

**CONSULTANT RATING/EVALUATION – CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT
STAGE 1 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

REPORT NO. 1

DATE: _____

PROJECT MANAGER: _____

ATTENTION: PRODUCTION

AREA ENGINEER: _____

CONSTRUCTION

RFL DATE: _____

CONTRACTS

CONSULTANT: _____

DATE OF LAST REVIEW: _____

ROUTE: _____

DISTRICT: _____

CONTRACT NO.: _____

WORK TYPE: _____

DESCRIPTION: _____

REVIEWER'S RATING ITEMS

1. PLANS: _____

2. PAY ITEMS & COST ESTIMATE: _____

3. UTILITIES AND RAILROAD: _____

4. ENVIRONMENTAL: _____

5. RIGHT OF WAY: _____

RATING TOTAL: _____

+2 Exceeds
+1 Above Average
0 Satisfactory
-1 Improvement Required
-3 Unsatisfactory

RATING SCORE: RATING TOTAL ÷ BY NUMBER OF RATING ITEMS: _____

REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: _____

**CONSULTANT RATING/EVALUATION – CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT
STAGE 2 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

REPORT NO. 2

DATE: _____

PROJECT MANAGER: _____ ATTENTION: PRODUCTION AREA ENGINEER: _____ CONSTRUCTION RFL DATE: _____ CONTRACTS

CONSULTANT: _____ DATE OF LAST REVIEW: _____

ROUTE: _____ DISTRICT: _____

CONTRACT NO.: _____ WORK TYPE: _____

DESCRIPTION: _____

REVIEWER'S RATING ITEMS

1. PLANS-ROAD: _____
 2. PLANS – BRIDGE: _____
 3. COST ESTIMATE: _____
 4. SITE INVESTIGATION: _____
 5. RIGHT-OF-WAY: _____
 6. UTILITIES & RAILROAD: _____
 7. ENVIRONMENTAL: _____
 8. TRAFFIC MAINTENANCE & TMP: _____
 9. CONSTRUCTION PHASING: _____
 10. SCHEDULE & SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS: _____
 11. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS: _____
- RATING TOTAL:** _____

+2	Exceeds
+1	Above Average
0	Satisfactory
-1	Improvement Required
-3	Unsatisfactory

RATING SCORE: RATING TOTAL ÷ BY NUMBER OF RATING ITEMS: _____

REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: _____

**CONSULTANT RATING/EVALUATION – CONSTRUCTION/PROJECT MANAGEMENT
STAGE 3 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

REPORT NO. 3

DATE: _____

PROJECT MANAGER: _____ ATTENTION: PRODUCTION AREA ENGINEER: _____ CONSTRUCTION RFL DATE: _____ CONTRACTS

CONSULTANT: _____ DATE OF LAST REVIEW: _____

ROUTE: _____ DISTRICT: _____

CONTRACT NO.: _____ WORK TYPE: _____

DESCRIPTION: _____

REVIEWER'S RATING ITEMS

1. PLANS - ROAD: _____
2. PLANS – BRIDGE: _____
3. PAY ITEMS: _____
4. QUANTITIES: _____
5. SPECIAL PROVISIONS: _____
6. UTILITIES AND RAILROAD: _____
7. ENVIRONMENTAL: _____
8. RIGHT-OF-WAY: _____
9. CONSTRUCTION PHASING: _____
10. TRAFFIC MAINTENANCE & TMP: _____
11. SCHEDULING & SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS: _____
12. SPECIAL MATERIALS/CONDITIONS: _____

RATING TOTAL: _____

+2	Exceeds
+1	Above Average
0	Satisfactory
-1	Improvement Required
-3	Unsatisfactory

RATING SCORE: RATING TOTAL ÷ BY NUMBER OF RATING ITEMS: _____

REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

CONSULTANT RATING/EVALUATION – PROJECT MANAGEMENT

DES No.: _____

DATE: _____

PROJECT MANAGER: _____

RFC DATE: _____

CONSULTANT: _____

ROUTE: _____ DISTRICT: _____

CONTRACT No.: _____ WORK TYPE: _____

DESCRIPTION: _____

REVIEW POINTS

- 1. ANNUAL/SPECIAL
- 2. CONSTRUCTABILITY STAGE 1 DESIGN
- 3. CONSTRUCTABILITY STAGE 2 DESIGN
- 4. CONSTRUCTION STAGE 3 FINAL PLAN PACKAGE
- 5. CONSTRUCTION (MID-CONTRACT)
- 6. CONSTRUCTION (POST CONSTRUCTION)

REVIEWER'S RATING ITEMS

- 1. SITE INVESTIGATION: _____
- 2. SCOPE: _____
- 3. SCHEDULE: _____
- 4. RESPONSIVENESS: _____

+2	Exceeds
+1	Above Average
0	Satisfactory
-1	Improvement Required
-3	Unsatisfactory

REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: _____

REVIEWER'S PRINTED NAME: _____ TELEPHONE: _____

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
LEVEL 1
PROJECT CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW 1
STAGE 1 PLAN REVIEW SUBMISSION
PROJECT MANAGER/CONSTRUCTION MANAGER**

PRIMARY DES No. _____ CONTRACT No. _____

PROJECT MANAGER _____

CONSTRUCTION MANAGER _____ DATE _____

THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA ARE TO BE USED AFTER PROJECT CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW 2 TO EVALUATE THE DESIGNER'S PERFORMANCE.

