Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSP	ORTATION	
Contractor Name: Horizons, Incorpor	rated.	CFMS Contract Number: A-87490
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Aerial Services	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 89507	Project Duration (Dates): 04/05/06 to 06/20/06
Summarize the purpose of the contrac	t, including why it was necessary to e	enter into a contract:
services in Districts 6, 7, 8 & Metro, This project was contracted out as M necessary for this type of work.	for mapping and other purposes. IN/DOT does not own an aerial ph	rammetric Aerial Vertical Photography notogrammetric camera and equipment
	Total Contract Amount: \$95,930.00	
Billable Hours (if applicable): No .	I otal Contract Amount: \$95,930.00	Source of Funding: District's Consultant
efficiently: Performing this work ourselves wou costs for personnel for this type of v	uld be for more expense. Capital co vork are prohibitive for the State.	its services or products better or more osts for necessary equipment and ongoing
No.	plain why the agency determined the	re was only a single source for the services:
Evaluate the performance of the work performance in meeting the terms and		tor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Please see the attached evaluation	form.	
Carol Boen	au	7-6-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissio	oner	Date

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>89507</u> District/Office <u>6, 7, 8 A M</u> S.P. <u>Numerous</u> T.H. <u>Nu</u> Contractor <u>Horizohs</u>	mercul I				
Subcontractor					
Subcontractor				•	
Contract Period: $4 - 5 - 06$; Work Start Date	$\frac{20}{20}$ Work Completion	$\frac{1}{Date}; \frac{7}{Expiration}$	<u>31 — 0 C</u> 1 Date	-	
Total Contract Cost: \$ <u>95,930</u> -=	= Orig Cost: \$9	1 <u>5 930-</u> +A	mended Cost:	\$ <u>ø</u>	
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun					
Item Rating		Ra	ting		
1 - 6 by Project Manager7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		•			-
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality	·				
2. Work Performance		V			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	V				-
4. Deliverables Complete and on time					
5. Project related cooperation	V				
6. QA/QC plan conformance					
7. Contract administration cooperation					
8. Invoices and progress reports	\sim				
9. Cost estimation/budget management					

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

Print Name

Total Points 33 (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: Print Name

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSP	ORTATION	
Contractor Name: GRW Aerial Surve	ys, Inc.	CFMS Contract Number: A-87489
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Aerial Services	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 89503	Project Duration (Dates): 04/10/06 to 6/26/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract	t, including why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
Remote Sensing services for mappin	ig and other purposes.	ammetric Aerial Vertical Photography and togrammetric camera and equipment
Billable Hours (if applicable): No.	Total Contract Amount: \$99,500.00	Source of Funding: District's Consultant
Explain why this amount was a cost ef efficiently: Performing this work ourselves wor costs for personnel for this type of v	uld be for more expense. Capital cos	ts for necessary equipment and ongoing
If this was a single source contract, ex	plain why the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
No.		
Evaluate the performance of the work performance in meeting the terms and		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Please see the attached evaluation	form.	
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissio	oner	7-5-06 Date
cc <mark>: P.Stembler, 112 Admin</mark> J. Brunner, MS 680		

Ģ

File

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Contractor Name: GRW Aerial Surv	veys, Inc.	CFMS Contract Number: A-87484
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Aerial Services	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 8950	4 Project Duration (Dates): 4/10/06 to 6/26/00
Summarize the purpose of the contra	act, including why it was necessary to	enter into a contract:
services in Districts 1, 2, 3, 4 & Me	etro & Airports for mapping and of	grammetric Aerial Vertical Photography her purposes. hotogrammetric camera and equipment
Billable Hours (if applicable): No .	Total Contract Amount: \$98,767.50	Source of Funding: District's Consultan
Performing this work ourselves w	ould be for more expense. Capital f work are prohibitive for the State	osts for necessary equipment and ongoing
Performing this work ourselves w costs for personnel for this type of f this was a single source contract, o	f work are prohibitive for the State	
costs for personnel for this type of f this was a single source contract, o No.	f work are prohibitive for the State explain why the agency determined the k including an appraisal of the contra nd objectives of the contract:	
Performing this work ourselves w costs for personnel for this type of f this was a single source contract, o No.	f work are prohibitive for the State explain why the agency determined the k including an appraisal of the contra nd objectives of the contract:	ere was only a single source for the services:

J. Brunner, MS File

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Contractor Name: GRW Aerial Surveys, Inc. CFMS Contract Number: A-87489 Project Name (if applicable): Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 89503 Project Duration (Dates): 04/10/06 to 6/26/06 Photogrammetric Aerial Services Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: The Purpose of this contract was for the Contractor to provide photogrammetric Aerial Vertical Photography and Remote Sensing services for mapping and other purposes. This project was contracted out as MN/DOT does not own an aerial photogrammetric camera and equipment necessary for this type of work. Billable Hours (if applicable): No. Total Contract Amount: \$99,500.00 Source of Funding: District's Consultant Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently: Performing this work ourselves would be for more expense. Capital costs for necessary equipment and ongoing costs for personnel for this type of work are prohibitive for the State. If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: No. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: Please see the attached evaluation form. The AMERICAN STREET Molno 7-5-06 Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner Date

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 89503 District/Office <u>3</u> , <u>6</u> , <u>7</u> , <u>4</u> , <u>8</u> S.P. <u>Numeroup</u> T.H. <u>Mu</u> Contractor <u>GRV/ThC</u> . Subcontractor <u>—</u> Subcontractor <u>—</u> Contract Period: <u>4 – 10 – 06</u> ; Work Start Date Total Contract Cost: <u>\$99,506</u> —	<u>G_ZG</u> Work Completion = Orig Cost: \$_	Location $$	$\frac{(f_1, 3, 6)}{31 - 06}$ n Date Amended Cost:	\$_Ø	e Sensin
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	∼ Additional	Work Nun	nber of Amenda	ments	
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting		
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality					
2. Work Performance					
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		1			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time					
5. Project related cooperation					
6. QA/QC plan conformance					
 Contract administration cooperation Invoices and progress reports 					
9. Cost estimation/budget management					

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: OM

Total Points <u>o</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator 1Ē (Print Name

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANS	PORTATION		
Contractor Name: GRW Aerial Surv	Contractor Name: GRW Aerial Surveys, Inc.		
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Aerial Services	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 89504	Project Duration (Dates): 4/10/06 to 6/26/06	
Summarize the purpose of the contra	act, including why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:	
services in Districts 1, 2, 3, 4 & Me	tro & Airports for mapping and othe	ammetric Aerial Vertical Photography er purposes. otogrammetric camera and equipment	
Billable Hours (if applicable): No.	Total Contract Amount: \$98,767.50	Source of Funding: District's Consultant	
costs for personnel for this type of	work are prohibitive for the State.	sts for necessary equipment and ongoing e was only a single source for the services:	
performance in meeting the terms ar	nd objectives of the contract:	or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	
Please see the attached evaluation	n form.		
Carol mol		7-5-06	
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commis	sioner	Date	
cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin			

J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

		4		۸
Agreement No. 89504 District/Office 1, 2, 3, 4, 8 Me	Type of w	ork Photog	Gumet	ria Aen
District/Office 1, 2, 3 4/ SIMe	tro Work Typ	e Code M	2	Ser
District/Office 1, 2, 3 4 & Me S.P. Numerous T.H. Mu	Merous L	ocation Did	+, 1,	2,3.4.51
Contractor CRW IL	<u>C</u>			I
Subcontractor			'	
Subcontractor			•	
Contract Period: $\frac{4 - 16 - 06}{\text{Work Start Date}}$;				
Total Contract Cost: \$ <u>98,76750</u>	Orig Cost: \$7	8,767 50 + A	mended Cost:	\$_\$
			, *	,
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	~ Additional	Work Num	iber of Amendn	nents
Item Rating		Ra	ting	
1 - 6 by Project Manager		1.4		
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		•		
	Above	A.v.o.v.o.g.o	Below	Poor
	Average 4 Points	Average	Average	FOOL
	11 011100	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point
1. Product Quality			2 Points	1 Point
 Product Quality Work Performance 			2 Points	1 Point
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT 			2 Points	1 Point
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 				1 Point
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 				<u> </u>
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time 				1 Point
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and 				1 Point
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance 				1 Point
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration cooperation 				1 Point
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration 				1 Point
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration cooperation 				1 Point

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Mañager:

Print Name

Total Points <u>3</u> (Maximum points 36) ContractAdministrator:

Print Name

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

	O I II II I			^ ·	A		000 1	with the final inv	
netructioner	Submit thic	torm to	('oncultant	SORVICOC	Soction	Mail Ston	A GRU SIANA	i with the tingl inv	ALCO.
nsuucuons.	Subini uns		Consultant	JEI VILES	Section.		<i>000 aluli</i>		UILE.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	×	
Contractor Name: Kadrmas, Lee and Jocks	on Inc.	CFMS Contract Number: A85525
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No .:	Project Duration (Dates):
HARN Observation – Phase III	89202	2/16/06 - 5/06/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
The purpose of the contract is to provide a	National Geodetic Survey in De	etroit Lakes
		×
)	
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$98,000.00	Source of Funding: OLM Consultant Budget
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
	, , ,	
2		
		1
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
Caral Molna	u	6-20-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
L		

cc: File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 89202	Type of v	work: Harn Ot	oservations Detro	oit Lakes-Ph
District/Office: Detroit Lakes		Work T	ype Code: 🕿	Sr
S.P. NA T.H.: NA		Location:		6.95
Contractor: Kadrmas, Lee and Jacks	on Inc.			A Color
Subcontractor				
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: 2/16/06 Work Start Date	Work Com	5/6/06 Deletion Date	Expiration Date	<u>6/30/06</u>
Total Contract Cost: $98,000.00 = 0$			+ Amended C	ر مودد ۹ ۱۰۰۰
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ting	
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor
1. Des hast Quality	4 Points	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point
1. Product Quality	Х			
2. Work Performance	Х			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	Х			
			1	
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	Х			
4. Deliverables Complete and	X X			
 Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation 				
 Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation 	X			
 4. Deliverables Complete and on time 5. Project related cooperation 6. QA/QC plan conformance 7. Contract administration 	X X			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: 5/31/2006 (John Barke)

(John Barke) Print Name

Total Points ___36 (Maximum points 36) Contract Administrate 垃 (Cathie Ashlin)

Print Name

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number: A85273
Cook Research and Consulting		
Project Name (if applicable): TH36 Closing Study	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 89248	Project Duration (Dates): 1/18/06-8/30/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include		
	3	
The study was designed to understand public Bear Avenues.	opinion regarding the re-const	ruction of TH36 between Century and White
It was necessary to enter into a contract to co	mplete 1000 general public and	d 75 business interviews.
· · · ·		
а. 		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
	Contract: \$63,594.00	Metro Consultant Funds
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
	*	(1) (1) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2
× 1		
×.		
	*	
Evaluate the performance of the work includin		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:	
SEE ATTACHED CON	SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
Carol molna	u	6-20-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions	Submit this	form to C	onsultant Services	Section I	Mail Ston 6	S80 along	with the fina	linvoice
monucions.	Subline this		Unsultant Services	Section, 1	iviali Stop u	Job along		i ilivoice,

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Contractor Name: Kadrmas, Lee and Jocks	on Inc.	CFMS Contract Number: A85525			
Project Name (if applicable): HARN Observation – Phase III	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 89202	Project Duration (Dates): 2/16/06 - 5/06/06			
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:					
The purpose of the contract is to provide a National Geodetic Survey in Detroit Lakes					
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$98,000.00	Source of Funding: OLM Consultant Budget			
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:			
•					
		·			
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:					
SEE ATTACHED CON	SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION			
Carol Molna	ec	6-20-06			
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date			

Poport on Professio	nal/Taahniaal Can	traata (War ¢50 000
Report on Professio	nal/rechnical Con		RECEIVED
Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16	C.08, subdivision 4 (c).		
Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	o 680 along v	vith the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			2000
Contractor Name: Cook Research and Consulting		CFMSIC on	tract/Number: NA85273ATION
Project Name (if applicable): TH36 Closing Study	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 89248	Project Dur 1/18/06-8/2	ration (Dates): 30/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include			
The study was designed to understand public Bear Avenues.	opinion regarding the re-constr	ruction of TH	36 between Century and White
It was necessary to enter into a contract to co	mplete 1000 general public and	d 75 busines	s interviews.
			x .
			2 4
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of F	Funding:
	Contract: \$63,594.00	Metro Cons	sultant Funds
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a	single source for the services:
			· · · ·
			~
			· ~
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objection		or's timeliness	s, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION	N A
~			
Carol molna	u	6-2	20-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	u	G-a Date	20-06

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No89248				
District/Office Communication	S Work Type	e Code <u>MR</u>		
S.P T.H	<u>36</u> Lo	cation		
Contractor Cook Research	_			
Subcontractor				
Subcontractor				
Contract Period:1/18/06 Work Start Date	_; 5/26/06; 8/30 Work Completion 1	/06 Date Expiration I	Date	
Total Contract Cost: \$63,594	= Orig Cost: \$6	3,594 + Amend	led Cost: \$0	
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	\sim Additional V	Vork Numb	per of Amendm	ients 0_
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ing	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	Average	Ų	Average	
	Average 4 Points	Ų	Average	
1. Product Quality	Average 4 Points 4	Ų	Average	
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time 	Average 4 Points 4 4 4 4 3	Ų	Average	
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation 	Average 4 Points 4 4 4 4	3 Points	Average	
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time 	Average 4 Points 4 4 4 4 3	3 Points	Average	
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration cooperation 	Average 4 Points 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	3 Points	Average	
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration 	Average 4 Points 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	3 Points	Average	

Contractor's rating for this contract:

)

Project Manager:

Lori Laflin_

(

Print Name

Total Points <u>35</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: uns (Melissa Mchinn Print Name

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

10

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract

a contract.		
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number: A57565
University of Minnesota		
Project Name (if applicable): Design and Safety Implications for ATIS Use with Cell Phones	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81655, WO 41	Project Duration (Dates): 11/1/3003 – 10/31/2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	l ding why it was necessary to er	Ler into a contract:
	ang why it was necessary to er	
This research project will estimate the relative tasks. The study will be completed in the Virtu based simulator with 210-degree forward field base. Two groups of subjects will be establish common driving contexts and trip purposes). I using a cell phone and performing other high fi will complete the task set sober; the other group practical and approved by the University of M	al Environment for Surface Tra of view, rear and side views, su hed who will drive a standard r During each drive, subjects will requency secondary tasks such a bup will complete the task set i	ansportation Research. A high resolution PC- rround sound system, and a three axis motion route (with traffic scenarios representative of complete a number of scripted in-vehicle tasks s operating a CD/radio. One group of subjects mpaired, under conditions determined to be
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$120,000.00	Source of Funding: Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
N/A		
×		
* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		· /
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objection		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	lolnau	6-20-06 Date

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Agreement No. 81655, WO 41	Type of work	Research
District/Office Investment Manage	ement	
Contractor <u>University of Minnese</u>	ota	
Contract Period: <u>11/1/2003</u> ; Start Date	10/31/2005 Expiration Date	
Original Contract Cost	Amendment Cost(s)	Final Cost:
\$ <u>120,000.00</u>	+ \$_N/A =	\$ <u>120,000.00</u>

Item Rating		Rat	ing	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	Х			·
2. Work Performance	Х			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		Х		
 Deliverables Complete and on time 		X		
5. Project related cooperation		X		
6. QA/QC plan conformance (N/A)	N/A			
7. Contract administration cooperation		X		
 Invoices and progress reports 		X		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		Х		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points <u>26</u> (Maximum points 36 32)

Contract Administrator:

Sleeping James Klessig

Project Manager:

Todd Kramascz

Definitions:



3.3

10

Comments:

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DEFARTMENT OF TRANSFORMATION		
Contractor Name: University of Minnesota		CFMS Contract Number: A48293
Project Name (if applicable): Impact of Alternative Storm-Water Management Approaches on Highway Infrastructure	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81655 WO 75	Project Duration (Dates): 5/20/2003 – 2/28/2006

Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:

1. Complete an annotated bibliography of research related to the impact of alternative storm-water control facilities on transportation infrastructures.

- 2. Assess the degree to which existing alternative storm-water control facilities meet design recommendations.
- 3. Assess possible positive and/or negative impacts of alternative storm-water control facilities on transportation infrastructures.
- 4. Determine the long-term maintenance costs of roadway infrastructures and of storm-water control practices, and assess how the storm-water practice affects the long-term costs of the infrastructure.
- 5. Assess the level of acceptance of alternative storm-water control practices among public works directors, land developers, and private property owners.
- 6. Develop a resource that provides criteria for making decisions on the use of alternative storm- water control practices.

Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$121,896.00	Source of Funding: State Aid		
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:		
N/A				
	x			
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION		
11 200	1			

Carol Abenau

6-19-06 Date

Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Agreement No81655 WO 75		Type of work	_Research
District/Office _Investment Manag	ement		
Contractor _University of Minnesc	ota_		
Contract Period:5/20/2003 Start Date	; _2/28/2006_ Expiration D	Pate	
Original Contract Cost	Amendment Cost(s	s) Fir	nal Cost:

\$_121,896.00_ \$<u>0</u> = \$ 121,896.00

Item Rating	Rating			<u>Fear ann an ann ann ann ann ann ann ann an</u>
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		3		
2. Work Performance		3		
 Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 		3		
 Deliverables Complete and on time 			2	
5. Project related cooperation	4	,		
 QA/QC plan conformance (N/A) 	N/A	3		
 Contract administration cooperation 		3		
8. Invoices and progress reports		3		
 Cost estimation/budget management 		3		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points ____ (Maximum points 36 32)

Project Manager:

David Jessu

Contract Administrator:

Sue Lodahl (for Barb Loida)

Definitions:



Comments:

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPOI	RTATION		
Contractor Name: Martinez Co			CFMS Contract Number: A-70679
Project Name (if applicable):		Mn/DOT Agreement No .:	Project Duration (Dates): 22 Feb. 2006
Photogrammetric Mapping		89347	to 8 June 2006
Summarize the purpose of the c	contract, includ	l ding why it was necessary to e	Inter into a contract:
The purpose of this contract v Features and create a Digital			Triangulation, compile Planimetric for this project.
This Photogrammetric Mappiı known as SP 2780-64.	ng project is f	for I-94, from the Crow Rive	r to the Fish Lake Interchange, also
and we consult out approximation	ately that sam complexity.	ne amount. This mapping p Time constraints on the de) Mapping Model Units (MMU) per year roject was a good candidate for a livery of this mapping product was also
Billable Hours (if applicable):		Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding: Consultant Mappin
-	act, explain wh	Contract: \$97,000.00 ny the agency determined the	re was only a single source for the services
	act, explain wh		
-	act, explain wh	ny the agency determined the	
-	act, explain wh	ny the agency determined the	
-	act, explain wh	ny the agency determined the	
_	act, explain wh	ny the agency determined the	
No. Evaluate the performance of the performance in meeting the term	e work includin ns and objectiv	ny the agency determined the	re was only a single source for the services
No. Evaluate the performance of the performance in meeting the term	e work includin ns and objectiv	ny the agency determined the org an appraisal of the contract ves of the contract: ISULTANT PERFORMANCE	re was only a single source for the services

