Representatives from Districts 8, 10, and 11 were responsible for selecting the consultant selection contracts that were reviewed and participating in the reviews of the local agency's contracts in their district. The FHWA representative, the Department's Process Review Engineer, and one representative from the Department's Structures Local Assistance were present at the local agency contract reviews.

The Department had been delegated the responsibility by FHWA of overseeing the local agencies, including the local agency consultant selection process. The only exception was the approval of environmental documents, which had been retained by FHWA.

E. Review Team

Eugene Shy, Department, Local Assistance, Process Review Engineer
James Lee, FHWA, California Division
Be Nguyen, Rand Helde, & Bob Jones; Department, Structures Local Assistance
Ray Meijer and Carl Radsick, Department, District 8 Representatives
Amin AbuAmara, Department, District 10 Representative
Don Pope, Department, District 11 Representative

F. Review Schedule

The fieldwork portion of this review was completed in June 2000, which was in accordance with the approved Consultant Selection Process Review Plan. It was found during the fieldwork that 11 of the 12 local agencies did use the consultant selection procedures in the LAPM, that deviations were of a minor nature, and that there were no major or unrecoverable project deficiencies. At this point in the review, the Process Review Engineer was temporarily assigned as the DBE coordinator for HQ Local Assistance and to other higher priority work. Consequently, the Final Report for this review had been delayed beyond the originally scheduled date.

IV. PROCESS REVIEW

A. Findings, Observations, and Recommendations:

Finding 1:

Two and three of the local agencies, respectively, had not completed the Certification of Consultant (Exhibit 10-F) and Certification of Local Agency (Exhibit 10-G) form for their consultant selection contracts over $100,000 that were reviewed. Each local agency with this deficiency subsequently corrected it.

Observation 1:

The LAPM presently includes the Consultant Agreement Reviewers Checklist (Exhibit 10-C) which is to be completed by the local agencies during the preparation and award of a consultant selection contract using federal-aid funds. Line II.E. of this checklist is entitled Certifications of Consultant and Agency Exhibits 10-F and 10-G and provides a location for the local agency to check indicating that these two exhibits have been completed. The breakdown of the system is that the checklist (Exhibit 10-C) is not submitted to the DLAE for review; it remains in the local agency's files. The DLAE, at present, has to go to the local agency and review the checklist in the their files to ensure that it has been completed correctly. This is seldom, if ever done.

Recommendation 1:

After considering the following three options and receiving input from the DLAEs, it was decided to recommend #(3) below:

(1) Do nothing; or

(2) Require the local agencies found with this deficiency to submit the Consultant Agreement Reviewers Checklist (Exhibit 10-C) to the DLAE for review within 30 days after award of their next consultant selection contract with federal-aid funds. No further action or submittals of the checklist on future consultant selection contracts would be needed if the checklist was found to be satisfactory by the DLAE; or

(3) Revise Chapter 10 of the LAPM to require local agencies to submit the Consultant Agreement Reviewers Checklist (Exhibit 10-C) to the DLAE for review within 30 days after award of all consultant selection contracts using federal-aid funds and include a method of positive enforcement. After review of the checklist by the DLAE, no further action would be needed if the checklist was satisfactory.

Finding 2:

Three of the local agencies had not completed a Consultant Agreement Reviewers Checklist (Exhibit 10-C) for their consultant selection contracts over $100,000. This checklist was to be prepared by the local agency to document completion of about 30 items including Exhibits 10-F and 10-G, mentioned in the previous finding. Each local agency with this deficiency subsequently corrected the deficiency.

Observation 2:

Same as Observation 1

Recommendation 2:

Same as Recommendation 1

Finding 3:

No system existed for a local agency to report to the Department, for upward reporting, the DBE participation at the time of contract award or completion for consultant selection contracts.