PRACTICAL DESIGN	
DID THE DESIGNER ADOPT PLANNING'S BUDGET AND APPLY PRACTICAL DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS, WHERE POSSIBLE, TO MAINTAIN OR IMPROVE PROJECT COST EFFECTIVENESS?	
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER IMPROVED THE PLANNING BUDGET BY MORE THAN 10%
A	ABOVE AVERAGE: ABOVE EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER IMPROVED BUDGET MORE THAN 5%
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER MAINTAINED THE APPROVED BUDGET.

1. PLANS	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

2. PAY ITEMS	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

3. UTILITIES AND RAILROAD	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE..
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

5. RIGHT OF WAY	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

6. SCHEDULE & SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
LEVEL 1
PROJECT CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW 2
STAGE 2 PLAN REVIEW SUBMISSION**

PRIMARY DES No. _____ CONTRACT No. _____

PROJECT MANAGER _____

CONSTRUCTION MANAGER _____ DATE _____

THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA ARE TO BE USED AFTER PROJECT
CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW 2 TO EVALUATE THE DESIGNER'S PERFORMANCE.

1. PLANS - ROAD	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

2. PLANS - BRIDGE	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

3. COST ESTIMATE (PAY ITEMS, QUANTITIES)	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

4. RIGHT OF WAY	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

5. UTILITIES AND RAILROAD	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

7. TRAFFIC MAINTENANCE & TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLANS	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

8. CONSTRUCTION PHASING

9. SCHEDULE & SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

10. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
LEVEL 1**

**PROJECT CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW 3
STAGE 3 PLAN REVIEW SUBMISSION**

CONSTRUCTION MANAGER/PROJECT MANAGER

PRIMARY DES No. _____ **CONTRACT No.** _____

PROJECT MANAGER _____

CONSTRUCTION MANAGER _____ **DATE** _____

THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA ARE TO BE USED AFTER PROJECT CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW 2 TO EVALUATE THE DESIGNER'S PERFORMANCE.

1. PLANS - ROAD	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.
2. PLANS - BRIDGE	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

3. PAY ITEMS	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

4. QUANTITIES	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED IN DOCUMENTS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. DOCUMENTS MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. DOCUMENTS HAVE SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. DOCUMENTS HAVE MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

5. SPECIAL PROVISIONS	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED IN DOCUMENTS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. DOCUMENTS MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. DOCUMENTS HAVE SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. DOCUMENTS HAVE MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

6. UTILITIES AND RAILROAD	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE..
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

7. ENVIRONMENTAL	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

8. RIGHT OF WAY	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

9. CONSTRUCTION PHASING

10. TRAFFIC MAINTENANCE & TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLANS	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

11. SCHEDULE & SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

12. SPECIAL MATERIALS/CONDITIONS	
RATING	CRITERIA
E	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. DESIGNER HAS ADDRESSED ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS TO A SUPERIOR LEVEL. NO ERRORS OR OMISSIONS NOTED. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 96% TO 100% COMPLETE.
S	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. ALL CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. MAY HAVE MINOR ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 80% TO 95% COMPLETE.
I	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. SOME CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS SEVERAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE 61% TO 79% COMPLETE.
U	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. MAJORITY OF CRITICAL ELEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED TO AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL. HAS MANY ERRORS AND OMISSIONS. CRITICAL ELEMENTS ARE ONLY 0% TO 60% COMPLETE.

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DESIGN CONSULTANT RATING GUIDELINES
FOR
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT CONTRACT PERFORMANCE

POST CONSTRUCTION PLAN REVIEW SUBMISSION

PRIMARY DES No. _____ CONTRACT No. _____
 PROJECT MANAGER _____
 CONSTRUCTION MANAGER _____ DATE _____

THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA ARE TO BE USED AFTER PROJECT CONSTRUCTABILITY REVIEW 1 TO EVALUATE THE DESIGNER'S PERFORMANCE.

1. BUDGET: DID THE CONSULTANT ADOPT PLANNING'S BUDGET INTO THE DESIGN PROCESS SUFFICIENTLY TO MAINTAIN COST EFFECTIVENESS?	
RATING	CRITERIA
+2	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER IMPROVED THE PLANNING BUDGET BY MORE THAN 10%.
+1	ABOVE AVERAGE: ABOVE EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER IMPROVED BUDGET MORE THAN 5%.
0	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER MAINTAINED THE APPROVED BUDGET WITHIN 5%.
-1	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER HAD BUDGET SLIPPAGE OF 5%-10%.
-3	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER EXCEEDED THE BUDGET BY MORE THAN 10%.