File

.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: Martinez Corporation		CFMS Contract Number: A-70679		
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Mapping	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 89347	Project Duration (Dates): 22 Feb. 2006 to 8 June 2006		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:				
The purpose of this contract was for the construct and create a Digital Terrain Mode				
This Photogrammetric Mapping project is known as SP 2780-64.	for I-94, from the Crow River	to the Fish Lake Interchange, also		
The Photogrammetric Unit is staffed to con and we consult out approximately that san consultant due to its size and complexity. large factor in deciding to consult out this	ne amount. This mapping pr Time constraints on the deli	oject was a good candidate for a		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$97,000.00	Source of Funding: Consultant Mapping		
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
No.				
	e e la superior de la companya de la			
	$\frac{1}{2} \int dx = \int dx = -\frac{1}{2} \int dx = -\frac{1}{$			
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall		
SEE ATTACHED CON	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION		
Carol Bolno	au	6-15-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date		
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sec				

File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 89347	Type of work: Photogrammetric Mapping			
District/Office: OLM	Work Type Code: MP			
S.P. 2780-64 T.H. 94	Location: Crow River to Fish Lake Interchange			
Contractor: Martinez Corporation	1000000			ion on ange
_				
Subcontractor				
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: 22 Feb. 2006 Work Start Date	8 June 2006 Work Completion I	31 July 2 Date Expiration		
Total Contract Cost: \$ 97,000.00	= Orig Cost: \$	97,000.00	+ Amended Co	ost: \$ 0.00
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	\sim Additional V	Vork Num	ber of Amendm	ents
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ing	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		X		
2. Work Performance	· · · ·	X		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time			X	
5. Project related cooperation	X			
6. QA/QC plan conformance		X		
7. Contract administration cooperation		X		
8. Invoices and progress reports		X		
9. Cost estimation/budget		X		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: Mike Elasky)

Print Name

Total Points: 30 (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: (For Mehrtash Mehran Print Name

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

The contract called for a delivery date of 31 May 2006 and the actual delivery date was 8 June 2006. Due to Mehrtash being out of the country, I have no idea if any agreement was made with regards to extending the due date. However, according to the contract language it is late and the contractor understands that no matter who is at fault, they accept the burden of some blame.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency:				
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: Stanley Consultants, Inc	CFMS Contract Number: A55917			
Project Name (if applicable): I-494 Stormwater Tunnel Feasibility Study			Project Duration (Dates): November 17, 2003 – June 30, 2005	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu	iding why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:		
The purpose of this project was to build upon a previous limited feasibility study that indicated a stormwater tunnel extending under I-494 from the Minnesota River to Penn Avenue (with the potential for a future extension to Trunk Highway 169) is the most cost effective drainage system for future I-494. Work included updating the corridor hydrologic and hydraulics data, providing a surface storm sewer layout with connections, conducting a subsurface investigation, and performing a detailed economic analysis to compare alternative tunnel layouts and conventional drainage designs. This project required expertise in a number of disciplines. The expertise needed to conduct the various aspects of this project was not available within Mn/DOT. In order to complete the project within the timeframe				
necessary to meet the overall I-494 recons Billable Hours (if applicable): 2302.7	Total Contract Amount:	Source of Funding:		
If this was a single source contract, explain w	\$236,880.42	Trunk Highway		
			U .	
N/A				
N/A				
N/A			0.	
N/A				
N/A				
N/A Attach a copy of the performance evaluation	on prepared for this contract.			
		6-7-06 Date		

File

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Stanley Consultants, Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A55917
Project Name (if applicable): I-494 Stormwater Tunnel Feasibility Study	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 85093	Project Duration (Dates): November 17, 2003 – June 30, 2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu	ding why it was necessary to e	enter into a contract:
The purpose of this project was to build u tunnel extending under I-494 from the Min extension to Trunk Highway 169) is the mo updating the corridor hydrologic and hydr connections, conducting a subsurface inv	nesota River to Penn Avenu ost cost effective drainage s aulics data, providing a surf	e (with the potential for a future ystem for future I-494. Work included face storm sewer layout with
alternative tunnel layouts and conventiona		a detailed economic analysis to compare
This project required expertise in a numbe		
aspects of this project was not available w necessary to meet the overall I-494 recons	truction schedule, the work	needed to be outsourced.
Billable Hours (if applicable): 2302.7	Total Contract Amount: \$236,880.42	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w		
N/A		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Attach a copy of the performance evaluation	on prepared for this contrac	t.
Carol Boena	ru	6-7-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No85093	Type of w	orkFeasibili	ty Study		
District/OfficeMetro	Work Typ	e CodeSS			
S.P2785-261 T.H494	Lo	ocationPenn	Ave to Minne	sota River	a fate
ContractorStanley Consultants, In	nc			C SIN L	- 450
SubcontractorWenck Associates	5			AN IUN	2006 cg
SubcontractorLyman Henn				2020	2006 . IVED ICE OF TANT SERVE R
SubcontractorBraun Intertec	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			CONSUL	TANT SERVE R
Contract Period:11/27/2003; Work Start Date V	6/23/2005 Vork Completion	_;6/30/2005 Date Expiration	Date	KEER BL	81.11. Black State
Total Contract Cost: \$_236,880.42	= Orig	Cost: \$214,65	54.54	+ Amended	
Cost: \$_22,225.88					
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	∼ Additional	Work Numł	per of Amendn	nents1	=
Item Rating		Rat	ing		
1 - 6 by Project Manager			8		
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1 - 6 by Project Manager	Average	Average	Below Average		-
1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Average	Average 3 Points	Below Average		
 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 	Average	Average 3 Points X	Below Average		
 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 2. Work Performance 3. Conformance with Mn/DOT 	Average	Average 3 Points X X X X X	Below Average		
 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 2. Work Performance 3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and 	Average	Average 3 Points X X X X	Below Average		
 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 2. Work Performance 3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and on time 	Average	Average 3 Points X X X X X	Below Average		
 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 2. Work Performance 3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and on time 5. Project related cooperation 6. QA/QC plan conformance 7. Contract administration cooperation 	Average	Average 3 PointsXXXXXXXXX	Below Average		
 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 2. Work Performance 3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and on time 5. Project related cooperation 6. QA/QC plan conformance 7. Contract administration 	Average 4 Points	Average 3 PointsXXXXXXXXX	Below Average		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points $\frac{29}{(\text{Maximum points 36})}$

Project Manager: Julie Whitcher Print Name

Contract Administrator: Mark Hagen (

)

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number: A48196
Yaggy Colby Associates		
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
TH 34 Pre-Design	78469 W.O. 3	5-6-2003 to 3-1-2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu-		
Summanze the purpose of the contract, meta	ding why it was necessary to en	ner mito a contract.
The purpose of the contract was to provide purpose of the contract was to provide purposed of the pre-design work included the pre-design work is extensive because the pro-desisting District 2 staff did not have adequate the program.	ne geometric layout and the rec ject involved reconstructing TH	quired Environmental Assessment. This I 34 from a 3 lane road to 5 lane road. The
		· ·
		·
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
6,112 hours	Contract: \$462,884.78	District 2 Consultant Set-Aside
If this was a single source contract, explain w		
In this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined then	e was only a single source for the services.
NIA		
I NA		
ΝΑ		
NA		
Evaluate the performance of the work includir		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti		
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION $G - G - O G$
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

cc:

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

instructions. Submit this form to consultan	i Services Section, Man Stop	ooo along with the inial involce.		
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name:	-	CFMS Contract Number:		
URS Corporation	A84795			
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):		
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment	89153	January 6, 2006 to May 10, 2006		
and Drilling Investigation				
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ	ling why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:		
The purpose of the contract was to complete a	a Phase I Environmental Site A	Assessment and drilling investigation of		
proposed highway right of way that is known to				
contamination that could impact soil and groun				
contamination problems early in project develo	opment, reduce potential liabili	ty, and avoid construction delays.		
		4		
The identification of known and suspected cor	ntaminated properties requires	specialized knowledge and experience,		
safety training, and field equipment. While sta				
Department of Health, and Minnesota Departmeter				
work, they are not available to be on-call to wo				
specialized field equipment, and state employe contaminated sites. It is not cost-effective for				
type of work.	win/DOT to hire, train, and equ	ip a workforce to do this highly specialized		
type of work.				
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:		
	Contract: \$52,771.25	Metro Consultant Services		
If this was a single source contract, explain wh		e was only a single source for the services:		
•				
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Evaluate the performance of the work including performance in meeting the terms and objective		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall		
penormance in meeting the terms and objective	les of the contract.			
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
0				
Mario Malma				
and not		6-6-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	× .	Date		
		· ·		
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration	<u>e</u> :			

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:		
URS Corporation		A84795		
Project Name (if applicable): Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Drilling Investigation	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 89153	Project Duration (Dates): January 6, 2006 to May 10, 2006		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ	ling why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:		
The purpose of the contract was to complete a proposed highway right of way that is known to contamination that could impact soil and grour contamination problems early in project develo	o be contaminated. This work ndwater in the project area, the	identified possible sources of reby allowing Mn/DOT to identify		
The identification of known and suspected contaminated properties requires specialized knowledge and experience, safety training, and field equipment. While state employees in Mn/DOT, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Minnesota Department of Health, and Minnesota Department of Agriculture have much of the knowledge and experience to do this work, they are not available to be on-call to work on Mn/DOT projects. In addition, the state does not own the required specialized field equipment, and state employees do not have the required specific safety training for work on contaminated sites. It is not cost-effective for Mn/DOT to hire, train, and equip a workforce to do this highly specialized type of work.				
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$52,771.25	Source of Funding: Metro Consultant Services		
If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services:				
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objective		r s unienness, quanty, cost, and overan		
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	u	6-6-06 Date		

cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>89153</u> Type of work <u>Level I—Drilling Investigation</u>

District/Office <u>Metro</u> Work Type Code <u>5.41</u>

S.P. <u>6285-125</u> T.H. <u>I-694</u> Location <u>Rice Street, Shoreview, MN</u>

Contractor URS Corporation

Subcontractor **Thein Well Company**

Subcontractor Environmental Science Corporation

Contract Period:January 6, 2006;May 10, 2006 ;July 31, 2006Work Start DateWork Completion DateExpiration Date

Total Contract Cost: $\frac{76,646.57}{100}$ = Orig Cost: $\frac{84,076.57}{100}$ + Amended Cost: $\frac{(7,430.00)}{100}$

Amended cost for: Change in subcontractor and resulting reduction in project cost.

Amended cost for: \sim Overrun

 \sim Additional Work

Number of Amendments **1**

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Rating			
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	X			
2. Work Performance	X .			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	x			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	x			
5. Project related cooperation	X			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	X			
7. Contract administration cooperation		X		
8. Invoices and progress reports		X		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		1		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager: rench Karlene French

Print Name

Contract Administra

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Product delivered without need for corrections and with little assistance from Mn/DOT. Report clearly provided rationale for investigation decisions and data evaluation. Project manager routinely was informed of project status. Contractor resolved all problems with field operations with minimal direction from Mn/DOT. Product was delivered in a timely fashion and project came in under budget.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

^a Report on Professional/Technical Contracts Over \$50,000

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number: A48196	
Yaggy Colby Associates			
Project Name (if applicable): TH 34 Pre-Design	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 78469 W.O. 3	Project Duration (Dates): 5-6-2003 to 3-1-2005	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include			
	ang why it was necessary to cr		
The purpose of the contract was to provide pr Rapids, MN. The pre-design work included th pre-design work is extensive because the proj existing District 2 staff did not have adequate the program.	e geometric layout and the req ject involved reconstructing TH	uired Environmental Assessment. This 34 from a 3 lane road to 5 lane road. The	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:	
6,112 hours	Contract: \$462,884.78	District 2 Consultant Set-Aside	
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:	
NA			
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION	
Carol Molna	A B B B B B B B B B B	6-6-06	
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date	
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration			

C: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

CUNJULIANI PERFURIVIANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>78469 W.O. 3</u> Type of work: <u>Pre-design – Layout and Env. Assessment</u>

District/Office District 2	Work Type	Code: <u>PD</u>		
S.P. <u>2901-18</u> T.H. <u>34</u>	Location: Park	Rapids	le le	A THURSDAY
Contractor: Yaggy Colby	Associates			MAY 2006
Subcontractor: WSB and	d Associates (Noi	ise Analysis)		in the second seco
Subcontractor			1 Ales	CONSULTANT DRV.
Contract Period:	5-6-2003;	March 1, 2005;	<u>March 1, 2005</u>	
	Work Start Date	Completion Date	Expiration Date	5. 7. 5. J. S. 4. 2.
Takal Canturat Cast \$471	02000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	C	A 1. 1 (1 CO	

Total Contract Cost: \$471,938.92 = Orig Cost: \$471,938.92 + Amended Cost: \$0

Amended cost for: \sim Overrun \sim Additional Work Number of Amendments <u>0</u>

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Rating			
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	4			
2. Work Performance	4			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		3		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	4			
5. Project related cooperation	4			
6. QA/QC plan conformance		3		
7. Contract administration cooperation	4			
8. Invoices and progress reports	4			
 Cost estimation/budget management 	4			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points <u>34</u> (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager: osem 5. Mikuon Joe McKinnon (Print Name

Contract Administrator: McKnim 5. usen Joe McKinnon (Print Name

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: University of Minnesota	<u> </u>	CFMS Contract Number: A49852
Project Name (if applicable): Preliminary Laboratory Investigation of a Commercial Enzyme Solution as a Soil Stabilizer	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81655, WO 79	Project Duration (Dates): 7/1/2003 – 7/31/2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	ter into a contract:
 Investigate the stabilization mech potential value for road construction 		nzyme solution to better understand the
2. Perform laboratory experiments to		·
		offers superior mechanical properties tory and field performance data already
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$58,996.00	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
N/A		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objection		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION
Carol Molnau, L. Governor/Commissioner	nau	6 - 6 - 0 6 Date
CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Agreement No. <u>81655, WC</u>	<u>) 79</u>	lype of work	
District/Office Investment	Management	_	
Contractor University of N	linnesota		
Contract Period: <u>7/1/2003</u> Start Dat		7/31/2005 Expiration Date	
Original Contract Cost	Ame	ndment Cost(s)	Final Cost:
\$58,996.00	+ \$N/A	=	\$58,996.00

Item Rating	Rating				
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality		3			
2. Work Performance		3			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		3			
 Deliverables Complete and on time 		3			
5. Project related cooperation		3			
6. QA/QC plan conformance (N/A)	N/A	3			
7. Contract administration cooperation		3			
8. Invoices and progress reports		3			
 Cost estimation/budget management 		3	ж.		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

Duane A. Blanck & Greg Johnson

Total Points ____27___ (Maximum points 36 32)

Contract Administrator:

Cory Johnson

Definitions:

Above Average:	
• Ŭ	Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
•	Contractor performs beyond expectations.
•	Deliverables exceed standards.
	Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
	Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
	Contractor needs little or no direction.
	Contractor responsive to requests.
• •	Contractor suggests improvements.
Average	contractor suggests improvements.
	Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
	Deliverables meet standards.
	Project is on time and budget.
	Project is on time and budget. Project Manager is informed of key milestones.
Below Average:	Froject wanager is informed of key milestones.
	Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
	Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
	Project is behind schedule or over budget.
Poor:	Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.
	Contractor requires evenesive quidence or direction
	Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
	Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
	Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
•	Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
•	Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Evaluation was completed by the contract administrator, and with the best knowledge available to the contract administrator per the ARTS database comments. The project manager (Duane A. Blanck) was unable to comment in any sort of a timely fashion. Repeated requests were solicited and no comments were received over the time frame of 1 and ½ months.

From:Cory JohnsonTo:Duane BlanckDate:5/18/06 7:42AMSubject:Re: Fwd: Evaluation for Agreement 81655, WO 79 - Preliminary LaboratoryInvestigation of a Commercia

Duane - Any luck getting this thing wrapped up? Thanks Cory

>>> "Duane Blanck" <Duane.Blanck@co.crow-wing.mn.us> 05/12/06 11:00 AM >>> Cory:

I will try to get at things over the weekend - I have been very busy and quite frankly this is not a priority, but I did make the commitment to be involved and I will follow-up accordingly.

Duane

>>> "Cory Johnson" <<u>Cory.Johnson@dot.state.mn.us</u>> 05/12/06 10:29 AM >>> Duane and/or Greg- I have not heard anything from either of you guys. Are you still working on this evaluation?

Cory

Duane and/or Greg-

My information indicates that you guys are the TL for this old research project. I believe that this project is completely done and the report is on the web but we need to complete the attached evaluation before any final payments can be executed. Please complete this evaluation form and return it to me ASAP.

Thanks Cory

Cory Johnson, P.E. Research Management Engineer First Floor North, MS 330 395 John Ireland Blvd St. Paul MN 55155 Ph. 651-205-4698 Fax. 651-297-2354 cory.johnson@dot.state.mn.us

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	o 680 along with the final invoice.		
Agency:				
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		OFMO Contract Number		
Contractor Name: SRF Consulting Group, Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A64492		
Project Name (if applicable):	Project Duration (Dates):			
Right of Way Acquisition for TH 52	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates).		
Design-Build in Oronoco, Olmsted	86595	8/05/04 - 3/31/06		
County				
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ling why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:		
•				
The State contracted with SRF Consulting				
for the construction of State Project (SP) 5				
available with the expertise required to con	mplete this work within the h	lecessary timeline.		
· · · ·				
•				
Dilloble Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Chant on	Source of Euroding		
Billable Hours (if applicable): 1900.3	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$271,211.02	Source of Funding: State and Federal Funds		
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
Not Applicable				
Not Applicable				
	1. A.			
	χ.			
		· · · · · ·		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objective		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall		
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:)		
performance in meeting the terms and objective)		
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION		
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:)		
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION		
performance in meeting the terms and objective SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION 6-5-06		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Contractor Name: Kadrmas, Lee and Jockson Inc. Project Name (if applicable): Mn/DOT Agreement No.:		CFMS Contract Number: A83822				
Project Name (if applicable): HARN Observation – Phase II	Project Duration (Dates): 12/05 – 5/30/06					
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:						
The purpose of the contract is to provide a	National Geodetic Survey in D	etroit Lakes				
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$98,000.00	Source of Funding: OLM Consultant Budget				
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the second se	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:				
		· ·				
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall						
	performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION					
Carol Moenau	L	6-5-06				
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date				

c: File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

M

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.		A64492
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Right of Way Acquisition for TH 52		
Design-Build in Oronoco, Olmsted	86595	8/05/04 – 3/31/06
County		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
The State contracted with SRF Consulting for the construction of State Project (SP) 5 available with the expertise required to con	508-84 on TH 52 in Oronoco.	. The State did not have sufficient staff
		·
		· · ·
		, ,
		5
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
1900.3	Contract: \$271,211.02	State and Federal Funds
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the second se		
Not Applicable	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Not Applicable	·	
Not Applicable	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Not Applicable		
Not Applicable	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Not Applicable	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Not Applicable Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	

cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Mn/DOT Contract No.: <u>86595</u> District/Office: <u>District 6</u>

Type of work: <u>Right of Way Acquisition for TH 52 Design-Build in Oronoco, Olmsted County</u>

Work Type Code: <u>DB – Design-Build</u>

S.P.: <u>5508-84</u>

T.H.: <u>52</u>

Location: <u>TH 52: from the Junction of 59th Avenue NW to the Junction of 85th Street in Oronoco</u>

Contractor: <u>SRF Consulting Group, Inc.</u>

Subcontractors: <u>Springer Appraisal Associates, Inc. and Conworth, Inc.</u>

Contract Period:	August 5, 2004 ;	March 31, 2006 ;	March 31, 2006	_ MAY 2008	1937 1947 1947
	Work Start Date	Work Completion Date	Expiration Date	(a≞ r'ED	ent.
Total Contract C	Cost: \$271,211.02	Orig Cost: \$329,993.20	Amended Cost:	\$0:00 OF	A.37

Amended for: _____ Overrun ___X Additional Time Number of Amendments:

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Rating						
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point			
1. Product Quality		X					
2. Work Performance		Х					
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		Х					
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		Х					
5. Project related cooperation		X					
6. QA/QC plan conformance		Х					
7. Contract administration cooperation		×					
8. Invoices and progress reports		×					
9. Cost estimation/budget management		\times					

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

(Jai Kalsy) Print Name

Total Points: <u>27</u>

(Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: (*Q*raig Lenz) Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor. copy to Jeff Brunner. Director. Consultant Services Section. MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direct from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manager is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Actual costs came in under budget. When proposing to work with 40+ property owners' assumptions were made a to the number of visits each particular owner may require in order to reach a settlement. SRF Right of Way Specialists were very conscious of their productive time and on this particular project were very successful in scheduling visits with multiple owners on each of the trips made to Oronoco.