Observation 3:

At the time of award of the consultant selection contract, Chapter 10 of the LAPM states in the Bidder/Proposer DBE Participation Requirements and Instructions (Exhibit 10-I) that the local agency is to have the consultant selection contractor complete and submit the Local Agency Bidder-DBE Participation (Exhibit 15-G) form to document DBE participation. However, there is no requirement in the LAPM that this completed form then be submitted by the local agency to the DLAE for upward reporting to FHWA. Consequently, the reporting of DBE participation to the DLAE at the time of award for consultant selection contracts is not presently being done. At the time of completion of the consultant selection contract, Chapter 10 of the LAPM states in the "Sample DBE Participation Requirements"(Exhibit 10-J) that upon completion of the contract, the contractor is to prepare and submit to the local agency the Final Report—Utilization of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE), First-Tier Subcontractors (Exhibit 17-F) showing total dollars paid to each DBE sub-consultant and supplier. Again, there is no requirement in the LAPM that the completed form be submitted by the local agency to the DLAE for upward reporting to FHWA, so DBE participation at the time of completion for consultant selection contracts is not presently being reported by the local agency.

Recommendation 3:

Revise Chapter 10 of the LAPM to require a local agency to submit the Local Agency Bidder-DBE Participation (Exhibit 15-G) and the Final Report—Utilization of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE), First-Tier Subcontractors (Exhibit 17-F) form to the DLAE for review within 30 days after award and completion, respectively. A method of positive enforcement would also be included. This would apply to all consultant selection contracts using federal-aid funds and would allow upward reporting of the DBE participation to FHWA.

Finding 4:

Five of the local agencies were unable to provide an independent engineer's cost estimate for their consultant selection contracts over $100,000. Although they did use other methods, such as pre-award audits, price and cost analyses, and DLAE staff participation, to ensure that the negotiated prices were fair, reasonable, and not in excess of the price which would have been incurred had there been full compliance by providing an independent engineer's cost estimate.

Observation 4:

The review team believed that the negotiated consultant selection contract prices were both fair and reasonable through the use of other methods used by the local agencies, but this does not relieve the local agencies of preparing an independent engineer's cost estimate. An independent engineer's cost estimate for consultant selection contracts is required per 23 CFR, Part 172, Section 172.7(a)(1)(ii) for all consultant selection contracts except those awarded under small purchase procedures ($100,000 or less). Chapter 10 of the LAPM says that an independent engineer's cost estimate is needed for consultant selection contracts but makes no exception for those awarded under small purchase procedures. A review of the Consultant Agreement Reviewers Checklist (Exhibit 10-C) revealed that it did not contain a checklist item to ensure that an independent engineer's cost estimate was prepared by the local agency for a consultant selection contract.

Recommendation 4:

Chapter 10 of the LAPM should be revised to state that a local agency is to prepare an independent engineer's cost estimate for all consultant selection contracts except for those awarded using small purchase procedures ($100,000 or less). The Consultant Agreement Reviewers Checklist (Exhibit 10-C), which is completed by the local agency, should be revised to include a checklist item for the independent engineer's cost estimate which is needed unless small purchase procedures are used ($100,000 or less). Also, a letter should be sent to the local agencies reminding them of this requirement. Preparation by the Department of an independent engineer's cost estimate to assist the local agencies, if needed, should also be considered as either "Reimbursed Work" or "Enhanced Services."

Finding 5:

The contract provision, Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters, that is presently being included in local agency federal-aid construction contracts, was not included in consultant selection contracts.

Observation #5:

A review of Chapter 10, Consultant Selection, revealed that several federal certifications and a number of federal contract provisions had been included as exhibits for use in consultant selection contracts but the contract provision Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters is not one of the exhibits. 49 CFR, Part 29, Section 29.110(a)(ii)(B), Coverage, states "Any procurement contract for goods or services between a participant and a person, regardless of type, expected to equal or exceed the Federal procurement small purchase threshold…." which would include consultant selection contracts. In addition, there may be other federal contract provisions in the LAPM now being included in federal-aid construction contracts that should also be included in consultant selection contracts.

Recommendation 5:

The federal contract provision, Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters, should be added to Chapter 10, Consultant Selection as a checklist item to the Consultant Agreement Reviewers Checklist (Exhibit 10-C). This addition will

ensure that it is included in future consultant selection contracts by the local agencies. Also, a review should be made of current federal contract provisions to determine if there are others that should also be added.

Finding 6:

One local agency project did not include DBE goals because the local agency believed that no DBE participation was required for consultant selection contracts. However, the local agency was referred to the relevant parts of the LAPM and now understands that a DBE goal should be included in a consultant selection contract, if appropriate, (available subcontracting opportunities and DBE sub-consultants) and is needed to meet the agency's overall annual goal. This local agency had planned to meet its overall annual DBE goal using future construction contracts.

