CITY OF SAN DIEGO CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the consultant's performance and will be retained by Public Works Contracts for five years to provide historical data to City staff when selecting consultants.

Section I PROJECT INFORMATION					
1. PROJECT DATA		2. CONSULTANT DATA			
1a. Project (title, location):	2a. Name, ad	ldress, phone	e & email of Co	onsultant:	
1b. Brief Description:	2b. Consultat	nt's Project N	Aanager:		
1c. Contract Amount: \$ WBS/IO:	Phone: (Email:				
3. CITY	DEPARTMENT RESPON	SIBLE			
3a. Department (include Division):	3b. Project M address):	lanager (nam	e, address, ph	one & email	
Deputy Director:	Phone: (Email:)			
Section II SPEC	CIFIC RATINGS				
PERFORMANCE				UN-	
EVALUATION		EXCELLENT		SATISFACTORY	N/A
1. Quality of Report, Study, Plans, Specifications, o		ope as noted:			
Deliverables submitted were complete in all respects.					
• All comments and review requests were adequately incorporated into Deliverables.					
• The Deliverables were properly formatted and well-coordinated.					
 Writing style/presentation and terminology was clear and straightforward with adequate backup provided. 					
2. Ability to adhere to contract schedule, budget, a	and overall timely respo	nses as note	d:	T	
• Deliverables prepared in accordance with the agreed upon schedule(s).					
 Consultant alerted the City to possible schedule problems well in advance of delays. 		ce			
• Consultant suggested solutions there were cost effective, appropriate and were provided in a timely manner.		nd 🗌			
• The Consultant provided responses to RFI's/emails/request for proposals, etc. in a timely manner.		ls, □			
3. Ability to manage project team, Subconsultants	s, and coordinate with C	ity staff as n	oted:		
• The Consultant was reasonable and fair during negotiations of the Agreement and/or on Task Orders.		ne 🗌			
• The Consultant followed direction and chain of responsibility.					
• The Consultant reviewed and analyzed Subconsultant Deliverables and oversaw their work in an appropriate manner.		nd 🗖			
oversaw then work in an appropriate manner.					

Section	II
---------	----

SPECIFIC RATINGS Continued

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	EXCELLENT	SATISFACTORY	UN- SATISFACTORY	N/A	
4. Ability to manage responsibilities in the regulatory/approval process as noted:					
 The Consultant researched and adhered to the necessary Federal/State/City code/regulations & requirements needed for the Deliverable. 					
• The Consultant advised the City the necessary regulatory restrictions that needed to be adhered to.					
5. Quality of Construction/Design Support as noted:					
• The drawings/plans reflected existing conditions accurately.					
• The Consultant provided direction/support to the Resident Engineer and work cooperatively with them.					
• The Consultant provided adequate support for As-Built drawings.					
• Change orders due to design deficiencies were kept to a minimum.					
Section III SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION	_				
(Please ensure to attach additional documentation as needed.)					

(Supporting documentation attached: Yes 🗌 🗌	No 🗌)
---	--------

Section IV FINAL RATING						
4. OVERALL RATING						
Consultant Rating	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfact	ory		
5. AUTHORIZING SIGNATURES						
5a. Project Manag <u>er</u>			1	Date		
Name 5b. Deputy Director		Signature		Date		
Name		Signature				
5c. Provided to Consultant		-				
Name of R	ecipient	Signature		Date Provided		
Consultant Concurrence*: Yes 🗌 No 🗌 *Note: Consultant has the right to appeal the contents of this evaluation. Please refer to SDMC 22.0811(a) for more details.						