Project Manager recommends that Contractor's fixed fee be reduced to reflect the agreed upon fixed fee % (15%) based on actual hours expended rather than budgeted amount.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

a contract.		
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	CFMS Contract Number: A79906
University of Minnesota		
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Instrumentation of a Full Depth Precast	81655 WO 187	9/1/2005-12/30/2005
Concrete Bridge Deck System		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, incl	uding why it was necessary to e	enter into a contract:
	during why it was neededary to t	
The objective of this project is to instrument Data collection and analysis will be done as		loped for rapid replacement/construction.
· · ·		
		I Source of Funding.
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain v	Contract: \$67,305.50	Federal & Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w N/A Evaluate the performance of the work include	Contract: \$67,305.50 why the agency determined the	Federal & Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services:
If this was a single source contract, explain w	Contract: \$67,305.50 why the agency determined the	Federal & Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services:
If this was a single source contract, explain w N/A Evaluate the performance of the work include performance in meeting the terms and object	Contract: \$67,305.50 why the agency determined the	Federal & Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services: or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
If this was a single source contract, explain w N/A Evaluate the performance of the work include performance in meeting the terms and object	Contract: \$67,305.50 why the agency determined the ing an appraisal of the contract tives of the contract:	Federal & Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services: or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
If this was a single source contract, explain w N/A Evaluate the performance of the work include performance in meeting the terms and object	Contract: \$67,305.50 why the agency determined the ing an appraisal of the contract tives of the contract:	Federal & Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services: or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
If this was a single source contract, explain w N/A Evaluate the performance of the work include performance in meeting the terms and object	Contract: \$67,305.50 why the agency determined the ing an appraisal of the contract tives of the contract:	Federal & Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services: or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall EVALUATION
If this was a single source contract, explain w N/A Evaluate the performance of the work include performance in meeting the terms and object	Contract: \$67,305.50 why the agency determined the ing an appraisal of the contract tives of the contract:	Federal & Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services: or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
If this was a single source contract, explain w N/A Evaluate the performance of the work include performance in meeting the terms and object	Contract: \$67,305.50 why the agency determined the ing an appraisal of the contract tives of the contract:	Federal & Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services: or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall EVALUATION

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

				- ·					
nstructions:	Submit this	form to (Concultant	Services	Section	Mail Ston	680 alonc	i with the fin	al invoice
nau ucuona.	Submit this		Jongunann	OCI VICCO		man otop			ui illivoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Contractor Name: Kadrmas, Lee and Jocks	CFMS Contract Number: A83822					
Project Name (if applicable): HARN Observation – Phase II						
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:						
The purpose of the contract is to provide a National Geodetic Survey in Detroit Lakes						
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding: OLM Consultant				
	Contract: \$98,000.00	Budget				
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:				
	· · ·					
		-				
		,				
		x				
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:						
	SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION					
Paulonaus						
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	r	6 - 5 - 0 6 Date				
		Date				

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 89001	Type of work: Harn Observations Detroit Lakes-Phase II				
District/Office: Detroit Lakes	Work Type Code: SU				
S.P. NA T.H.: NA		Location:		STELL	K 2627
Contractor: Kadrmas, Lee and Jacks	on Inc.				ang Sta
Subcontractor		,	·	(22 MAL	
Subcontractor			r 06	E contraction	ANT SERV. C
Contract Period:		4-01-06	5-30-06 Expiration Date	Constant of the second	
Work Start Date	Work Com	pletion Date	Expiration Date	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	6,8,1,2
Total Contract Cost: \$98,000.00 = 0	Orig Cost: \$98	,000.00	+ Amended	Cost: \$	
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	~ Additional	Work Nurr	nber of Amendr	ients	
Item Rating		Ra	ting]
1 - 6 by Project Manager	· · · ·				
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above	T	Below		-
	Above	Average	Average	Poor	
	4 Points	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point	
1. Product Quality	X				
2. Work Performance	Х			•	
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT	X				
Standards/Requirements	37				-
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	X				
5. Project related cooperation	X				
6. QA/QC plan conformance	X	· · ·			
7. Contract administration cooperation	X				
8. Invoices and progress reports	Χ				
9. Cost estimation/budget management	X				

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: 5/23/2001 John Barke) Print Name

Total Points __36 (Maximum points 36) Contract Administrator: -23-06 TU (Cathie Ashlin) Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name: University of Minnesota	r.	CFMS Contract Number: A79906	
Project Name (if applicable): Instrumentation of a Full Depth Precast Concrete Bridge Deck System	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81655 WO 187	Project Duration (Dates): 9/1/2005-12/30/2005	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ	ling why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:	
The objective of this project is to instrument a Data collection and analysis will be done as pa		ped for rapid replacement/construction.	
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$67,305.50	Source of Funding: Federal & Trunk Highway	
If this was a single source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:	
N/A			
• •			
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall			
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Caroensoe	nau	6-5-06	
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date	

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No81655 WO 187	Type of worl			
District/Office _Investment Manager	nent	V	Work Type Cod	le <u>f</u>
S.PN/A T.H	N/A Loca	ution		
Contractor _University of Minnesota				
Subcontractor	· .			
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: 09/01/2005 833165, Work Start Date	12/30/2005 Work Completion	;_12/30/2005 Date Expiration	Date	
Total Contract Cost: \$67,305.50_	= Orig Cost: \$	67,305.50_+	Amended Cost	:: \$NA
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	\sim Additional	Work Num	ber of Amendn	nents0
Item Rating		Rat	ing	
1 - 6 by Project Manager7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator				
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	х			
2. Work Performance	х			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		Х.		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X		
5. Project related cooperation		X		
6. QA/QC plan conformance	ж. 19	Х		
7. Contract administration cooperation		X		
8. Invoices and progress reports		8		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		¥.		
Contractor's rating for this contract:		Total Point (Maximum r		N

Project Manager: Keith Molnau – Erik Wolhowe

my Hardin Contract Administrator: Jim Klessig

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

		o 680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Commonwealth Cultural R	Resources Group, Inc.	CFMS Contract Number:
Project Name (if applicable): Development of a Deep Site Testing Protocol for Pre-Historic Archaeological Sites	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 85878	Project Duration (Dates): 3/17/2004 – 2/28/2006
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:
The project tested the cost effectiveness of se meter) pre-historic archaeological sites. From for Mn/DOT to follow when there is a potential where archaeological sites might be present a n compliance with Section 106 in such instan- nave the staff or the specific expertise to conc	n the results of these investigat I that Mn/DOT projects might in at some depth. This protocol w ces. The consultant contract w	tions, the consultants developed a protocol mpact places (such as river valley deposits <i>i</i> ill help Mn/DOT save both time and money
Billable Hours (if applicable):3402	Total Amount Spent on Contract:\$349,995.99	Source of Funding:
f this was a single source contract, explain wh		e was only a single source for the services:
	.,	
	.*	
•		
valuate the performance of the work includin		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
valuate the performance of the work includin erformance in meeting the terms and objectiv		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
erformance in meeting the terms and objective		
erformance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION
erformance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:	

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Aconova		
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:	÷	CFMS Contract Number:
Short Elliott Hendrickson Inc. (SEH)		A75503
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
The Regional Transportation Management	88026	May 16, 2005 – March 31, 2006
Center (RTMC) Emergency Operations		
Center Operations Plan	·	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to en	iter into a contract:
The above referenced contract was neces Mn/DOT using the Regional Transportation EOC. The EOC is directly related to the dowill serve as the physical location for Mn/D ERP. For purposes of completing the EOC documents applicable to Mn/DOT, including amendment to the original contract was we Plan (ERP). The Mn/DOT staff member we new role within Mn/DOT prior to the complex knowledge of what was needed to complex smooth transition of staff in Mn/DOT's Offer	on Management Center (RTI evelopment of Mn/DOT's En DOT to carry out the emerge C plan, the Contractor review ng the draft ERP. Additional ritten, to assist in completion tho was originally responsible letion of the ERP. As such, the tet the ERP with minimal effort	MC) as the primary location for the nergency Response Plan (ERP) as it ncy responsibilities specified in the ved emergency management services were needed, and an n of the Mn/DOT Emergency Response e for completion of the ERP took on a the Contractor was able to step in with ort to get up-to-speed and ensure a
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
580	Contract: \$95,713.46	Consultant
If this was a single source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
· · · ·		7
·		
		<i>б</i> .
Evaluate the performance of the work including		's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objective		
SEE ATTACHED CON	SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION
Carol Molnaec Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	_	5-23-06 Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Cambridge Systematics		A42586
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Mileage Based User Fees Demonstration	83110	November 1, 2002 – April 30, 2006
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to er	
To develop and conduct a demonstration proj incentives and/or by simulating the replaceme based on mileage or time-of-day travel.	ect that tested price elasticities ent of fixed costs of ownership/l	of driving behavior by offering financial leasing and operation with fees or charges
		ж
		,
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
NA	Contract: \$950,034.00	Federal and Pooled Funds
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
		, ,
NA		
	*	
*		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
*		×
r		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract.	
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
ALL TSolnai	<u> </u>	5-23-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		
		Date
cc: File		

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Agreement No. 83110

Type of work Research

District/Office: Office of Investment Mangement

Contractor: Cambridge Systematics

Contract Period: November 1, 2002; April 30, 2006 Start Date Expiration Date

Original Contract Cost		Amendn	nent Cost(s)	Final Cost:
\$950,034.00	+	\$0		=	\$950,034.00

Item Rating	Rating			
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	V			·
2. Work Performance	i			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		V		
 Deliverables Complete and on time 		~		
5. Project related cooperation				
6. QA/QC plan conformance (N/A)	N/A			
7. Contract administration cooperation				
 Invoices and progress reports 		V		
 Cost estimation/budget management 		v		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

11

12

Total Points 27(Maximum points 36 32)

Project Manager:

multo

Contract Administrator:



Comments:

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

nstructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.			
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name: Commonwealth Cultural R	esources Group, Inc.	CFMS Contract Number:	
Project Name (if applicable): Development of a Deep Site Testing Protocol for Pre-Historic Archaeological Sites	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 85878	Project Duration (Dates): 3/17/2004 – 2/28/2006	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:			
The project tested the cost effectiveness of several available methods for detecting the presence of deeply buried (> 1 meter) pre-historic archaeological sites. From the results of these investigations, the consultants developed a protocol for Mn/DOT to follow when there is a potential that Mn/DOT projects might impact places (such as river valley deposits) where archaeological sites might be present at some depth. This protocol will help Mn/DOT save both time and money in compliance with Section 106 in such instances. The consultant contract was necessary because Mn/DOT does not have the staff or the specific expertise to conduct such studies.			
Billable Hours (if applicable):3402	Total Amount Spent on Contract:\$349,995.99	Source of Funding:	
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:	
		, ,	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	
performance in meeting the terms and object			
performance in meeting the terms and object	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION	
performance in meeting the terms and objection SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract:		

cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 858	Type of work	Cultural Resources Consulting
District/Office <u>En</u>	vironmental Services	Work Type Code <u>CR</u>
S.P	T.H	Location
Contractor _Comm	onwealth Cultural Resources (Group, Inc.
Subcontractor Haye	es and Monaghan, Geoarchaeo	logists
Subcontractor Strat	a Morph Geoexploration, Inc.	
Subcontractor <u>Glen</u>	n A. Black Laboratory of Arch	naeology, Indiana University
Contract Period: <u>5/1</u> Work	17/2004 ; 2/28/2006 Start Date Work Completion	in Date Expiration Date
Total Contract Cost	: \$349,995.99 = Orig Cost:	<u> 349,995.99</u> + Amended Cost: \$ <u>0</u>
Amended cost for:	Overrun D Additional	Work Number of Amendments <u>1 (time extension)</u>

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	pr		Rating	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	4			
2. Work Performance	4			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	4			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time			2	
5. Project related cooperation	4			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	4			
7. Contract administration cooperation		X		
8. Invoices and progress reports		X		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		×		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points 3 (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator 16/06 Ashl Print Name

Project Manager:

Elizabet tolla (Elizabeth Hobbs) Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

The Consultant did excellent quality work. However, they fell behind schedule during the field work phase of the project and never caught up. Consequently, the Consultant had to request a time extension to complete the final report. I should point out that this was a very ambitious project. This consultant proposed more field work than anyone else who bid on the project, and for a lower cost. We got excellent value from them, despite the slightly longer time frame (they delivered the final report three months later than the original deadline). Moreover, the quality of their work on this project was much higher than I've seen in my previous experience with Mn/DOT consultants.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name: Retrofit Recycling, Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A76052	
Project Name (if applicable): Regulated Waste Removal on SP5508-84 (TH 52) and SP 5509-62 (TH 63)	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88117	Project Duration (Dates): May 31, 2005 – Feb. 28, 2006	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:			
The State contracted with Retrofit Recycling, Inc. to provide assistance in the removal and disposal of regulated waste from right of way for the construction of State Projects (SP) 5508-84 on TH 52 in Oronoco and SP 5509-62 on TH 63 in Rochester. The State did not have sufficient staff available with the expertise required to complete this work within the necessary timeline.			
Billable Hours (if applicable): Not Applicable	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$63,671.38	Source of Funding: District 6 Allocation, State Funds	
If this was a single source contract, explain w	by the agency determined there	was apply a single assures for the services.	
	ny the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:	
Not Applicable	ny the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:	
Not Applicable	ny the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:	
Not Applicable	ny the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:	
Not Applicable	ny the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:	
Not Applicable	ny the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:	
Not Applicable	ny the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:	
Not Applicable	ny the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:	
Not Applicable	ny the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:	
Not Applicable Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ng an appraisal of the contractor		
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ng an appraisal of the contractor	's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ng an appraisal of the contractor ves of the contract:	's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	

cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Mn/DOT Contract No.: <u>88117</u> District/Office: <u>District 6</u>

Type of work: <u>Regulated Waste Removal</u>

Work Type Code: <u>AB – Asbestos Abatement</u>

S.P.: <u>5508-84 & 5509-62</u> T.H.: <u>52 & 63</u>

Location: Along TH 63 in Rochester and Along TH 52 in Oronoco

Contractor: <u>Retrofit Recycling, Inc.</u>

Subcontractor: None

Contract Period: <u>May 31, 2005</u> ;	February 28, 2006 ;	March 31, 2006
Work Start Date	Work Completion Date	Expiration Date
Total Contract Cost: <u>\$63,671.38</u>	Orig Cost: <u>\$45,750.00</u>	Amended Cost: <u>\$17,921.38</u>

Amended for: <u>X</u> Overrun

_ Additional Work

Number of Amendments: 1

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ing	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	X		- 15	
2. Work Performance	X			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	Х			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	X		· · ·	
5. Project related cooperation	Х			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	X			
7. Contract administration cooperation	X			
8. Invoices and progress reports	X			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		X		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

roject Manager

for(Craig Hansen) Print Name

Total Points: <u>35</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: (Craig Lenz) Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

The Contractor was very responsive to requests by the Right of Way Office in District 6, and timely in scheduling and delivering the required products. The Contractor's Project Manager (Dan Harrington) did a good job of coordinating with the District Office, and always clarified concerns before proceeding with work. They also did a good job of supplying documents and reports. The State's Project Manager recommends full payment for services provided by the Contractor with high rating of performance.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Short Elliott Hendrickson Inc. (SEH)		CFMS Contract Number: A75503
Project Name (if applicable): The Regional Transportation Management Center (RTMC) Emergency Operations	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88026	Project Duration (Dates): May 16, 2005 – March 31, 2006
Center Operations Plan		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ	ling why it was necessary to en	ter into a contract:
The above referenced contract was neces Mn/DOT using the Regional Transportation EOC. The EOC is directly related to the da will serve as the physical location for Mn/I ERP. For purposes of completing the EOC documents applicable to Mn/DOT, includin amendment to the original contract was we Plan (ERP). The Mn/DOT staff member we new role within Mn/DOT prior to the complex knowledge of what was needed to complex smooth transition of staff in Mn/DOT's Off	on Management Center (RTI evelopment of Mn/DOT's En DOT to carry out the emerge C plan, the Contractor review ng the draft ERP. Additional ritten, to assist in completion tho was originally responsibl letion of the ERP. As such, the the ERP with minimal effe	MC) as the primary location for the nergency Response Plan (ERP) as it ncy responsibilities specified in the ved emergency management services were needed, and an n of the Mn/DOT Emergency Response e for completion of the ERP took on a the Contractor was able to step in with ort to get up-to-speed and ensure a
Billable Hours (if applicable): 580	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$95,713.46	Source of Funding: Consultant
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objection		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		5-23-06 Date

cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No88026 District/Office: Homeland Security E	Type of	work Professio	nal Technical	Planning St
District/Office: Homeland Security E	Emergency Mar	nagement	Work Type Co	te PS
S.PN/A T.H. N	J/A			
Location				
Contractor Short Elliott Hendrickson				
Subcontractor				
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: May 16, 2005; Work Start Date	March 31, 2006;			
Total Contract Cost: \$95,713.46 = Or	rig Cost: \$57,8'	79.46 + Amend	led Cost: \$37,38	34.00
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	E Additional V	Work Num	ber of Amendm	ents 2
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ting	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		X		
2. Work Performance	X			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	X			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X		
5. Project related cooperation	Х			
6. QA/QC plan conformance			X	
7. Contract administration cooperation	×			
8. Invoices and progress reports	×			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		×		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

Cathy Clark Print Name

Total Points 36)

Contract Administrator: w MELISSAM ыnm Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

We were very happy with the product delivered by the consultant under the original contract, which was for the development of the Regional Transportation Management Center (RTMC) Emergency Operations Center Operations Plan. The comments and the scoring for ratings below *above average* address the amended work process involving Mn/DOT's Emergency Response Plan document.