Observation 6:

Pages 10-5 and 10-6 of Chapter 10, Consultant Selection, of the LAPM include a paragraph entitled "Establish Intent for DBE Participation." This paragraph addresses consultant selection contracts with or without DBE goals and refers the reader to Exhibits 10-I and 10-J for sample contract clauses to be used in consultant selection contracts with or without specified DBE goals. This paragraph adequately describes and provides for consultant selection contracts with or without DBE goals. In essence, the issue of a DBE goal or not for a consultant selection contract should be addressed at the time that the local agency develops its overall annual DBE goal. This is done by reviewing all of next year's contracts for subcontracting opportunities and available DBE sub consultants, and then determining the local agency's overall annual DBE goal. This data is submitted to and reviewed by the Department for approval.

Recommendation 6:

Since the LAPM is clear that DBE goals can be used for consultant selection contracts, no action is needed to revise the LAPM. The local agency needs to provide evidence that their overall annual DBE goal was met using construction contracts and that DBE goals are now being considered for appropriate future consultant selection contracts. More guidance and training on DBE goal setting for consultant selection contracts has been requested by the DLAEs.

Finding 7:

One County was using a very comprehensive Consultant Performance Evaluation form (see attachment) to evaluate their consultant's performance.

Observation 7:

Chapter 10, Consultant Selection, of the LAPM presently addresses the consultant's Performance Evaluation by stating, "The contract administrator evaluates the consultant's performance after the consultant's final report has been submitted and the contract administrator has conducted a detailed evaluation with the consultant's project manager." No form or format is included in the LAPM, so it is up to each local agency to develop its own evaluation procedures and/or form. The inclusion of a sample consultant Performance

Evaluation form, similar to the County's, in Chapter 10 of the LAPM or on the Local Assistance website would assist the local agencies by saving them time, costs, and not having to "reinvent the wheel." Architect-engineering consultants are selected based upon their qualifications, of which a consultant's past performance is a major contributor, and the use of a Performance Evaluation will help to ensure that it is well documented pursuant to 23 CFR, Part 172, Section 172.13(b).

Recommendation 7:

That the County's "Consultant Performance Evaluation" form, or a similar one from the Department, be edited and included as an exhibit in Chapter 10 of the LAPM, or as an addition to the Local Assistance website. The sample form would then be available for local agencies to use.

Finding 8:

Some of the consultant selection contracts reviewed were less than $100,000 and Small Purchase Procedures were not used by the local agencies. The Small Purchase Procedures are defined in 23 CFR, Part 172, Section 172.7(b), and in 49 CFR, Part 18, Section 18.36(d)(1), and provide relatively simple and informal procurement methods for securing services, including Consultant Selection/Architect-Engineer services, for contracts that are $100,000 or less.

Observation 8:

The Small Purchase Procedures had not been included in Chapter 10 of the LAPM. The Small Purchase Procedures only require a local agency to solicit price or rate quotations from an adequate number of qualified consultants. This would eliminate the more formal and lengthy consultant selection process, which was based upon a consultant's qualifications and/or technical proposals for consultant contracts that were $100,000 or less and save the local agencies both time and money.

Recommendation 8:

Include Small Purchase Procedures and definition of services in Chapter 10 of the LAPM for use by the local agencies.

Finding 9:

One County awarded two contracts, each in the amount of $1,167 and $1,500, after requesting by telephone and receiving one proposal for each contract. This was essentially a "sole source" procedure.

Observation 9:

Based upon the dollar value of each of these contracts, they would fall under either the Personal Service Agreement described in Chapter 10, Page 10-22 of the LAPM; or Small Purchase Procedures described in 23 CFR, Part 172, Section 172.7(b) and in 49 CFR, Part 18, Section 18.36(d)(1); both of which require adequate competition. Without adequate competition, "sole source" justification and documentation were needed but had not been

provided by the County of Stanislaus. This particular project was subsequently cancelled by the County of Stanislaus as a federal-aid project.

Recommendation 9:

As a result of the project being cancelled as a federal-aid project, no action is needed in this matter. However, it would be helpful to clarify the rules for "sole source" procurements and the approval process.