2. SCOPE: DID THE CONSULTANT DEFINE PLANNING'S SCOPE TO INTEGRATE THE DESIGN PROCESS SUFFICIENTLY TO IMPROVE COST EFFECTIVENESS?	
RATING	CRITERIA
+2	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER EXCELLED IN DEVELOPING THE PROJECT SCOPE TO REDUCE COSTS, SCHEDULE AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT WHILE MAINTAINING THE REQUIRED PURPOSE AND NEED OF THE PROJECT.
+1	ABOVE AVERAGE: ABOVE LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER USED INNOVATIVE METHODS DEVELOPING THE PROJECT TO REDUCE EITHER COSTS, SCHEDULE AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT TO IMPROVE SAFETY.
0	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER DEVELOPS THE PROJECTS TO THE SPECIFIED OBJECTIVES.
-1	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER ALLOWED SOME SCOPE CREEP.
-3	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER HAD EXCESSIVE SCOPE CREEP.

3. SCHEDULE: DID THE CONSULTANT MEET INTERMEDIATE SUBMITTAL DATES?	
RATING	CRITERIA
+2	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER PROVIDED AN ACCURATE SUBMITTAL WITHIN THE SCHEDULE IN ALL CASES AND EXCEEDED THE SCHEDULE BY 15 CALENDAR DAYS.
+1	ABOVE AVERAGE: ABOVE EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE CONSULTANT PROVIDED AN ACCEPTABLE SUBMITTAL WITHIN THE SCHEDULE IN ALL CASES AND EXCEEDED THE SCHEDULE BY 7 CALENDAR DAYS.
0	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE CONSULTANT PROVIDED ACCEPTABLE SUBMITTALS WITHIN THE SCHEDULE OR WAS LATE BY 7 CALENDAR DAYS OR LESS.
-1	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE CONSULTANT WAS MORE THAN 7 CALENDAR DAYS LATE IN PROVIDING ANY ACCEPTABLE SUBMITTAL, OR MORE THAN 50% OF INTERMEDIATE SUBMITTALS WERE LATE.
-3	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE CONSULTANT DID NOT COMPLY WITH ANY OF THE ABOVE.
4. SCHEDULE: DID THE CONSULTANT MEET FINAL CONTRACT TIME REQUIREMENTS?	
RATING	CRITERIA
+2	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. A SUPERIOR FINAL WORK PRODUCT CERTIFIED "READY FOR CONTRACT" MORE THAN 60 CALENDAR DAYS AHEAD OF SCHEDULE.
+1	ABOVE AVERAGE: ABOVE EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. AN ACCEPTABLE FINAL WORK PRODUCT WAS CERTIFIED "READY FOR CONTRACT" MORE THAN 30 CALENDAR DAYS AHEAD OF SCHEDULE.
0	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. AN ACCEPTABLE FINAL WORK PRODUCT WAS DELIVERED WITHIN THE SCHEDULED TIME.
-1	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. AN ACCEPTABLE FINAL WORK PRODUCT WAS DELIVERED UP TO TWO MONTHS BEHIND SCHEDULE.
-3	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. AN ACCEPTABLE FINAL WORK PRODUCT WAS DELIVERED MORE THAN TWO MONTHS BEHIND SCHEDULE.
5. RESPONSIVENESS: HOW WELL DID THE CONSULTANT RESPOND TO THE REVIEWER?	
RATING	CRITERIA
+2	EXCEEDS: EXCEPTIONAL LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. EXCEEDED EXPECTATIONS IN ANSWERING QUESTIONS AND MAKING REQUESTED CHANGES. THE DESIGNER PROJECT COORDINATION WAS PROACTIVE IN ADDRESSING PROJECT ISSUES.
+1	ABOVE AVERAGE: ABOVE EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. WILLINGNESS TO ANSWER QUESTIONS AND MAKE REQUESTED CHANGES. THE DESIGNER PROJECT COORDINATION WAS PROACTIVE IN ADDRESSING PROJECT ISSUES.
0	SATISFACTORY: EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER DID REVISE THE PLANS/DOCUMENTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COMMENTS AND/OR EXPLAINED WHY REVISIONS WERE NOT MADE. THE DESIGNER HANDLED PROJECT COORDINATION. THE DESIGNER SHOWED A WILLINGNESS TO ANSWER QUESTIONS.
-1	IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED: BELOW LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER DID NOT REVISE SOME OF THE PLANS/DOCUMENTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COMMENTS AND DID NOT EXPLAIN WHY SOME OF THE REVISIONS WERE NOT MADE. THE DESIGNER SHOWED SOME COOPERATION AT HANDLING PROJECT COORDINATION. THE DESIGNER SHOWED SOME COOPERATION IN ANSWERING QUESTIONS BUT REQUIRED SEVERAL REQUESTS.
-3	UNSATISFACTORY: WELL BELOW EXPECTED LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE. THE DESIGNER DID NOT COMPLY WITH ANY OF THE ABOVE.