The contractor requested additional time for document development and preparation, which resulted in a delay affecting the internal agency internal review process. After the final project meeting, the consultant delivered a final work product containing many typographical errors, requiring an unexpected and additional internal document review.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Veit Environmental, Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A65482
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Asbestos Abatement for TH 63 in Rochest		July 27, 2004 to December 16, 2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to ent	er into a contract:
The State contracted with Veit Environmer asbestos containing materials from right-o Rochester. The State did not have sufficie within the necessary timeline.	of-way for the construction of	State Project (SP) 5509-62 on TH 63 in
	λ	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
Not Applicable		District 6 Allocation, State Funds
If this was a single source contract evoluin w	hy the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:
If this was a single source contract, explain w Not Applicable	hy the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:
	hy the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:
	hy the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:
	ng an appraisal of the contractor	
Not Applicable Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object	ng an appraisal of the contractor	's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Not Applicable Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objection SEE ATTACHED CON	ng an appraisal of the contractor ves of the contract: NSULTANT PERFORMANCE E	s timeliness, quality, cost, and overall VALUATION $5 - 23 - 06$
Not Applicable Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objection SEE ATTACHED CON	ng an appraisal of the contractor ves of the contract: NSULTANT PERFORMANCE E	s timeliness, quality, cost, and overall VALUATION

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Mn/DOT Contract No.: <u>83116 WO4</u>	District/Office:	District 6		
Type of work: <u>Asbestos Abatement</u>	-			
Work Type Code: <u>AB – Asbestos Aba</u>	tement			Reparts E
S.P.: <u>5509-62</u> T.H.:	63			
Location: Along TH 63 in Rochester	_		act.	SULTANT SEDA
Contractor: <u>Veit Environmental, Inc.</u>	-			
Subcontractor: <u>None</u>				CC 22 12 12 20 20
Contract Period: <u>July 27, 2004</u> ; Work Start Date	December 16, 2 Work Complet		March 31, 2006 Expiration Date	
Total Contract Cost: <u>\$83,637.63</u> C	Drig Cost: <u>\$48,8</u>	30.00 Amen	ded Cost: <u>\$34,8</u>	807.63
Amended for: X_Overrun X	Addi	itional Work	Number of Am	endments: <u>4</u>
Item Rating		Rat	ing	
1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator				
1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
	Average	Ŭ	Average	
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Average 4 Points	Ŭ	Average	
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator1. Product Quality	Average 4 Points X	Ŭ	Average	
 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 2. Work Performance 3. Conformance with Mn/DOT 	Average 4 Points X X	Ŭ	Average	
 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 2. Work Performance 3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and 	Average 4 Points X X X X	Ŭ	Average	
 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 2. Work Performance 3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and on time 	Average 4 Points X X X X X	Ŭ	Average	

Contractor's rating for this contract:

8. Invoices and progress reports

9. Cost estimation/budget

management

Project Manager:

€or(Craig Hansen) Print Name

Total Points: <u>34</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: (Craig Lenz) Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

X

X

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

The Contractor produced a work product that is satisfactory to State's staff. The Contractor's Project Manager (Mr. Scott Lodico) was responsive and timely to the District 6 Right of Way Office's requests and timeline for asbestos abatement on SP 5509-62. The Contractor was willing to do extra work as required when unidentified asbestos materials were discovered. The Contract was amended for additional costs and time extension for the Contractor to complete the extra work discovered during the project. The State's Project Manager recommends full payment for services provided by the Contractor with high rating of performance.

÷.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultar	nt Servic	es Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	1		
Contractor Name: Veit Environmental, Inc.		×.	CFMS Contract Number: A65482
Project Name (if applicable): Asbestos Abatement for TH 63 in Rochest		In/DOT Agreement No 3116 WO4	 Project Duration (Dates): July 27, 2004 to December 16, 2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu-	ding why	it was necessary to er	ter into a contract:
The State contracted with Veit Environment asbestos containing materials from right-or Rochester. The State did not have sufficient within the necessary timeline.	of-way fe	or the construction of	State Project (SP) 5509-62 on TH 63 in
	-		
Billable Hours (if applicable): Not Applicable		mount Spent on ct: \$83,637.63	Source of Funding: District 6 Allocation, State Funds
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the a	gency determined there	was only a single source for the services:
Not Applicable			
			· · ·
		λ	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti			r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
	ISULTAI	NT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION
SEE ATTACHED CON			
Carol Moenau	_	-	5.23-06
Caral Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	-		ゴーコヨー 06 Date

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c),

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: READEX RESEARCH, INC.		CFMS Contract Number: A84379
Project Name (if applicable): COMMUNITY CONSTRUCTION EVALUATION STUDY	Mn/DOT Contract N 89111	Project Duration (Dates): 12/13/05 - 4/28/06
Summarize the purpose of the Contract, including why The State feels that different highway construction projects public, regardless of project scope. It is believed that in son consistent throughout the project, while in other cases, publ the evaluation of several projects throughout the state to rep to understand the differences in opinion resulting from certa on future projects. The State would like to understand how best to ensure positi	throughout the state garne ne cases, public reaction (j ic reaction shifts during th resent different project typ in construction projects in	er different reactions from the positive or negative) remains the course of the project. By using pes and situations, the State wants in order to improve public opinion
Specifically, the State would like to understand:	ive public experience uno	ugnout the course of a project.
 Initial public reaction to the project and whether tha If initial public reaction to the project was negative, What steps, taken before the onset of a project, are What steps, taken during a project, can change public Evaluation of various highway construction project aspects of construction such as managing traffic, ad include evaluation criteria specific to an individual 	why it was; more likely to lead to positi ic opinion from negative to from the public's point of herence to schedules and t	tive initial reaction; to positive; and, f view, concerning different
Billable Hours (if applicable):Total AmouN/A\$81,020.00	int Spent on Contract:	Source of Funding: TRUNK HIGHWAY
If this was a single source Contract, explain why the age services:	ncy determined there wa	
N/A		
Evaluate the performance of the work including an approver overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives		timeliness, quality, cost and
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT	PERFORMANCE EVAL	UATION
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	Date	5-19-06
c: P.Stembler, 112 Admin		

J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: HDR Engineering, Inc		CFMS Contract Number: A78935
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Bridge 27V74	87993	8/01/05 thru 4/01/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, incl Final design services for Bridge 27V74. This An/DOT designers were not available to pro etting, consequently consultant services we	s bridge is included in the \$250,0 wide the necessary design serv	000,000 Crosstown Renovation Project.
		•
illeble Lleure (if applicable)	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
1367.5	Contract: \$116,960.52	Trunk Highway
1367.5	Contract: \$116,960.52	Trunk Highway
1367.5	Contract: \$116,960.52	Trunk Highway
1367.5	Contract: \$116,960.52	Trunk Highway
1367.5	Contract: \$116,960.52	Trunk Highway
1367.5	Contract: \$116,960.52	Trunk Highway
1367・5 this was a single source contract, explain w valuate the performance of the work includ	Contract: \$116,960.52 why the agency determined ther ing an appraisal of the contracto	Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the service
this was a single source contract, explain v valuate the performance of the work includ erformance in meeting the terms and objec	Contract: \$116,960.52 why the agency determined ther ing an appraisal of the contracto	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the service

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: URS Corporation		CFMS Contract Number: A81302
Project Name (if applicable): Bridge 27V87	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87995	Project Duration (Dates): 9/21/05 thru 3/17/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
Contractor provided final design services for I included in the Crosstown Renovation Project services in time to meet the construction lettin schedule.	. State design personnel were	not available to provide the required design
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
1,782	Contract: \$111,871.89	State Funds
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
	/	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		5-19-06 Date
L		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

CC:

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

			<u>م</u>	
Agreement No. 87995	Type of work:]	Final Bridge De	esign oc	MAY 2001
District/Office Bridge Office	Work Type Cod	le: <u>BD</u>	10	OFFICE CE
S.P. <u>2782-27V87</u> T.H. <u>35W</u>	Locatio	on: <u>T.H. 35W u</u>	under 50 th St.;	linneapolis 3
Contractor: URS Corporation			k	Elman
Subcontractor: <u>NA</u>				ALL DE DE
Contract Period: <u>Sept. 21, 2005;</u> Work Start Date			<u>Oct. 30, 200</u> Expiration E	
Total Contract Cost: <u>\$111,871.89</u> =	= Orig Cost: <u>\$11</u>	1,871.89 + A	mended Cost: §	0.00
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	~ Additional		ber of Amendn	nents: <u>None</u>
Item Rating		Ra	ting	
1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator				
	Above	r	Below	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	Average		Average	
 Product Quality Work Performance 	Average	3 Points	Average	
	Average	3 Points X	Average	
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time 	Average	3 Points X X	Average	
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and 	Average	3 Points X X X X X	Average	
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time 	Average	3 Points X X X X X	Average	
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration cooperation 	Average	3 Points X X X X X X X	Average	
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration 	Average	3 Points X X X X X X X X X X X	Average	

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

Print Name

Maniula Louis)

Total Points 27 (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: Ko (Robert J. Miller)

Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680
Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

At 30% plan review, the flange plate thickness was large. We provided the optimum plate

thickness.

60% plan was not delivered

The 95% plan was delivered two weeks later than the contract date.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: URS Corporation	* ₁	CFMS Contract Number: A81302
Project Name (if applicable): Bridge 27V87	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87995	Project Duration (Dates): 9/21/05 thru 3/17/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
Contractor provided final design services for included in the Crosstown Renovation Projec services in time to meet the construction lettin schedule.	t. State design personnel were	not available to provide the required design
•		
	<i>}</i>	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
1,782	Contract: \$111,871.89	State Funds
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
		. *
	*	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
Care Molnau		5-19-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

CC:

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c),

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Contractor Name: READEX RESEARCH, INC.		CFMS Contract Number : A84379			
Project Name (if applicable): COMMUNITY CONSTRUCTION EVALUATION STUDY	Mn/DOT Contract N 89111	Droject Duration (<i>Dates</i>): 12/13/05 – 4/28/06			
STODY Summarize the purpose of the Contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a Contract: The State feels that different highway construction projects throughout the state garner different reactions from the public, regardless of project scope. It is believed that in some cases, public reaction (positive or negative) remains consistent throughout the project, while in other cases, public reaction shifts during the course of the project. By using the evaluation of several projects throughout the state to represent different project types and situations, the State wants to understand the differences in opinion resulting from certain construction projects in order to improve public opinion on future projects. The State would like to understand how best to ensure positive public experience throughout the course of a project.					
 Initial public reaction to the project and whether tha If initial public reaction to the project was negative, What steps, taken before the onset of a project, are r What steps, taken during a project, can change public Evaluation of various highway construction projects 	 Specifically, the State would like to understand: Initial public reaction to the project and whether that reaction changed by the end of the project; If initial public reaction to the project was negative, why it was; What steps, taken before the onset of a project, are more likely to lead to positive initial reaction; What steps, taken during a project, can change public opinion from negative to positive; and, Evaluation of various highway construction projects from the public's point of view, concerning different aspects of construction such as managing traffic, adherence to schedules and feelings of safety. This may 				
Billable Hours (if applicable):Total AmouN/A\$81,020.00	nt Spent on Contract:	Source of Funding: TRUNK HIGHWAY			
If this was a single source Contract, explain why the agen services: N/A	ncy determined there wa	s only a single source for the			
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the Contract:					
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION					
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	Date	5-19-06			

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No89111	Type of work	Market Res	earch Study	
District/Office <u>OIM</u>	Work Type	e CodeMR		
S.P T.H	Lo	cation		
Contractor _Readex Research				
Subcontractor				
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: <u>12/13/05</u> Work Start Date	_; 4/28/06; 7/3 Work Completion	1/06 Date Expiration	Date	
Total Contract Cost: \$81,020	= Orig Cost: \$8	1,020 + Amen	ded Cost: \$0	
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	\sim Additional V	Work Num	ber of Amendm	ents 0_
Item Rating		Rat	ing	
1 - 6 by Project Manager7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator				
	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor
1. Product Quality	4 Points	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point
2. Work Performance	4			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	4			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	4			
5. Project related cooperation	4			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	4			
7. Contract administration cooperation	*			
8. Invoices and progress reports	×			
9. Cost estimation/budget management	×			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

)

Total Points <u>36</u> (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager:

Lori Laflin (

Print Name

Contract Administrator: Manegr w Melissa Musinnis) Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Note: final report delayed due to unforeseen circumstances. This delay was approved by the Project Manager. However, the deliverables themselves were excellent and met our needs completely. In addition, the contractor continued to answer ad hoc questions following the delivery of the final report. These two things, together, moved the rating on 'Deliverables Complete and on Time' from a 3 to a 4.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: HDR Engineering, Inc		CFMS Contract Number: A78935
Project Name (if applicable): Bridge 27V74	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87993	Project Duration (Dates): 8/01/05 thru 4/01/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu	ding why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:
Final design services for Bridge 27V74. This Mn/DOT designers were not available to prov letting, consequently consultant services were	vide the necessary design serv	
	•	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$116,960.52	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined ther	
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and object		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED COI	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		5-19-06 Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sec File		

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>87993</u>		Type of work:	<u>Final Design B</u>	ridge 27V74	
District/Office: <u>Bridge Office</u>	Work Type Code: <u>BD</u>				
S.P. <u>2782-27V74</u> T.H. <u>35W</u>	Location: <u>TH</u>	35W & TH 62	over RR in Min	meapolis	2.V.C.V.
Contractor: HDR Engineering, Inc				3031	123°
Subcontractor: <u>NA</u>				M B	-≪s ≜Y 2 ∩∩e
Contract Period: <u>Aug 1, 2005;</u> Work Start Date	<u>April 1</u> Work Compl		<u>Oct. 1,</u> Expirat	2006 ion Date	DF DF LTANT SER
Total Contract Cost: <u>\$122,384.18</u> = 0	Orig Cost: <u>\$104</u>	. <u>,981.19</u> + Ame	ended Cost: <u>\$17</u>	,402.99	1.11.91.51
Amended cost for: Overrun	X <u>Additional</u>	Work Nu	mber of Amend	ments: <u>1</u>	•
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting		
	Above Average 4 Points	Ra Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1 - 6 by Project Manager	Average	Average	Below Average		
1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Average	Average 3 Points	Below Average		
 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 2. Work Performance 3. Conformance with Mn/DOT 	Average	Average 3 Points X	Below Average		
 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 2. Work Performance 	Average	Average 3 Points X X	Below Average		
 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 2. Work Performance 3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and 	Average	Average <u>3 Points</u> X X X X	Below Average		
 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 2. Work Performance 3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and on time 	Average 4 Points	Average <u>3 Points</u> X X X X	Below Average		
 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 2. Work Performance 3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and on time 5. Project related cooperation 	Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points X X X X X	Below Average		
 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator 1. Product Quality 2. Work Performance 3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and on time 5. Project related cooperation 6. QA/QC plan conformance 7. Contract administration 	Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points X X X X X X	Below Average		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Managor: en f (Duane M Green)

(Duane M Gree Print Name Total Points: <u>28</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator:

(Robe**t** J. Miller) Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Just prior to plan submittal for 95% review the Department required the bridge to be lengthened 5 ft because existing utilities that were expected to be relocated could not be relocated. Contractor acted immediately to revise the bridge plans and as a result the overall project schedule was maintained.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
University of Minnesota		A47146
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Identification of Causal Factors and		Project Baraton (Bateo).
Potential Countermeasures for Fatal	81655, WO 39	January 20, 2002 – October 30, 2005
(and Severe) Rural Crashes		buildary 20, 2002 - 000000 00, 2000
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	l ding why it was passage to a	nter inte a contract:
Summanze the purpose of the contract, include	ang why it was necessary to e	
The primary objective of this project was t possible countermeasures, for fatal and se		actors and, associated with these,
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		с.».
	·	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
N/A	Contract: \$60,000.00	Federal/STIP
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined ther	e was only a single source for the services:
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
N/A		
Ν/Α		
N/A Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object	ives of the contract:	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object		
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object	ives of the contract:	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object	ives of the contract:	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object SEE ATTACHED CON	ives of the contract:	EVALUATION
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object SEE ATTACHED CON	ives of the contract:	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object	ives of the contract:	EVALUATION 5-19-06
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object SEE ATTACHED CON	ives of the contract:	EVALUATION

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Type of work: Research Agreement No. 81655, WO 39

District/Office: Office of Investment Management

Contractor: University of Minnesota

Contract Period: January 20, 2003; October 30, 2005 Start Date **Expiration Date**

Original Contract Co	st	Amendment (Cost(s)	Final Cost:
\$60,000.00	+	\$0	, = ,	\$60,000.00

Item Rating	Rating			
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		3		
2. Work Performance		3		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		3		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time			2	
5. Project related cooperation	4			
6. QA/QC plan conformance (N/A)	N/A	J		
7. Contract administration cooperation		3		
 Invoices and progress reports 		3		
9. Cost estimation/budget management			2	

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points 23 (Maximum points 36 32)

Project Manager:

Marc Briese

Contract Administrator:

Jim Kless



Comments:

Gary Davis was willing to modify the work plan to better accommodate Mn/DOT's wishes. This was in the form of adding the expert panel discussion to the project. This was perhaps the most useful portion of the study to Mn/DOT.

The schedule for this project slid several times. I believe the project finished well over a year later than originally scheduled. There were many reasons that certain tasks could not be completed in the time period in the work plan (modifications to PC Crash for example), nonetheless it was disappointing that a one year project turned into a two and a half year project.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Bolton & Menk Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A81899
Project Name (if applicable): HARN Observation	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88792	Project Duration (Dates): 10/19/05 - 6/30/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ	ding why it was necessary to er	
The purpose of the contract is to provide a	National Geodetic Survey in M	ankato
	·	
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$98,000.00	Source of Funding: OLM Consultant Budget
If this was a single source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
Evaluate the performance of the work including	a an appraisal of the contracto	r's timeliness, quality cost, and everall
performance in meeting the terms and objectiv		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
Carol Molna		5-16-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		 Date

cc: File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

			0
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name:			CFMS Contract Number:
Retrofit Recycling, Inc.			A76052
Project Name (if applicable):		Mn/DOT Agreement No	
Regulated Waste Removal on SP5508-84 (TH 52) and SP 5509-62 (TH 63)		88117	May 31, 2005 – Feb. 28, 2006
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding v	vhy it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
The State contracted with Retrofit Recyclin regulated waste from right of way for the o SP 5509-62 on TH 63 in Rochester. The St to complete this work within the necessary	const ate d	ruction of State Projects id not have sufficient st	s (SP) 5508-84 on TH 52 in Oronoco and
			*
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Tota	al Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
Not Applicable		tract: \$63,671.38	District 6 Allocation, State Funds
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the	agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:
Not Applicable			
* · · · ·			
*			
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objective			r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objection	ves 0		
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISUL"	TANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	au		5-19-06 Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration	-		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Bolton & Menk Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A81899
Project Name (if applicable): HARN Observation	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88792	Project Duration (Dates): 10/19/05 - 6/30/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ	ding why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:
The purpose of the contract is to provide a	National Geodetic Survey in M	lankato.
		RECEIVED MAY 2 5 2006 DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$98,000.00	Source of Funding: OLM Consultant Budget
If this was a single source contract, explain with the source contract, explain with the source of the work including performance in meeting the terms and objection objection.	g an appraisal of the contracto	
	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE I	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	u	5-16-06 Date

JC: File

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 88792	Type of y	work: NGS Su	rvey in Mankato)
District/Office: Mankato	Work Type Code: SU			
S.P. T.H.:	Locat	ion:		
Contractor: Boltin & Menk Inc	4			
Subcontractor				
Subcontractor			(130/0)	
Contract Period: 10/05 10/19/05 Work Start Date	4/06 Work Comp	30/06	6/30/06 6/06 Expiration Date	2
Total Contract Cost: \$98,000.00 =	Orig Cost: \$	+ An	nended Cost: \$	
Amended cost for: ~ Overrun	~ Additional V	Work Num	ber of Amendm	ents
Item Rating		Rat	ting	
1 - 6 by Project Manager7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator				
7-9 by Agreement Auministrator	Above		Below	
	Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	v			
2. Work Performance	X			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	Х	-		· ·
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	Х			
5. Project related cooperation	Х			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	Х			9)
7. Contract administration cooperation	X			
8. Invoices and progress reports	X			
			방법은 동물을 많은 것도 안내 가지를 받았는 것을 했다.	