V. PROCESS REVIEW CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions reached from this process review are that the LAPM is being used extensively by the local agencies in the consultant selection process and this needs to be simplified and streamlined for contracts under $100,000 by including the Small Purchase Procedures; and that the LAPM needs to include good examples of Personal Service Agreements and Small Purchase Procedures for the local agencies to follow.

Attachment: County's Consultant Performance Evaluation form

Attachment

Consultant Performance Evaluation

Section I The purpose of this form is to provide historical data to County staff when selecting consultants. File No. _____

1. PROJECT DATA	2. CONSULTANT DATA
1a. Project (include title, location, and Activity/CIP No.)	2a. Consultant Name and Address
1b. Brief Description of Project (design, study, etc.)	2b. Consultant's Project Manager
1c. Budgeted Cost for Project: $ _____	2c. Phone: (_____) _____

3. COUNTY DEPARTMENT/SECTION RESPONSIBLE

3a. Department (include section and division)	3b. County Project Manager (name & phone)

4. CONTRACT DATA (Engineering Services)

4a. Contract No.: _____ Termination date: _____ Base Fee: $ _____
Agreement date: _____ Date terminated: _____ Contingency: $ _____

4b. Amendments $ _____ (Total Value) / # _____ (Initiated by County) $ _____ (Total Value) / # _____ (Initiated by Consultant)

4c. Change Orders $ _____ (Total Value) / # _____ (Initiated by County) $ _____ (Total Value) / # _____ (Initiated by Consultant)

4d. Total Fee per Agreement (4a. + 4b. + 4c.) $ _____ Total Fee Paid $ _____
(Do not include Contingency listed in 4a.)

4e. Type of Services (Design, study, etc.)

4f. Historical Record of Key Submittal Dates (enter date or n/a if not applicable)

	Preliminary	30%	70%	90%	100%	Final
Per Agreement						
Delivery Date						
Acceptance Date						

4g. Notice To Proceed _____ (date)

4h. Working Days _____ (number)

4i. Actual working Days _____ (number)

4j. Reason for Change Orders: (Indicate total for each reason)

Errors/Omissions	$	% of Base Fee	%
Unforeseen Conditions	$	% of Base Fee	%
Changed Scope	$	% of Base Fee	%
Changed Quantities	$	% of Base Fee	%
Programmed Task Options	$	% of Base Fee	%

5. OVERALL RATING (Complete Section II on reverse, include comments as appropriate.)

		Outstanding	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	N/A
5a.	Plans/Specifications accuracy						
5b.	Consistency with budget						
5c.	Responsiveness to County Staff						
5d.	Overall Rating						

6. AUTHORIZING SIGNATURES

6a. County Design Team Leader _____ Date: _____

6b. County Project Manager _____ Date: _____

6c. County Public Works Manager _____ Date: _____

6d. Consultant Representative _____ Date: _____

SEE REVERSE SIDE

Section II — SPECIFIC RATINGS

PLANS/SPECIFICATIONS ACCURACY	Outstanding	Above Avg.	Avg.	Below Avg.	Poor	N/A
Plans/Specifications clear and concise						
Plans/Specs Coordination						
Plans/Specs properly formatted						
Code Requirements covered						
Adhered to County Standard Drawings/Specs						
Drawings reflect existing conditions						
As-Built Drawings						
Quality Design						
Change Orders due to design deficiencies are minimized						

RESPONSIVENESS TO STAFF	Outstanding	Above Avg.	Avg.	Below Avg.	Poor	N/A
Timely Responses						
Attitude toward Client and review bodies						
Follows directions and chain of responsibility						
Work product delivered on time						
Timeliness in notifying County of major problems						
Resolution of field problems						

CONSISTENCY WITH BUDGET	Outstanding	Above Avg.	Avg.	Below Avg.	Poor	N/A
Reasonable Agreement negotiation						
Adherence to fee schedule						
Adherence to project budget						

Section III — EXPLANATIONS AND SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

(Attach additional documentation as needed)

Item _____ : _____

Item _____ : _____

Item _____ : _____

Item _____ : _____

Item _____ : _____

Item _____ : _____

*** Indicates supporting documentation attached.**

SEE REVERSE SIDE