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: (John Barke) Print Name

Total Points __36 (Maximum points 36) Contract Administrate Æ (Cathie Ashlin) Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Sto	p 680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:	× ,	CFMS Contract Number:
Environmental Troubleshooters, Inc.	A71993	
Project Name (if applicable): S.P. 4912-48 (TH 371) Environmental	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87464	Project Duration (Dates): 12/15/04 To 03/07/06
Assessment / Oversight		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:
The purpose of this agreement was to provide S.P. 4912-48 (TH 371), as directed by the Stablecause the department did not have the nec	ate Project Manager. It was neo	cessary to enter into this agreement
•		
	*	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding: Consultant Services
N/A	Contract: \$100,000.00	Budget Allotment for District 3
N/A		
		•
Evaluate the performance of the work includin		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objection	ves of the contract:	
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE I	EVALUATION
Para Malana	,	5-11-06
Cleroc IV Sorna	\sim	
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
		1
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	ion	

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultar	nt Services Section, Mail Sto	o 680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: STS Consultants, LTD		CFMS Contract Number: A79779
Project Name (if applicable): TH35W/62, Crosstown Bridge Asbestos/Regulated Materials Assessments	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88629	Project Duration (Dates): 8/22/05 – 2/10/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:
To meet MPCA requirements/regulations of a demolition. A total of 20 bridges were assess		and other regulated materials prior to
*		• *
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$58,848.64	Source of Funding: Metro Consultant Allocation
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined ther	e was only a single source for the services:
	с. С	
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objection		
performance in meeting the terms and objecting SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION 5-11-06
performance in meeting the terms and objecting SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency:		p 680 along with the final invoice.
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		-
Contractor Name: LHB Corporation		CFMS Contract Number: A76077
Project Name (if applicable): Bridges 27V78, 27V85 and 27V86	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87634	Project Duration (Dates): June 7, 2005 to March 31, 2006
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to e	
The Contract was for final construction plans Bridge 27V85, T.H. 35W Southbound over Ni Avenue in the City of Richfield. Work on the b used because Mn/DOT did not have design p letting date.	collet Avenue and Bridge 27V pridges is part of the Crosstow	86, T.H. 35W Northbound over Nicollet n revitalization project. A Contractor was
· •		
		•
	Tatal Annant On ant an	O come of Free dia m
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$154,292.41	Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget allotment fo Bridge Office.
this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined the	
	•	
·		
valuate the performance of the work includin	g an appraisal of the contracto	or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
erformance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:	
	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION
SEE ATTACHED CON		
SEE ATTACHED CON	u	5-11-06

File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Contractor Name: Iowa State University		CFMS Contract Number: A67369			
Project Name (if applicable): Cost Effectiveness of Design-Build, and A+B Contracting Techniques	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 82617, WO 7	Project Duration (Dates): 9/9/2004 – 3/31/2006			
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:			
The purpose of this research project is to investigate the effectiveness of using alternative contracting techniques for transportation projects. Specifically, the objectives are to compare performance, cost and value implications of design-build contracts, A+B contracts and lane rental contracts. Specific performance measures will be determined after a thorough literature review, consultation with Dr. Molenaar, and meetings with Mn/DOT managers and engineers. However, prior research in this area, along with Table 5-1 "Performance Framework and Measures" from the Minnesota Statewide Transportation Plan suggest that at a minimum, first cost, cost variation, schedule, safety, project quality, overall value and administrative expenditures should be considered. This research will also identify critical success factors required to maximize the effectiveness of each contracting techniques and compare the three alternative contracting techniques to traditional contracting on relevant performance factors.					
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$86,203.00	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway			
If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services:					
	ing the ageney determined there				
N/A					
N/A Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objectiv	g an appraisal of the contracto				
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objectiv	g an appraisal of the contracto	r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall			
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objective SEE ATTACHED CON	ig an appraisal of the contracto ves of the contract:	r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall			
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objectiv	ig an appraisal of the contracto ves of the contract:	r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall EVALUATION			

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

	· ·				
Agreement No. 82617 WO 7 Typ			07		
District/Office - Investment Manage				1	11110
S.P. 88 016 00670 T.H. – N/A	Location			- 37175	A TO THE
Contractor - Iowa State University				A RO	
Subcontractor					97 210 5 5
Subcontractor		·		100 CO	- SF 1
	1/2006	<u>3/31/2006</u>		KC KC	TANT SERV.
Work Start DateWorkTotal Contract Cost: \$86,203.00= C	k Completion Dat) Exa	
				and the second s	
Amended cost for: Overrun	L Addition	nal Work 1	Number of Ame	endments	
1					
I tem Rating		Ra	ting		
1 - 6 by Project Manager					
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above	I	Below	T	
	Average	Average	Average	Poor	
1. Product Quality	4 Points	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point	
2. Work Performance		×			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT		V			
Standards/Requirements					
4. Deliverables Complete and on time					
5. Project related cooperation		X			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	•••	X			
7. Contract administration cooperation		×			
8 Invoices and progress reports		X			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		×			
Contractor's rating for this contract:		Total Poin (Maximum		Ash leak	pulli
Project Manager: <i>Ihima . Rom</i> Fom Ravn		Contract Adr	ninistrator: VYUVM	Ownerf	130106

Tom Ravn

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:	
AL commuts: Tom Raunt I both c	one in on
the project right at the end it	hafne, we don't
have any comments The folk	the I could
tell was the project was on time 1	then d got it.
	0

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

	CFMS Contract Number: A67369
Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
82617, WO 7	9/9/2004 – 3/31/2006
<u></u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
iding why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:
	din din di lui no fondano di din
ate the effectiveness of using alter	native contracting techniques for transportation m_{i}
	nd administrative expenditures should be
	mize the effectiveness of each contracting
	ontracting on relevant performance factors.
	Source of Funding:
Contract: \$86,203.00	Trunk Highway
hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
· · · · ·	
·	
	11
g an appraisal of the contracto	r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
g an appraisal of the contracto ves of the contract:	r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
ves of the contract:	
ves of the contract:	
ves of the contract:	
ves of the contract:	VALUATION
ves of the contract:	
	82617, WO 7 Iding why it was necessary to e ate the effectiveness of using alter are performance, cost and value im rmance measures will be determin h Mn/DOT managers and enginee asures" from the Minnesota Statew ty, project quality, overall value a il success factors required to maxi racting techniques to traditional co Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$86,203.00

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: University of Minnesota		CFMS Contract Number: A57115		
Project Name (if applicable): Motor Grader and Gravel Road Maintenance Techniques, Training Video and Suggested Instructional Guide	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81655 WO 80	Project Duration (Dates): 1/2/2004 – 12/30/2005		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:		
The objective of the training video and suggested instructional guide is to provide training in performing basic motor grader and gravel road maintenance techniques to staff responsible for these activities. Topics addressed will be: routine surface smoothing, removing shoulder berms, removing washboarding, spreading new gavel, and ditching and back sloping. Incorporating this information into the training video will produce a video that will educate equipment operators on proper motor grader and gravel road maintenance techniques. Better understanding of these techniques by maintenance worker should help insure safer roadways and less gravel lost during this maintenance operation, which should result in an economic savings.				
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:		
N/A	Contract: \$77,000.00	State Aid		
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
		·		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objection		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall		
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	le	5-11-0.6 Date		

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Agreement No	_81655 WO 80
--------------	--------------

Type of work _Research___

District/Office _Investment Management_

Contractor _University of Minnesota___

Contract Period: _1/2/2004____; _12/30/2005____ Start Date Expiration Date

Original Contract Cost	Amendment Cost(s)			Final Cost:
\$68,000.00	+	\$ <u>9,000.00</u>	=	\$_77,000.00

Item Rating	Rating			
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	X		×.	
2. Work Performance	X			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	X			
 Deliverables Complete and on time 	X		(5)	
5. Project related cooperation	X			
6. QA/QC plan conformance (N/A)	N/A			
 Contract administration cooperation 		X		
 Invoices and progress reports 		X		
 Cost estimation/budget management 		X		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

x (future west)

Richard West

Total Points _29____ (Maximum points 36 32)

Contract Administrator:

altMor

Clark Moe



Comments:

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

a contract.				
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: University of Minnesota		CFMS Contract Number: A57388		
Project Name (if applicable): Research Publication and Outreach Services (2004-2006)	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81655, WO 111	Project Duration (Dates): 2/2/2002 – 2/28/2006		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ling why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:		
The objective of this project is to provide assistance to Mn/DOT's Research Services Section with focused efforts in the areas of publishing and disseminating research results and management of the research contracting process.				
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$111,048.00	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway		
If this was a single source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
		-		
N/A				
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	C	5-2-06 Date		
		Duit		

cc: File

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 81655, WO 111	Type of work	Research		
District/Office: OIM	Work Type	Code		
S.PN/A T.H	N/A	Location	N/A	
Contractor <u>University of Minnesota</u>				
Subcontractor				
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: <u>2/2/2002</u> ; <u>2/</u> Work Start Date	28/2006 Work Completion	;2/28/2006_ Date Expiration	Date	
Total Contract Cost: \$111,048.00 = 0	Orig Cost: \$157	7,800.00 + Amer	nded Cost: \$-40	6,752.00
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	\sim Additional	Work Numl	per of Amendm	nents1
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ing	
/ -) by Agreement Auministrator				
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	Average		Average	
	Average 4 Points		Average	
1. Product Quality	Average 4 Points X		Average	
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time 	Average 4 Points X X		Average	4.445 (0021 - CM-0021)
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and 	Average 4 Points X X X X		Average	4.445 (0021 - CM-0021)
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time 	Average 4 Points X X X X X		Average	4.443 (0021 - CMI 0221
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation 	Average 4 Points X X X X X X		Average	4.443 (0021 - CMI 0221
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration 	Average 4 Points X X X X X X X X X		Average	

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: Sue Lodahl

Total Points __35 (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: - M Sandra McCully

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name:	<u></u>	CFMS Contract Number: A66880	
University of Minnesota Project Name (if applicable): Investigation of Deterioration of Stainless Steel Dowel Tubes Under Repeated Loading	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81655 WO 133	Project Duration (Dates): 8/16/2004 – 12/31/2005	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ confirm long-term bearing capacity of a dowel fitted with end caps. This will allow Mn/DOT a decision of approval or rejection of this type of pavements. If schedule 40 pipe is approved for case in similar dowel bar designs.	ed joint constructed using 316 and the Federal Highway Admir f dowel bar as a design alterna	L stainless steel schedule 40 pipes that are nistration (FHWA) to make a rational tive for high performance concrete	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:	
, <i>,</i>	Contract: \$74,997.00	Federal and Trunk	
If this was a single source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:	
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:			
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Carol Molenar	L	5-2-06	
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date	

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

a contract.				
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: University of Minnesota		CFMS Contract Number: A66880		
Project Name (if applicable): Investigation of Deterioration of Stainless Steel Dowel Tubes Under Repeated Loading	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81655 WO 133	Project Duration (Dates): 8/16/2004 – 12/31/2005		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: The University will confirm long-term bearing capacity of a doweled joint constructed using 316L stainless steel schedule 40 pipes that are fitted with end caps. This will allow Mn/DOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to make a rational decision of approval or rejection of this type of dowel bar as a design alternative for high performance concrete pavements. If schedule 40 pipe is approved for use, any State may adopt Mn/DOT's specifications, as has been the case in similar dowel bar designs.				
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$74,997.00	Source of Funding: Federal and Trunk		
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
Caral Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	L	5-2-06 Date		

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No81655 WO 133	Type of wo	rk _Research			
District/Office _Investment Manager	ment Wo	ork Type Code 🤦	26		
S.P. 8801600662 T.H	I	location			
Contractor _University of Minnesota	l			63	WILL BY
Subcontractor				60 M	
Subcontractor					ETVEN OF LETE
Contract Period: <u>\$/16/2004</u> 8/18/04	12/31/2005	; 12/31/2	2005		INTA WE SE
Work Start Date	Work Completion	n Date Expiration		E Can de	en de
Total Contract Cost: \$_74,997.00_ =	= Orig Cost: \$_	_74,997.00+	Amended Cost:	\$0 <u></u>	1) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	\sim Additional	Work Num	ber of Amendm	nents 1 -	Time
·					-
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting	· · ·	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	-
1. Product Quality	X				
2. Work Performance	X				
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X			
5. Project related cooperation		x			
6. QA/QC plan conformance		X			
7. Contract administration cooperation		K		. ·	
8. Invoices and progress reports		to.			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		D]
Contractor's rating for this contract:		Total Poin (Maximum)	ts 36 (Johlyft	atifi
Project Manager:		Contract Adr	ninistrator:	- 51 	11/00
Berziard Izevbekhai		Jim Klessig			
Note: Any rating of below average or poor, o	copy to Jeff Brun	ner, Director, Const	ultant Services Sec	tion, MS 680	

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: University of Minnesota		CFMS Contract Number: A57574		
Project Name (if applicable): Section Travel- Time Measurement Using Inductance Signatures of Loop Detectors	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81655 WO 40	Project Duration (Dates): 11/1/2003 – 2/28/2006		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ling why it was necessary to en	ter into a contract:		
This research will study a new way of measuring the average section travel time by tracing inductance signatures of the vehicles from two points, the section entrance and exit. The basic methodology will extract the features of the inductance signatures generated by each vehicle passing through the upstream station, and then re-identify them at the downstream station by matching the features of both ends. For signal processing of vehicle inductance, several blind de-convolution approaches will be studied to develop an algorithm that will lead to clearer discrimination of the inductance signatures. Another important issue in the feature extraction process is normalization of the signatures so that each signature found is independent of the vehicle speed. An adaptive optimization approach will be developed for this normalization process. During the vehicle identification process, the features will be time shaped with the arrival time and used to compute the travel time.				
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$51,000.00	Source of Funding: Federal and Trunk		
If this was a single source contract, explain wh				
N/A				
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	au	5-2-06 Date		

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Agreement No81655 W	O 40_		Type of work _Re	search		
District/OfficeInvestme	nt Man	ageme	nt			
Contractor _University of I	Minnes	ota				
Contract Period: _11/01/2 Start Da		;	_2/28/2006 Expiration Date			
Original Contract Cost		Ame	ndment Cost(s)	Final	Cost:	
\$ 51,000.00	+	\$ 0	=	\$ 51,000.0	0	

Item Rating	Rating			
х. Э.	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	X			
2. Work Performance	X			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	X		¥	
 Deliverables Complete and on time 		X		
5. Project related cooperation	X	14		
6. QA/QC plan conformance (N/A)	N/A			
7. Contract administration cooperation	4			
 Invoices and progress reports 	(A.		
 Cost estimation/budget management 		¥.		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

Jose (Tony) Fischer

Total Points <u>29</u> (Maximum points 36 32)

Contract Administrator:

19 10

Above Average: Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT. Contractor performs beyond expectations. Deliverables exceed standards. Project Manage is informed of project status regularly. Contractor resolves any problems that occurred. Contractor needs little or no direction. Contractor responsive to requests. Contractor suggests improvements. Average Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less. Deliverables meet standards. Project is on time and budget. Project Manager is informed of key milestones. Below Average: Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms. Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply. . Project is behind schedule or over budget. Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce. Poor: Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction. Contractor is unresponsive to requests. Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks. Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations. Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:



Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

a contract.				
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: University of Minnesota`		CFMS Contract Number:		
Project Name (if applicable): Use of Adhesives to Repair Out of Plane	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):		
Bending at Stiffener to Web Connection	74708, WO 133	11/15/1999 – 9/29/2004		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include				
The objective of the project is to develop a not attached to girder flanges.	and test adhesively bonded	retrofit for connection plates that are		
		4		
		e e		
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$150,000.00	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway		
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
N/A				
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall				
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
As a ma				
Carol Moeno	u	5-2-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date		
Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 74708, WO 133	Type of work	k: Research		
District/Office of Investment Manage	ement W	ork Type Code _		
S.P. <u>N/A</u> T.H. <u>N/A</u>	_ Location _			
Contractor University of Minnesota				
Subcontractor	······			
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: <u>8/16/2004</u> ; <u>12/</u> Work Start Date	31/2005 Vork Completion	; <u>12/31/2005</u> Date Expiration	Date	
Total Contract Cost: \$ <u>150,000.00</u> =	Orig Cost: \$1	<u>.50,000.00</u> + Am	nended Cost: \$	<u>N/A</u>
Amended cost for: ~ Overrun	∼ Additional	Work Num	ber of Amendn	nents
Item RatingR1 - 6 by Project Manager7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator			ating	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		X ×		
2. Work Performance		X No.		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X		
5. Project related cooperation		X		
6. QA/QC plan conformance		X		
7. Contract administration cooperation	×			
8. Invoices and progress reports		X		
9. Cost estimation/budget management	×			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

Todd Niemann

ĥiĝ

Total Points Z (Maximum points 36)

ontract_Administrator:

zala

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.			
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Contractor Name: Foth and Van Dyke and Associates, Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A78198			
Project Name (if applicable): TH 12 Cemetery	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88499	Project Duration (Dates): 8-30-05 to 6-30-06			
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ	ling why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:			
This contract was necessary for the project to receive federal funding. Since the project is receiving federal funding, Mn/DOT CRU (on behalf of FHWA) needs to ensure that the effects of the project on cultural resources is being taken into account as per the requirements of 36 CFR 800 (Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act). It is necessary to use a contract on this project since no state-employed personnel who meet the Secretary of Interior's Professional Standards for cultural resource investigations on FHWA-funded projects were available to complete the work in a timely manner due to work load.					
Billable Hours (if applicable): 1,912	Total Amount Spent on Contract: 55,495.43	Source of Funding: Metro District			
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the second se	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:			
The single source contract was used as part of direct selected from the list of pre-qualified inc	lividuals for cultural resources	work. This project fell into that category.			
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objective		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall			
SEE ATTACHED CON	SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION			
Catal Molnau Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		5 2 0 6 Date			

cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No88499 Type	e of work: <u>Geo</u>	omorphology		
District/Office <u>Metro</u> Work Ty	pe Code 📿			
S.P. <u>2713-75</u> T.H. <u>12</u> Location <u>Lo</u>	ng Lake			
Contractor <u>Foth and Van Dyke</u>				
SubcontractorN/A				
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: <u>8-30-05;</u> Work Start Date	<u>12-30-05;</u> Work Completion	6-30-06 Date Expiration	Date	
Total Contract Cost: $\$55,495.43 = C$	rig Cost <u>: \$55,4</u>	<u>495.43</u> + Amer	ded Cost: <u>\$0.0</u>	<u>0</u>
Amended cost for: Overrun	Additiona	ıl Work Nur	nber of Amend	ments _0_
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ing	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	X			
2. Work Performance	X			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		Х		
5. Project related cooperation	X			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	Х			
7. Contract administration cooperation		×		
8. Invoices and progress reports		X		
9. Cost estimation/budget management				

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: Kristen Zschomler)

Kristen Zschomler Print Name

Total Points <u>36</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrat 128/06 Print 1

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

The consultant mobilized quickly, responded to the needs of the District in terms of schedules and needed data, performed the work well, and produced a solid report. The overall project and results were very good.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Bloom Consultants, LLC		CFMS Contract Number: A81515
Project Name (if applicable): Final Design Temporary Bridges 99194 and 99195.	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87997	Project Duration (Dates): October 5, 2005 to March 9, 2006
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to er	hter into a contract:
The Contract was for final construction plans Bridge 99195, Northbound Exit to TH 121 in H revitalization project. A Contractor was used to Mn/DOT to meet scheduled construction lettin	lennepin County. Works on the because Mn/DOT did not have o	se bridges are part of the Crosstown
	- -	
Billable Hours (if applicable): 591.75	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$102,061.75	Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget allotment for Bridge Office.
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
	х. Х	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir	on an appraisal of the contracto	r's timeliness quality cost and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objecti		
SEE ATTACHED CON	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
Carol Boln		5206
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	au	9 6 00

cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>87997</u>	Type of w	ork: <u>Bridge</u>	Design		
District/Office: <u>Bridge Office</u>	Work Typ	e Code <u>BD</u>			
S.P. <u>6280-99194</u> T.H. <u>35W</u>	Location:	Temporary Brid	<u>dge 99194 for B</u>	<u>ridge 27V76</u>	
Contractor: Bloom Consultants, LLC.		and Bridge 99	195, NB 135 to	TH 121 in	276272820m
Subcontractor: <u>N/A</u>		Hennepin Cou	nty.	BUN	
Subcontractor: <u>N/A</u>					APR 2006
Contract Period: <u>October 5, 2005;</u> Work Start Date	<u>March 9, 20</u> Work Completi		November 30, 200 Expiration Date		RECEIVED OFFICE OF ISULTANT SERV.
Total Contract Cost: $\$102,061.75 =$	Orig Cost: <u>\$94</u>	<u>,023.60</u> + A	mended Cost: <u>\$</u>	8,038.15	.0
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	X~ Additiona	l Work Nu	mber of Amend	lments: <u>1</u>	22.21.10 Der
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Rating				
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality			2	- <u></u>	
2. Work Performance		3		· ·	
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements			2		-
4. Deliverables Complete and on time			2		
5. Project related cooperation		3			
6. QA/QC plan conformance			2	·	
7. Contract administration cooperation		3			
8. Invoices and progress reports		3			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		3			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: (Manjula Louis) Print Name

Total Points <u>23</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: ictor E.H. Crobbe

(Victor E. Crabbe) Print Name

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

1. The beam lengths on Preliminary plan were not correct. I really appreciate the consultant

working around this problem.

2. Errors in Working point layout.

3. The roadway centerline is on a horizontal curve, the interference of railing anchorages with the beam top flange was not taken into consideration.

4. Bridge substructures on a skew, Glulam panels were not laid out parallel with substructure.

5. Variation in Bituminous Wearing course to account for super elevation was not considered.

- 6. More than normal amount of time spent on review.
- 7. Temporary bridges are unusual and hopefully the consultant will do better on future projects.

8. Project Manager Mary Sue was very cooperative.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Les de la contra d	f	0	1-11 Of 000 -l	would be the first free to a
Instructions: Submit this	form to Consultant	Services Section, IN	hall Stop 680 alon	g with the final involce.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Bloom Consultants, LLC		CFMS Contract Number: A81515
Project Name (if applicable): Final Design Temporary Bridges 99194 and 99195.	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87997	Project Duration (Dates): October 5, 2005 to March 9, 2006
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:
The Contract was for final construction plans Bridge 99195, Northbound Exit to TH 121 in H revitalization project. A Contractor was used to Mn/DOT to meet scheduled construction lettin	lennepin County. Works on the because Mn/DOT did not have	ese bridges are part of the Crosstown
and,		
Billable Hours (if applicable): 591.75	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$102,061.75	Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget allotment for Bridge Office.
	· · · · ·	
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objectiv		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objective		
performance in meeting the terms and objectiv	ves of the contract:	
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	o 680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number: A78198
Foth and Van Dyke and Associates, Inc.		
Project Name (if applicable): TH 12 Cemetery	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88499	Project Duration (Dates): 8-30-05 to 6-30-06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ	ling why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
cultural resources is being taken into National Historic Preservation Act). employed personnel who meet the Se	behalf of FHWA) needs to en account as per the requirement It is necessary to use a contr coretary of Interior's Profession	nsure that the effects of the project on ents of 36 CFR 800 (Section 106 of the ract on this project since no state-
Billable Hours (if applicable): 1,912	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
	Contract: 55,495.43	Metro District
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the single source contract was used as part of direct selected from the list of pre-qualified incomposition of the source of the work including the selected formance of the work including the selected formation of	of Mn/DOT's Pre-Qualified syst lividuals for cultural resources	em. All projects under \$100,000 can be work. This project fell into that category.
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:	
SEE ATTACHED CON	SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
Calle Bolna	ie i	5206
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
		· · · · · · ·

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

CC:

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

5

, b.,

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency:		
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Retrofit Recycling, Inc.		A68745
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Regulated Waste Removal	87149	9/24/04 – 3/16/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ		
The purpose of this contract was to re		
moving. State does not have staff cer	rtified in regulated waste r	emoval or ability to transport.
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
N/A	Contract: \$98,723.46	State
If this was a single source contract, explain w		
In this was a single source contract, explain w	iny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services.
		۸.
		*
		*
		۸
Evaluate the performance of the work includir		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and object	ives of the contract:	
performance in meeting the terms and object		
performance in meeting the terms and object	ives of the contract:	
performance in meeting the terms and objecti SEE ATTACHED CON	ives of the contract:	EVALUATION
performance in meeting the terms and object	ives of the contract:	
performance in meeting the terms and objecti SEE ATTACHED CON	ives of the contract:	EVALUATION
performance in meeting the terms and object SEE ATTACHED CON Carol Moderat	ives of the contract:	EVALUATION 24-34-06
performance in meeting the terms and object SEE ATTACHED CON (arol Molnau	ives of the contract:	EVALUATION 24-34-06

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Contract No. <u>87149</u>	Type of work <u>Remove Regulated Waste</u>			
District/Office <u>One</u>	Work Type Code _AB			
S.P. <u>8821-130</u> T.H. <u>999</u>	Location <u>Districtwide</u>			
Contractor <u>Retrofit Recycling</u>				
Subcontractor				
Subcontractor				,
Contract Period: <u>September 24, 2004</u> ; <u>Work Start Date</u>	March 16, 2006 Work Completion	: <u>April 30,</u> Date Exj	2006 piration Date	
Total Contract Cost: <u>\$_98,723.46</u> =	Orig Cost: \$ <u>90</u>	<u>),000.00</u> + An	nended Cost: \$_	<u>9,000.00</u>
Amended cost for: Overrun	Additional Wor	rk Number o	of Amendments	s <u> </u>
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ting	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	Х			×
2. Work Performance	X			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	Х			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	Х			
5. Project related cooperation	Х			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	Х			
7. Contract administration cooperation	x			
8. Invoices and progress reports		X		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		x		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points <u>34</u> (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager:

f. 0000 a (Roberta Dwyer Print Name

Contract Administrator:

IER. Print Name

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Retrofit was very cooperative and able to meet tight schedules.

Did not always follow proper invoicing procedures.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final involce.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Evergreen Land Services		A47745
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Bovey Bypass R/W	82070, WO 3	4/18/03 – 5/9/05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include		
The purpose of this contract was to p		
near Bovey. The work items included		
purchase. This work could not be dor		
workload.	le by state personner in th	the to meet the letting due to a peak
workidad.		
		<i>p</i>
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
N/A	Contract: \$215,169.34	State
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
1		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	;
Evaluate the performance of the work includir		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	
SEE ATTACHED COM	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
A Jan		
Course Morn	Rec	4-24-11-
Carol Molnay It Covernor/Commissioner	all	4-24-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	all	4-24-06 Date
000	all	

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice. Agency: **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION** Contractor Name: CFMS Contract Number: Evergreen Land Services A47745 Project Name (if applicable): Project Duration (Dates): Mn/DOT Agreement No.: Bovey Bypass R/W 82070, WO 3 4/18/03 - 5/9/05 Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: The purpose of this contract was to provide right of way services for the reconstruction of T.H. 169 near Bovey. The work items included field title reports, authorization map, appraisals and direct purchase. This work could not be done by state personnel in time to meet the letting due to a peak workload. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Source of Funding: Contract: \$215,169.34 N/A State If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Hal Molnau 4-24-06 Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner Date Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration CC:

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Contract No. <u>82070 WO 3</u>	Туј	e of work <u>Ri</u>	ght of Way	
District/Office <u>One</u>	Work Type Code <u>RW</u>			
S.P. <u>3116-106</u> T.H. <u>169</u>	Loo	ation <u>Bovey</u>	Bypass	10 11 12 12 h
Contractor <u>Evergreen Land Service</u>	S			
Subcontractor Bonestroo, Rosene, A	Anderlik & Ass	ociates		APR 2006
Subcontractor <u>Norell on Real Prope</u>	rty			<u>_D</u> کل
Contract Period: <u>April 18, 2003</u> ; <u>Work Start Date</u>	May 9, 2005 Work Completion	: <u>April 30,</u> Date Ex	2006 piration Date	CONSULTANT SERV
Total Contract Cost: <u>\$215,169.34</u> =	= Orig Cost: \$	260,798.33 +	Amended Cost	: \$ (-49,672,00)
Amended cost for: Overrun	Additional Wo	rk Number	of Amendment	s <u>1</u>
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		X		
2. Work Performance		X		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X		
5. Project related cooperation	X			
6. QA/QC plan conformance		Х		
7. Contract administration cooperation		x		
8. Invoices and progress reports		x		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		X		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points <u>28</u> (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager: (Derek Fredrickson

Print Name

Contract Administrator:

(Roberta Dwyer Print Name

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Evergreen Land Services was thorough in their courthouse investigation and field title reports. When the parcel packages were received in District One, a couple of documents were missing. Once Evergreen was notified of the missing documents, they quickly rectified the situation. Bonestroo Rosene Anderlik & Associates needed some assistance from Mn/DOT staff in producing the authorization map and parcel sketches. Although changes were made in the design, both consultant firms were receptive to making these changes in a timely manner.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

nstructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: City of Lindstrom		CFMS Contract Number: A79429
Project Name (if applicable): Lindstrom T.H. 8 Corridor Transportation Study	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 85542	Project Duration (Dates): December 3, 2003 to June 25, 2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	l ding why it was necessary to er	Inter into a contract:
The purpose of this contract was to provid 302nd Street to the east city limits.	le a safety and capacity stud	y of T.H. 8 in Lindstrom from west of
This project is part of a larger land use stu well as T.H. 8. Because of the city's owner was the logical choice to manage the study expertise required to complete this project	ship stake and familiarity wit y. Mn/DOT's participation wa	th the area and their needs, Lindstrom as limited to T.H. 8. In addition, the
•		
Billable Hours (if applicable): 552	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$50,929.80	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
The City of Lindstrom requested Mn/DOT's limits. The study includes T.H. 8 through I conducted by Lindstrom to include city str confined to T.H. 8; Lindstrom will act on its done off the trunk highway system. The C its own, in order to better coordinate the T considered a single source because of the study, and their ability to facilitate meshing surrounding city streets.	Lindstrom. This will be inclu- eets impacted by T.H. 8. Mn s own under a separate agree ity was the lead agency, rath .H. 8 portion into the City-wid ir familiarity with the area, th	ded as part of a larger study being /DOT's contract with Lindstrom was ement with their consultant for work er than Mn/DOT hiring a consultant on de study. The City of Lindstrom was eir stake in the outcome of the T.H. 8
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objection		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED COM	SULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		4-24-06 Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sect File	tion	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>85542</u> Type of	work <u>Concept</u>	Development		
District/Office <u>Metro</u> Work Ty	pe Code <u>SS</u>			
S.P. <u>1380-66</u> T.H. <u>8</u> Location <u>Fr</u>	com West of 3	02nd Street to t	he Lindstrom E	ast City Limits
Contractor City of Lindstrom				
Subcontractor TKDA				ALE ION
Subcontractor				APR APR
Contract Period: <u>December 3, 2003;</u> Work Start Date	June 25, 2 Work Comple		cember 31, 2005 xpiration Date	1 mm
Total Contract Cost: $\underline{\$43,109.32} = O$	rig Cost: <u>\$43,</u>	<u>109.32</u> + Amer	nded Cost: <u>\$14,5</u>	1
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	X Additional	Work Nur	ber of Amendm	nents 3
Item Rating		Ra	nting	
1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator				
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above		Below	
	Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		3		
2. Work Performance		3		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		3		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time			2	-
5. Project related cooperation		3		
6. QA/QC plan conformance	•	3		
7. Contract administration cooperation			× –	
8. Invoices and progress reports			\times	
9. Cost estimation/budget				

Contractor's rating for this contract:

)

Project Manager:

management

(Tod Sherman Print Name

Total Points 24 (Maximum points 36)

×

Contract Administrator: فترز Mark Hagen) (

Print Name

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

This project was a real challenge. There was a great deal of disagreement among various groups within and outside the City about how to handle improvements to TH 8 through Lindstrom. TKDA had to work with local businesses, politicians, schools, Mn/DOT, the County, TH 8 Task Force, local interest groups, etc. and each entity had their own idea of how to address the situation. Because of the difficulty of the task, the time frame was significantly underestimated. TKDA did a good job working with Mn/DOT and did well in their effort to obtain consensus, and we are close to obtaining consensus, but we're still not quite there yet and a new contract between the City and TKDA (without a City/Mn/DOT Joint Powers Agreement) will be developed. Also, the change in personnel near the completion of the contract was fairly difficult. With Rick Arnebeck, John Powell (TKDA), and I no longer involved with the project, a great deal of historical knowledge was lost which added to the difficulties.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency:		
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Retrofit Recycling, Inc.		A68745
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Regulated Waste Removal	87149	9/24/04 - 3/16/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu	ding why it was necessary to er	
The purpose of this contract was to re		
moving. State does not have staff ce		
	c .	
· · · ·		
×		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	-	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
N/A	Contract: \$98,723.46	State
If this was a single source contract, explain w	by the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Evaluate the performance of the work including performance in meeting the terms and object		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and object	ives of the contract:	
performance in meeting the terms and object		
performance in meeting the terms and object	ives of the contract:	
performance in meeting the terms and object SEE ATTACHED CO	ives of the contract:	EVALUATION
performance in meeting the terms and object SEE ATTACHED COI	ives of the contract:	EVALUATION 21-34-06
performance in meeting the terms and object SEE ATTACHED CO	ives of the contract:	EVALUATION
performance in meeting the terms and object SEE ATTACHED COI (awd Molnau Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	ives of the contract:	EVALUATION 21-34-06
performance in meeting the terms and object SEE ATTACHED COI	ives of the contract:	EVALUATION 21-34-06

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Instructions. Submit this form to consultan	it services section, mail stop	boo along with the final involce.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: City of Lindstrom		CFMS Contract Number: A79429
Project Name (if applicable): Lindstrom T.H. 8 Corridor Transportation Study	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 85542	Project Duration (Dates): December 3, 2003 to June 25, 2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
The purpose of this contract was to provid 302nd Street to the east city limits.	le a safety and capacity stud	y of T.H. 8 in Lindstrom from west of
This project is part of a larger land use stu well as T.H. 8. Because of the city's owner was the logical choice to manage the study expertise required to complete this project	ship stake and familiarity wi y. Mn/DOT's participation wa	th the area and their needs, Lindstrom as limited to T.H. 8. In addition, the
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Billable Hours (if applicable): 552	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$50,929.80	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
The City of Lindstrom requested Mn/DOT's limits. The study includes T.H. 8 through L conducted by Lindstrom to include city str confined to T.H. 8; Lindstrom will act on its done off the trunk highway system. The C its own, in order to better coordinate the T considered a single source because of the study, and their ability to facilitate meshing surrounding city streets.	indstrom. This will be inclu- eets impacted by T.H. 8. Mn s own under a separate agree ity was the lead agency, rath H. 8 portion into the City-wic ir familiarity with the area, th	ded as part of a larger study being /DOT's contract with Lindstrom was ement with their consultant for work er than Mn/DOT hiring a consultant on de study. The City of Lindstrom was eir stake in the outcome of the T.H. 8
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objective		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	-	2/-22-06 Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sect File	ion	

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Contractor Name: Optimal Geomatics	CFMS Contract Number: A-84313	
Atlantic Technologies, Incorporated, a subsidiary of MacDonald, Dettwiler		
and Associates, Ltd.		
Project Name (if applicable):	oject Name (if applicable): Mn/DOT Contract No.: 89077	
Photogrammetric Mapping		

Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:

The Purpose of this contract was for the Contractor to produce an Aero-triangulation, Compile Planimetric Features and create a Digital Terrain Model, (DTM) for this project.

This Photogrammetric Mapping project is for Trunk Highway 169 (from Elk River to County Rd. 74), District 3 / Project number 7106-73.

"Advances a transportation purpose", we have employees for this purpose but they are already too busy with work. In house we run two shifts for Photogrammetric Mapping, but equipment and personnel capacity constraints require us to contract out.

Billable Hours (if applicable): No.	Total Contract Amount: \$98,200.00	Source of Funding: District 3 Consultant.

Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently:

Performing this work ourselves would be for more expense. Capital costs for necessary equipment and ongoing costs for personnel for this type of work are prohibitive for the State.

If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services:

No.

Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:

Please see the attached evaluation form.

, moenau

Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680

1-13-06

Date

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

		,	V	
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: MAVO Systems, Inc.			CFMS Contract Number: A66783	
Project Name (if applicable): Asbestos Abatement for Projects in Presto Oronoco, and Northfield	on,	Mn/DOT Agreement No 83120 WO3		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu-	ding w	hy it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:	
The State contracted with MAVO Systems containing materials from right-of-way for SP 5508-84 on TH 52 in Oronoco, and SP 6 available with the expertise required to co	the co 6612-8	onstruction of State Pro 2 on TH 3 in Northfield	oject (SP) 2310-22 on TH 52 in Preston, The State did not have sufficient staff	
		* *		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Tota	I Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:	
Not Applicable	Cont	tract: \$186,593.95	District 6 Allocation, State Funds	
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the	agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:	
Not Applicable				
			-	
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti SEE ATTACHED CON	ives of			
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Carol Molna	u		4-13-06	
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner			Date	
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration	•			

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name: MAVO Systems, Inc.			CFMS Contract Number: A66783
Project Name (if applicable): Asbestos Abatement for Projects in Presto Oronoco, and Northfield	ject Name (if applicable): Mn/DOT Agreement No.: bestos Abatement for Projects in Preston, 83120 WO3		 Project Duration (Dates): August 9, 2004 to February 28, 2004
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding w	hy it was necessary to en	ter into a contract:
The State contracted with MAVO Systems, Inc. to provide assistance in the removal and disposal of asbestos containing materials from right-of-way for the construction of State Project (SP) 2310-22 on TH 52 in Preston, SP 5508-84 on TH 52 in Oronoco, and SP 6612-82 on TH 3 in Northfield. The State did not have sufficient staff available with the expertise required to complete this work within the necessary timeline.			
			•
Billable Hours (if applicable):		I Amount Spent on tract: \$186,593.95	Source of Funding:
Not Applicable			District 6 Allocation, State Funds
If this was a single source contract, explain wind Not Applicable	hy the	agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:
Not Applicable			
6			
κ.			
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti			r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of		
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	Ves of	The contract:	VALUATION
performance in meeting the terms and objecti SEE ATTACHED CON	Ves of	The contract:	

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

CC:

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Mn/DOT Contract No.: 83120 WO3	District/Office:	District 6		AN 230x
Type of work: <u>Asbestos Abatement</u>	<i>F</i>	B		
Work Type Code: <u>AB – Asbestos Aba</u>	tement			APR 2006
S.P.: <u>2310-22, 5508-84, & 6612-82</u>	T.H.: <u>3</u>	& 52		CONSULT OF
Location: Preston (TH 52), Oronoco (T	TH 52), and North	nfield (TH 3)		Stary Ster.
Contractor: <u>MAVO Systems, Inc.</u>	_			ACT 61 01 11 91
Subcontractor: <u>None</u>				UI UI LLA
Contract Period: <u>August 9, 2004</u> ; Work Start Date	February 28, Work Comple		March 31, 2006 Expiration Date	
Total Contract Cost: <u>\$186,593.95</u>	Orig Cost: <u>\$124</u>	<u>,600.00</u> An	nended Cost: <u>\$61</u>	,993.95
Amended for: <u>X</u> Overrun <u>X</u>	K Addi	tional Work	Number of Ame	ndments: <u>2</u>
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ing	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	X			
2. Work Performance	X	······································	·	
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	X			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	X			
5. Project related cooperation	Х			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	X			
7. Contract administration cooperation	X			
8. Invoices and progress reports	X			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		X		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager

(Craig Hansen) Print Name

Total Points: <u>35</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: (Prentiss Sayeweh)

Print Name

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

The Contractor produced a work product that is satisfactory to State's staff. The Contractor was very cooperative in responding to State's needs. The Contract was amended for additional costs and time extension for the Contractor to complete the extra work identified during the project. The Project Manager recommends full payment for services provided by the Contractor with a high rating of performance.

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Contractor Name: Optimal Geomatics	CFMS Contract Number: A-84313	
Atlantic Technologies, Incorporated, a subsidiary of MacDonald, Dettwiler		
and Associates, Ltd.		
Project Name (if applicable): Mn/DOT Contract No.: 89077		Project Duration (Dates): 12/19/05 to 2/15/06
Photogrammetric Mapping		

Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:

The Purpose of this contract was for the Contractor to produce an Aero-triangulation, Compile Planimetric Features and create a Digital Terrain Model, (DTM) for this project.

This Photogrammetric Mapping project is for Trunk Highway 169 (from Elk River to County Rd. 74), District 3 / Project number 7106-73.

"Advances a transportation purpose", we have employees for this purpose but they are already too busy with work. In house we run two shifts for Photogrammetric Mapping, but equipment and personnel capacity constraints require us to contract out.

Billable Hours (if applicable): No.	Total Contract Amount: \$98,200.00	Source of Funding: District 3 Consultant.

Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently:

Performing this work ourselves would be for more expense. Capital costs for necessary equipment and ongoing costs for personnel for this type of work are prohibitive for the State.

If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services:

No.

Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:

Please see the attached evaluation form.

Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner

H-13-06 Date

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>89077</u>	Type of w	ork _///./	photoge MP	innet	ic.
District/Office D_3					
S.P. <u>7106_73</u> T.H. <u>/</u>	<u>59</u> L	ocation	k Kij	erts (30 Rd 74)
S.P. <u>7106-73</u> T.H. <u>16</u> Contractor <u>Optime</u> <u>Ce</u> Subcontractor <u>–</u>	matic	(form	6-17 Khow	nRI Atla	nticTech
Subcontractor		(Conto	instand 5	DODOGIL	4400
Subcontractor —			10,740	000040	4100)
Contract Period: $12 - 19 - 05$; Work Start Date	$\frac{fel}{15}$ - Work Completion	$\frac{06}{\text{Date}}; \frac{7-3}{\text{Expiration}}$	31-06 1 Date	- 69% 	
Total Contract Cost: \$ <u>98,200</u> =	= Orig Cost: \$	<u>18,200</u> 4A	Amended Cost:	\$ <u>6</u>	son a
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	∼ Additional	Work Num	ber of Amendn	nents4	
Item Rating		Ra	ting		C. X. and Market
1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		· .		,	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	-
1. Product Quality					
2. Work Performance				· · ·	-
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	V				
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	V			-	
5. Project related cooperation					
6. QA/QC plan conformance					
7. Contract administration cooperation	\checkmark				
8. Invoices and progress reports		\mathcal{U}			
9. Cost estimation/budget management					

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: SCHLADW EILON Print Name

Total Points 36

Contract Administrator: Print Name

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency:		· · · · ·
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Contractor Name: Widseth Smith Nolting, Inc		CFMS Contract Number:
		A 80 336
Project Name (if applicable): Final Design Bridge 27V84	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87994	Project Duration (Dates): 9/12/05 thru 2/11/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu-		
This bridge is part of the I35W & TH 62 Cross design services due to other Mn/DOT design		
construction letting date was met.	needs. Consultant services we	ere required to insure the scheduled
		·
· · · · ·		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
1585.25	Contract: \$ 128,830.00	Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined ther	e was only a single source for the services:
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION
		·
Carol Molnau		4-10-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sect	ion	

File

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant	t Services, Mail Stop 680, with the	e final invoice.	
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name: SRF Consulting Group, Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A73682	
Project Name (if applicable): Oak Park Heights Design Alternative	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87816	Project Duration (Dates): March 18, 2004 – August 31, 2005	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, in	I cluding why it was necessary to	enter into a contract:	
integrated into the project, the design r preferred alternative design and inform	H. 5 segment) 1995 design alte from the cities of Stillwater an it. Croix River Crossing Enviro needed to be converted from m nation regarding environmenta	rnative. The 1995 option, which d Oak Park Heights, is the proposed nmental Impact Statement. In order to b netric to English, integrated into the	
Billable Hours (if applicable): 1096.3	Total Contract Amount:	Source of Funding:	
	\$79,552.61	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway ere was only a single source for the services	
f this was a single source contract, explain	\$79,552.61	Trunk Highway	
f this was a single source contract, explain	\$79,552.61	Trunk Highway	
f this was a single source contract, explain	\$79,552.61	Trunk Highway	
If this was a single source contract, explain	\$79,552.61	Trunk Highway	
f this was a single source contract, explain	\$79,552.61	Trunk Highway	
f this was a single source contract, explain	\$79,552.61	Trunk Highway	
f this was a single source contract, explain	\$79,552.61	Trunk Highway	
If this was a single source contract, explain	\$79,552.61 n why the agency determined the	Trunk Highway ere was only a single source for the services	
Billable Hours (if applicable): 1096.3 If this was a single source contract, explain N/A Attach a copy of the performance evalu	\$79,552.61 n why the agency determined the ration prepared for this contrac	Trunk Highway are was only a single source for the services	

J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	* •		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:	
Braun Intertec Corporation		A79610 Project Duration (Dates):	
Project Name (if applicable): Soil boring for the Paynesviille bypass.			
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include		8/22/2005 - 4/1/2006	
This contract provided soil borings needed for highway design on the State Project 3408-15, on highway 23 for the future Paynesville bypass.			
This contract was required to perform work the the project design on schedule.	at the State's staff would not h	ave been able to perform in time to keep	
	. 8		
	4		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:	
	Contract:\$101,925.00 (est.)	TRUNK Highway	
If this was a single source contract, explain wh			
	ly the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services.	
* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
•			
		4	
Evaluate the performance of the work including	g an appraisal of the contracto	r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	
Evaluate the performance of the work including performance in meeting the terms and objective		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	
performance in meeting the terms and objectiv	es of the contract:		
performance in meeting the terms and objectiv			
performance in meeting the terms and objectiv	es of the contract:		
performance in meeting the terms and objectiv SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract: SULTANT PERFORMANCE E		
performance in meeting the terms and objectiv SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract: SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION	
performance in meeting the terms and objective SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract: SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION $Af - 10 - 0.6$	
performance in meeting the terms and objectiv SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract: SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION	

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

cc: 1

Report on Professional/Technical Contracts Over \$50,000 Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name: Bolton & Menk Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A75682	
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87873	Project Duration (Dates): 5/20/2005 to 2/10/2006	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:	
Design needs to be completed in order to	correct deteriorated pavement idered; however, due to the sch	nedule, it does not allow for adequate time	
	2. ¹		
Billable Hours (if applicable): 1380	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$100,000.00	Source of Funding: District 7 Consultant Budget	
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:	
NA			
· · ·			
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objective		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	
SEE ATTACHED CON	SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION	
Carol Malnau Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		4-10-06 Date	
cc: Paul Stembler Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Secti File	on		

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

		9
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: ADV Document Systems Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A 61198
Project Name (if applicable): Electronic Pocument Management System	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 86249	Project Duration (Dates):May 2004 – February 2006
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
Design, plan, direct and support the implemer		
	·	
Billable Hours (if applicable): 3076	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$299,910	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway Fund
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the second se	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
Not Applicable	,	
	м	
±		
		sector sector
	•	
Evelopete the superformation of the superior built		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objective		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION
A. mai		
Carol Molnar	\mathcal{L}	4-10-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	· .		
Contractor Name: Bonestroo Rosene Anderli	k & Associates	CFMS Contract Number: A76074	
Project Name (if applicable): Bridge 27V88	Project Duration (Dates): June 7, 2005 thru February 11, 2006		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu	ding why it was necessary to e		
Final design services for Bridge 27V88. This personnel were not available to provide the reconsultant services were necessary.			
Billable Hours (if applicable): 1977	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$164,101.87	Source of Funding: Bridge Office Consultant Budget	
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined the	re was only a single source for the services	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objection		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	
SEE ATTACHED COM	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION	
No Ami	944	2-10-06	
Carol Hoene		,	

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 87638 Type of	work: <u>Final Br</u>	idge Design		12 13 14 15 76 77 18
District/Office: Bridge Office W	ork Type Code	: <u>BD</u>		MAR 2006
S.P. 2781-27V88 T.H. 35W Loc	ation: 46th Stre	eet over I35W i	in Minneapolis	RECLIVED
Contractor Bonestroo Rosene Anderl	ik & Associate	S		CONSULTANT SERV.
Subcontractor: NA				the second
Contract Period: <u>June 7, 2005;</u> Work Start Date Wo	Feb. 11, 2006 ork Completion		ept. 30, 2006 piration Date	CLAISON DE
Total Contract Cost: $\$164,637.40 = 0$	Orig Cost: <u>\$154</u>	4 <u>,269.74</u> + Am	ended Cost: <u>\$10</u>	<u>,367.66</u>
Amended cost for: Overrun	x Addition	al Work N	lumber of Amer	ndments 1
Item Rating	-	Ra	ting	
1 - 6 by Project Manager				
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		×		
2. Work Performance		×		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		×		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		· ×		
5. Project related cooperation		\varkappa		
6. QA/QC plan conformance		×		
7. Contract administration cooperation		X		
8. Invoices and progress reports		X		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		x .		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

louis

Project Manager:

anilla

(Manjula Louis)

Total Points 27 (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: (Robert J. Miller)
- Above Average:
 - Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
 - Contractor performs beyond expectations.
 - Deliverables exceed standards.
 - Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
 - Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
 - Contractor needs little or no direction.
 - Contractor responsive to requests.
 - Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Erry Pertzsch look the intiative to set up the bick off meet before starting the design. fice. wherour Jerry worked with John Griffith (Mn/DOT) & Past Jones (Metro transit) finalize the bus pull out section on the bridge to with SEH & Metro Transit & Kept me worked Jerry Future metro transit station. timely manner JEREMY WEST (SRF) & Dave Hall in a Notified 'coordinatie obiscrepancy in the corner tie in ' When there was :\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898 & Elevations of railing on retaining wall & bridge. - It was a great pleasure to work with Terry & look forward to working with him in the fature.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

matractions. Oublint this form to consultar	it bei vices bection, man btop	boo along with the final involoe.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Bonestroo Rosene Anderli	k & Associates	CFMS Contract Number: A76074
Project Name (if applicable): Bridge 27V88	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87638	Project Duration (Dates): June 7, 2005 thru February 11, 2006
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu-	ding why it was necessary to er	
Final design services for Bridge 27V88. This personnel were not available to provide the reconsultant services were necessary.		
)		· · · ·
1	6 · · ·	
· · ·		
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
/977	Contract: \$164,101.87	Bridge Office Consultant Budget
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
	*	
· · · ·		
		· · ·
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objective		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
	ves of the contract.	
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION
Carol Moena	m	21-10-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Short Elliot Hendrickson, Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A24592
Project Name (if applicable): S.P. 8606-46 (TH 55) R/W Turnkey Project	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81286	Project Duration (Dates): From 08/02/01 To 02/15/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ	ling why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
The Contractor was to perform all engineering acquisition of all of the parcels associated with Contractor performed all of the duties typically with Mn/DOT.	n the proposed new construction	on of TH 55 through the City of Buffalo. The
This contract was necessary because Mn/DO services described above.	T did not have available the ne	eded qualified personnel to conduct the
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract:\$614,078.88	Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget Allotment for District 3
If this was a single source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:
N/A		
Evaluate the performance of the work including performance in meeting the terms and objective		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION
Card Molnoy		4-10-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	•	
Contractor Name: Braun Intertec Corporation		CFMS Contract Number: A79610
Project Name (if applicable): Soil boring for the Paynesviille bypass.	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88146	Project Duration (Dates): 8/22/2005 - 4/1/2006
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to en	ter into a contract:
This contract provided soil borings needed for future Paynesville bypass.	r highway design on the State F	Project 3408-15, on highway 23 for the
This contract was required to perform work th the project design on schedule.	at the State's staff would not h	ave been able to perform in time to keep
Rillabla Houra (if applicable);	Total Amount Chant on	Course of Funding
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract:\$101,925.00 (est.)	Source of Funding: TRUNK Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION
Carol Molna	L	4-10-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 88146 Type of work: Soil borings

District/Office: 8 - Willmar Work Type Code

S.P.: 3408 - 15 T.H.: 23 Location: Paynesville (future Paynesville bypass)

Contractor: Braun Intertec Corporation

Subcontractor : N/A

Contract Period: August 22, 2005;February 24, 2006;April 1, 2006Work Start DateWork Completion DateExpiration Date

Total Contract Cost: \$130,511.68 = Orig Cost: \$130,511.68 + Amended Cost: N/A

Amended cost for: $\sim Overrun \sim Additional Work$ Number of Amendments: 0

Item Rating		Rat	ting	
1 - 6 by Project Manager				
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		Х		
2. Work Performance		X		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X		
5. Project related cooperation	X			. "
6. QA/QC plan conformance		X		
7. Contract administration cooperation	X			
8. Invoices and progress reports		X		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		X		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points: 29 (Maximum points 36)

Raell Print Name

Contract Administrator: <u>Souce</u> (<u>ast</u> (<u>Gene East</u>) Print Name

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
 - Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Project Manager's comments: Paul Martin, project manager for Braun Intertec, did a very good job of coordinating the drilling for the Paynesville Bypass, Contract No. 88146. Paul was very easy to work with and we were able to resolve issues quickly to keep the crew on task.

The data was collected using an electronic format and all the information required was provided.

We made two field visits and the crew was helpful, providing us with updated information as to what they were finding. The field crew did an excellent job of field identification as verified by Lab Classification conducted according to the consultant contract.

Agreement Administrator's comments: The contractor was very cooperative in helping establish the contract, and also in addressing an invioce issue (the only issue with the contract) that came up on the contract. Average ratings given for cost estimation/budget management reflect some difficulty in reaching agreement on the initial budget for the contract. Overall, the contractor's cooperation was excellent.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency:		
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Short Elliot Hendrickson, Inc.		A24592
Project Name (if applicable): S.P. 8606-46 (TH 55) R/W Turnkey Project	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81286	Project Duration (Dates): From 08/02/01 To 02/15/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include		
The Contractor was to perform all engineering acquisition of all of the parcels associated with Contractor performed all of the duties typically with Mn/DOT.	n the proposed new construction	n of TH 55 through the City of Buffalo. The
This contract was necessary because Mn/DO services described above.	T did not have available the ne	eded qualified personnel to conduct the
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding: Consultant Services
39.54.1	Contract:\$614,078.88	Budget Allotment for District 3
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
N/A Evaluate the performance of the work includir	on an appraisal of the contracto	r's timeliness quality cost and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objecti		n 5 uniciliicos, quality, cost, anu overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		4-10-06 Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 81286

Type of work <u>R/W Professional Assistance</u>

District/Office <u>3/Right-of-Way</u>

Work Type Code <u>0109</u> Location In the City of Buffalo

Contractor Short Elliot Hendrickson, Inc.

T.H. 55

Subcontractor N/A

S.P. 8606-46

Subcontractor N/A

Contract Period: August 2, 2001; February 15, 2006; April 8, 2006Work Start DateWork Completion DateExpiration Date

Total Contract Cost: $\frac{614,078.88}{170,878.82} = \text{Orig Cost: } \frac{443,200.06}{143,200.06} + \text{Amended Cost: } \frac{170,878.82}{170,878.82}$

Amended cost for: \sim Overrun \sim Additional Work Number of Amendments <u>4</u>

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ting	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		3		
2. Work Performance	-	3		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		3		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		3		
5. Project related cooperation		3		
6. QA/QC plan conformance		3		
 Contract administration cooperation Invoices and progress reports 		3		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		3		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager

Print Name

Brett

Total Points 27 (Maximum points 36)

atract Administrator: Gregor

Grégory J./Thompson Print Name

- Above Average:
 - Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
 - Contractor performs beyond expectations.
 - Deliverables exceed standards.
 - Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
 - Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
 - Contractor needs little or no direction.
 - Contractor responsive to requests.
 - Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Widseth Smith Nolting, Inc.	•	CFMS Contract Number:
Project Name (if applicable): Final Design Bridge 27V84	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87994	Project Duration (Dates): 9/12/o5 thru 2/11/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ This bridge is part of the I35W & TH 62 Cross design services due to other Mn/DOT design construction letting date was met.	stown Renovation. Mn/DOT des	sign personnel were unable to provide
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$ 128,830.00	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE I	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau		4-10-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 87994 Type of work: Final Design Bridge27	V84
District/Office: Bridge Office Work Type Code: BD	MAD
S.P. 2782-27V84 T.H. 35W Location: 35W under Diamond I	ake road, Minneapolis
Contractor: Widseth Smith Nolting, Inc.	E Contractor Cuj
Subcontractor: NA	Star Star
Contract Period:9/12/05 ;2/11/06;Work Start DateWork Completion Date	Expiration Date
Total Contract Cost: \$128,961.55 = Orig Cost: \$128,830.00 + Am	*

Amended cost for: $\Box X$ Overrun

□ Additional Work

l Work Number of Amendments 0

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		X		
2. Work Performance		Х	1.	
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X		;
5. Project related cooperation		X		
6. QA/QC plan conformance	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	X		
7. Contract administration cooperation		X		
8. Invoices and progress reports		X		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		X		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

(Robert J Miller

Print Name

Total Points <u>27</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: (Manjula Louis)

Print Name

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Manjula Louis

All the deliverables were on time.

Jeff Rensch was the main designer on this project and the calculations submitted were easy to follow and Jeff did an excellent job of following through AASHTO Interim changes for Steel beam design.

The designer in the future should coordinate with roadway, abutment and

wing wall tie in points with adjacent retaining walls as soon as the bridge layout is finalized.

The pier footings were much larger than required.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Bob Miller

The footing issue was resolved during the 60% review resulting in an economical design. The Contractor now understands they must coordinate with the preliminary designers when required. Overall good work on a tight schedule.

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	•	
Contractor Name: SRF Consulting Group, Ir		CFMS Contract Number: A73682
Project Name (if applicable): Oak Park Heights Design Alternative	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87816	Project Duration (Dates): March 18, 2004 – August 31, 2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ling why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
The purpose of the contract was to provide Trunk Highway (T.H.) 36 (Osgood to T.H. 5 previously received municipal consent from interim solution for T.H. 36 within the St. C integrated into the project, the design need preferred alternative design and information	segment) 1995 design altern m the cities of Stillwater and roix River Crossing Environ ded to be converted from me on regarding environmental i	native. The 1995 option, which Oak Park Heights, is the proposed mental Impact Statement. In order to be tric to English, integrated into the mpacts updated.
The work was contracted because person one-time service when needed.	nel with the necessary experi	tise were not available to provide this
		¢
Billable Hours (if applicable): 1096.3	Total Contract Amount:	Source of Funding:
	\$79,552.61	Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
N/A		
	× .	
•		
Attach a copy of the performance evaluation	on prepared for this contract	•
Carol Moena	u	4-10-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File		

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>87816</u>	Гуре of work _	<u>Oak Park Heig</u>	hts Design Alte	<u>rnative</u>
District/Office <u>Metro</u> Work T	ype Code <u>PI</u>)	,	
S.P. <u>8214-114</u> T.H. <u>36</u>	Location	Osgood to T.H	. 5 in Oak Park	Heights
Contractor <u>SRF Consulting Group</u> ,	Inc.			56272829303
Subcontractor				ADD A
Subcontractor				MAR 2001
Contract Period: March 18, 2005; Work Start Date V Total Contract Cost: $\$79,552.61 = 0$	May 31, 2005; Work Completion	Date Expirati	0, 2005 ion Date nded Cost: <u>\$ 0.0</u>	OFFICE OF CONSULTANT SE
Amended cost for: ~ Overrun	∼ Additional T	ime Num	ber of Amendm	ents <u>0</u>
Item Rating		Ra	ting	
1 - 6 by Project Manager7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator				
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		×		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
2. Work Performance		\star		-
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 		*	×	
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT		× ×	×	
 Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and 	*		×	·
 Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time 	×.		×	
 Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance 	×. X	×	×	
 Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration 	×.	×	×	

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points < 0 (Maximum points 36)

oject Manager: Alana Getty Print Name

Contract Administrator: Mark Hagen Print Name

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

-work completed quickly - problems with CAPD Standards & effort of MnDOT staff to convert/use.

Report on Professional/Technical Contracts Over \$50,000 Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Bolton & Menk Inc.		A75682
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87873	Project Duration (Dates): 5/20/2005 to 2/10/2006
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu	ding why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:
Design needs to be completed in order to	o correct deteriorated pavement sidered; however, due to the scl	nedule, it does not allow for adequate time
ž.		
•		
Rillable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spont on	Source of Funding:
1380	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$100,000.00 /hy the agency determined ther	Source of Funding: District 7 Consultant Budget e was only a single source for the services
1380	Contract: \$100,000.00	District 7 Consultant Budget
f this was a single source contract, explain w	Contract: \$100,000.00	District 7 Consultant Budget
f this was a single source contract, explain w	Contract: \$100,000.00	District 7 Consultant Budget
f this was a single source contract, explain w	Contract: \$100,000.00	District 7 Consultant Budget
f this was a single source contract, explain w	Contract: \$100,000.00	District 7 Consultant Budget
f this was a single source contract, explain w	Contract: \$100,000.00	District 7 Consultant Budget
f this was a single source contract, explain w	Contract: \$100,000.00	District 7 Consultant Budget
f this was a single source contract, explain w	Contract: \$100,000.00	District 7 Consultant Budget
f this was a single source contract, explain w NA Evaluate the performance of the work includi	Contract: \$100,000.00 /hy the agency determined ther	District 7 Consultant Budget e was only a single source for the services
1380 If this was a single source contract, explain w NA	Contract: \$100,000.00 /hy the agency determined ther	District 7 Consultant Budget e was only a single source for the services
If this was a single source contract, explain w NA Evaluate the performance of the work includi performance in meeting the terms and object	Contract: \$100,000.00 /hy the agency determined ther	District 7 Consultant Budget e was only a single source for the services or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>87873</u> Ty	pe of work	Final Design	Construction Pla	an	
District/Office <u>7</u>	Work Typ	e Code <u>DD</u>		201	× 21 22
S.P. <u>0704-81</u> T.H. <u>22</u>	Lo	cation <u>Ma</u>	nkato		ULICC 33
Contractor <u>Bolton & Menk Inc.</u>				210	MAP S
Subcontractor				NO.	
Subcontractor					My St
Contract Period: <u>May 20,2005</u> ; <u>H</u> Work Start Date W	February 10,2006			Store Cal	9 Gt Clair
Total Contract Cost: \$_100,000.00 =	Orig Cost: \$_9	<u>9,208.49</u> + An	nended Cost: \$_	791.51	
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	∼ Additional `	Work Nun	nber of Amendn	nents <u>1</u>	n
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting		
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality		X			
2. Work Performance		X			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		Х			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X			
5. Project related cooperation	Х				
6. QA/QC plan conformance		X			
7. Contract administration cooperation	X				
8. Invoices and progress reports		Х			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		X			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: Mary Dieken Print Name

Total Points <u>29</u> (Maximum points 36)

Administrator: Contract Craig Felber

Print Name

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultar	nt Services Section, Mail Stop	o 680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: ADV Document Systems Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A 61198
Project Name (if applicable): Electronic Pocument Management System	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 86249	Project Duration (Dates):May 2004 – February 2006
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu	iding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
Design, plan, direct and support the impleme	ntation of the document manag	gement system (EDMS) within MnDOT.
Billable Hours (if applicable): 3076	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$299,910	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway Fund
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
Not Applicable		
Evaluate the performance of the work including performance in meeting the terms and object		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CO	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION
CarolWolna	l	4-10-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 862	249 Type of	work: Computer Se	ervices	A Contraction of the second seco	
District/Office: OIT	Γ Work Ty	vpe Code: CP		(m)	MAR 2006
S.P	T.H	Locati	ion		OFFICE OF
Contractor: ADV D	Ocument System	ns Inc.			SERV.
Subcontractor: Ber	nchmark				2029292W
Subcontractor					
Contract Period: May, 2 Work S	2004; Start Date	February, 2006; Work Completion Date	-		
Total Contract Cost:	\$ \$ 299,910 = C	rig Cost: \$ 249,990	+ Amended Cost:	\$ 49,920	
Amended cost for:	∼ Overrun	~ Additional Wor	<u>k</u> Number of	Amendments 2 (1 to	

add dollars; 1 to define subcontracting requirements)

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Rating				
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality		X			
2. Work Performance	Х				
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		Х			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X			
5. Project related cooperation	X				
6. QA/QC plan conformance		X			
7. Contract administration cooperation	×				
8. Invoices and progress reports		×			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		×			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project/Manager Nichael A. Barnes Print Name

Total Points _____ (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: (Melissa ucuihn's Print Name

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	N				
Contractor Name: Martinez Corporation	CFMS Contract Number: A-82833				
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Mapping	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88894	Project Duration (Dates): 11/04/05 to 02/15/06			
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu-	ding why it was necessary to e	enter into a contract:			
The Purpose of this contract was for the C create a Digital Terrain Model for this pro	-	riangulation, compile Planimetric Features and			
This Photogrammetric Mapping project is	for TH 55 from Buffalo to R	ockford in District 3 / Project number 8607-53.			
"Advances a transportation purpose", we In house we run two shifts for Photogramm require us to contract out.		pose but they are already too busy with work. nent and personnel capacity constraints			
Billable Hours (if applicable): No. Total C	Contract Amount: \$83,500.00	Source of Funding: Consultant Mapping			
Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently: Performing this work ourselves would be for more expense. Capital costs for necessary equipment and ongoing costs for personnel for this type of work are prohibitive for the State.					
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined the	re was only a single source for the services:			
No.	an a				
		1. 1. 1. 1. A			
Evaluate the performance of the work includi performance in meeting the terms and objecti		tor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall			
Please see the attached evaluation form.	· · ·				
Carol Molnae		4-10-06			
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date			
or D Stamphon 112 Admin					

P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Contractor Name: Optimal Geomatics	CFMS Contract Number: A-82835	
Atlantic Technologies, Incorporated, a s		
and Associates, Ltd.		
Project Name (if applicable):	Project Duration (Dates): 11/14/05 to 2/15/06	
Photogrammetric Mapping		

Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:

The Purpose of this contract was for the Contractor to produce an Aero-triangulation, Compile Planimetric Features and create a Digital Terrain Model, (DTM) for this project.

This Photogrammetric Mapping project is for Trunk Highway 55 (from Annandale to Buffalo), District 3 / Project number 8606-53.

"Advances a transportation purpose", we have employees for this purpose but they are already too busy with work. In house we run two shifts for Photogrammetric Mapping, but equipment and personnel capacity constraints require us to contract out.

Billable Hours (if applicable): No .	Total Contract Amount: \$79,850.00	Source of Funding: L/M, Consultant Mapping

Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently:

Performing this work ourselves would be for more expense. Capital costs for necessary equipment and ongoing costs for personnel for this type of work are prohibitive for the State.

If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services:

No.

Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:

Please see the attached evaluation form.

Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner

Date

4-10-06

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPOR	ΓΑΤΙΟΝ	J			
Contractor Name: Martinez Corporation			CFMS Contract Number: A-82833		
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Mapping			Project Duration (Dates): 11/04/05 to 02/15/06		
Summarize the purpose of the contra-	ct, incluc	ling why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:		
The Purpose of this contract was for create a Digital Terrain Model for		-	riangulation, compile Planimetric Features and		
This Photogrammetric Mapping pr	roject is f	for TH 55 from Buffalo to R	ockford in District 3 / Project number 8607-53.		
			pose but they are already too busy with work. ient and personnel capacity constraints		
Billable Hours (if applicable): No.	Total C	ontract Amount: \$83,500.00	Source of Funding: Consultant Mapping		
Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently: Performing this work ourselves would be for more expense. Capital costs for necessary equipment and ongoing costs for personnel for this type of work are prohibitive for the State.					
If this was a single source contract, e	xplain w	hy the agency determined the	re was only a single source for the services:		
No.		an a			
			у. Турана (анкала) — анкала (анкала) — а		
Evaluate the performance of the worl performance in meeting the terms and		• • • •	tor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall		
Please see the attached evaluation	form.				
Carol Mo		L	4-10-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commis	ssioner		Date		
cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680					

File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Opport				
Agreement No. <u>66090</u>	Type of w	ork <u>Pho</u>	togram	metric
District/Office $13 - 3$	Work Typ	be Code <u>/0.1</u>	_ MP	, j
Agreement No. $\frac{88944}{100000000000000000000000000000000000$	Ī Ļ	ocation 4	om Buffa	alo to R
Contractor Martinez	Corpor	ation	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	and a
Subcontractor —	- 1		' ئ.	
Subcontractor			294 2 2 2 2	CAR ATE TH
Contract Period: $\frac{11-4-05}{\text{Work Start Date}}$;	-			
Total Contract Cost: \$ <u>\$3,500</u> ~=	• Orig Cost: \$ <u>2</u>	<u>33,500 </u> + A	mended Cost	\$ <u>0</u> 27
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	\sim Additional	Work Num	ber of Amendr	ments
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager ' 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting	-
7 - 7 Dy Agreement Administrator			· .	
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
	Average		Average	
. Product Quality	Average		Average	
. Product Quality . Work Performance	Average		Average	
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 	Average		Average	
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time 	Average		Average	
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation 	Average 4 Points		Average	
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation 	Average 4 Points		Average	
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration 	Average 4 Points		Average	
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration cooperation 	Average 4 Points		Average	

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: Mith Print Name

Total Points 30(Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: Ē Print Name

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

 Contractor Name: Optimal Geomatics Inc., (formerly known as MD
 CFMS Contract Number: A-82835

 Atlantic Technologies, Incorporated, a subsidiary of MacDonald, Dettwiler
 CFMS Contract Number: A-82835

 and Associates, Ltd.
 Project Name (if applicable):
 Mn/DOT Contract No.: 88891

 Photogrammetric Mapping
 Project Name (if applicable):
 Mn/DOT Contract No.: 88891

Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:

The Purpose of this contract was for the Contractor to produce an Aero-triangulation, Compile Planimetric Features and create a Digital Terrain Model, (DTM) for this project.

This Photogrammetric Mapping project is for Trunk Highway 55 (from Annandale to Buffalo), District 3 / Project number 8606-53.

"Advances a transportation purpose", we have employees for this purpose but they are already too busy with work. In house we run two shifts for Photogrammetric Mapping, but equipment and personnel capacity constraints require us to contract out.

Billable Hours (if applicable): No.	Total Contract Amount: \$79,850.00	Source of Funding: L/M, Consultant Mapping
-------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--

Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently:

Performing this work ourselves would be for more expense. Capital costs for necessary equipment and ongoing costs for personnel for this type of work are prohibitive for the State.

If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services:

No.

Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:

Please see the attached evaluation form.

arol Molnau

Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680

4-10-06

Date

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

				•
Agreement No. <u>88891</u>	Type of w	ork Phot	Toffan	metric
District/Office $D - 3$	Work Typ	e Code <u>10.</u>	$_{-}$ $^{\cup}$ MP	i
S.P. 8606-53 T.H. 55	Г L	ocation for	no Amagu	dale to 1
Contractor <u>optimal Geo</u> Subcontractor	matics f	brnerk	Known	a Atla
Subcontractor			ð	
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: $11 - 14 - 05$; Work Start Date	$2 - 1 \leq -0$ Work Completion	D ₆ ; <u>6</u> -3 Date Expiration	<u>0 - 0 6</u> 1 Date	- To 474
Total Contract Cost: $\frac{79856}{}$				\$ 0
Amended cost for: ~ Overrun	~ Additional `		ber of Amend	ments
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager '		Ra	ting	
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	•	· .		
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	V	·· <u>······</u> ····························		
2. Work Performance			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements				
4. Deliverables Complete and on time			-	
5. Project related cooperation				
6. QA/QC plan conformance				· · · ·
 6. QA/QC plan conformance 7. Contract administration cooperation 				
7. Contract administration				

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: yr R HLADWELLON RÞ 50 Print Name

Total Points (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: P 1E Print Name

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>			
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Contractor Name: ADDCO, Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A63115			
Project Name (if applicable): Duluth TOCC Expansion	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 86389	Project Duration (Dates): 6/22/04 – 12/31/05			
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include					
There was need for additional cameras on the variable message signs and a communication was needed. This type of expertise did not ex	is link between Duluth and the	Wisconsin Department of Transportation			
	, *				
	к. , т ан та				
*					
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:			
N/A	Contract: \$464,715.61	State and Federal			
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:			
	*.				
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:					
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION					
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	de .	3 27-06 Date			
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sect File	ion				

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice

instructions. Submit this form to consultan	i Services Section, Mail Stop	boo along with the final involce.		
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name:	CFMS Contract Number:			
Toltz, King, Duvall, Anderson & Associates, Ir	1 <u>C.</u>	A75612		
Project Name (if applicable): Bridges 27V80 and 27V81	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87636	Project Duration (Dates): May 23, 2005 to February 25, 2006		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:				
The Contract was for final construction plans 60 TH Street and Bridge 27V81, T.H. 35W over the City of Richfield. A Contractor was used b Mn/DOT to meet scheduled construction letting	preparation for Bridge 27V80, I ⁻ 60 Th Street. Both bridges are p ecause Mn/DOT did not have o	Ramp (35S62E) & Ramp (35S62W) over part of the Crosstown renovation project in		
	• ×			
	· ·			
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:		
N/A	Contract: \$187,306.13	Consultant Services Budget as allocated		
		to Bridge Office.		
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
8				
× · · · ·				
Evaluate the performance of the work includir		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall		
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract.			
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION		
<u> </u>		·		
Carol Dolnai	L	3-27-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date		
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration				
Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sect	ion			
File				

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

mati detteria: edonint tina form to consultan	t bervices bection, man btop	ooo along waar are mar motoc.		
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:		
Edwards and Kelcey, Inc.		A77073		
Project Name (if applicable):Final Design	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):		
Bridges 27V67 and 27V69 87637		July 15, 2005 to February 22, 2006		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:				
The Contract was for final construction plane	proportion for Dridge 27//67	TH 62 weathound over TH 121 and		
The Contract was for final construction plans Bridge 27V69, Ramp from T.H. 121 northbou				
Crosstown renovation project in the City of Ri				
personnel available and it enabled Mn/DOT to				
		5		
		· · · · ·		
· .				
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:		
N/A	Contract: \$205,091.75	Consultant Services Budget as allocated		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	to Bridge Office.		
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
		•		
	· ·			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
*	·			
Evaluate the performance of the work includin		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall		
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:			
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION		
and malma		3-27-06		
Carol Molpau Lt Covernor/Commissioner	n			
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date		
p: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration				

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final	invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name:	CFMS Contract Number:			
Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc.		A75015		
Project Name (if applicable): P701 Spatial Index User Interface for Right of Way Maps	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87834	Project Duration (Dates): 5/2/05 – 12/31/06		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to en	nter into a contract:		
ArcIMS is a software product within Mn/DOT's standard family of GIS products for delivering data via a map interface through a web browser. There have been eleven requests for web-mapping capabilities over the past year through the Department. Phase 1 of this project will build the ArcIMS infrastructure and an ArcIMS enterprise web interface template. This infrastructure will be the foundation for other business areas to deliver their own data via the enterprise web interface template. This will ensure a consistent e-government look and feel for Mn/DOT's data delivery via a map interface through a web browser. Phase 1 of this project will also deliver an enterprise spatial data warehouse that will supply data to ArcGIS clients throughout the Department, in addition to providing data sources for ArcIMS web services. An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project.				
Billable Hours (if applicable): 660.25	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway		
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution.				
Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs.				
It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department.				
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		3-27-06 Date		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

cc:

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

	it bervices bection, man btop	ood along with the final involce.		
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:		
EVS, Inc.		A62220		
roject Name (if applicable): Mn/DOT Agreement No.:		Project Duration (Dates):		
BAP 101 – Conversion to Freeway 86309		6/15/2004 – 1/31/2006		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:				
This contract was necessary to deliver the pre-	eliminary design engineering (ir	ncluding geometric layouts, hydraulics		
analysis, environmental documents, etc.) for t				
in Wright County because there were not suff				
legislated time constraints.				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
		1 at		
	λ.			
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:		
5895	Contract: \$612,761.20	BAP Funds		
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
	,			
	<i>y</i>			
·				
1				
		v		
×				
		к.		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin	g an appraisal of the contracto	r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall		
performance in meeting the terms and objectiv				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION		
 A set of points in the set of t				
A have				
arol /Ktolnau	-	3-27-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *			
		Date		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

		680 along with the final invoice.	
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name: Short Elliot Hendrickson,		CFMS Contract Number: A74386	
Project Name (if applicable): Bridge 27V68	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87176	Project Duration (Dates): April 14, 2005 to January 15, 2006	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ	ling why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:	
The Contract was for final construction plans p from Westbound T.H. 62 to Southbound T.H. Richfield. Work on Bridge 27V68 is part of the Mn/DOT did not have design personnel availa	35W, at the junction of Eastbo Crosstown revitalization proje	und T.H. 62 and T.H. 121, in the City of ct. A Contractor was used because	
	Tatal Assaunt On ant an		
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$492,125.41	Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget allotment for Bridge Office.	
If this was a single source contract, explain wh	w the agency determined there		
· ·			
		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	
Evaluate the performance of the work including performance in meeting the terms and objectiv SEE ATTACHED CON			

File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name: Short Elliot Hendrickson,	Inc.	CFMS Contract Number: A74386	
Project Name (if applicable): Bridge 27V68	Project Duration (Dates): April 14, 2005 to January 15, 2006		
Bridge 27V6887176April 14, 2005 to January 15, 2006Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:			
The Contract was for final construction plans preparation for Bridge 27V68, Eastbound T.H 62 over T.H. 35W and ramp from Westbound T.H. 62 to Southbound T.H. 35W, at the junction of Eastbound T.H. 62 and T.H. 121, in the City of Richfield. Work on Bridge 27V68 is part of the Crosstown revitalization project. A Contractor was used because Mn/DOT did not have design personnel available and it enabled Mn/DOT to meet scheduled construction letting date.			
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$492,125.41	Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget allotment for Bridge Office.	
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined ther	e was only a single source for the services:	
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:			
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		3-27-04 Date	
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration			

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 87176	Туј	pe of work Fir	nal Desigi	γ	
District/Office: <u>Bridge Office</u>	W	ork Type Code	BD		
S.P. <u>2782-27V68</u> T.H. <u>35</u>		cation	-		897
Contractor: <u>Short Elliot Hendricks</u>	on, Inc.			So'	
Subcontractor: <u>N/A</u>				A MAR	2006
Subcontractor: <u>N/A</u>		•		7	v2 U ∵ OF
Contract Period: <u>April 14, 2005;</u> Work Start Date	January 15, 20 Work Completion	n Date Expi	ber 1, 2006 ration Date	CONSUL	A 2006
Total Contract Cost: $\$492,125.41 = 0$	Orig Cost: <u>\$44</u>	<u>4,493.08</u> + Am	ended Cost: <u>\$4'</u>	7,632.33	17 67 77 69
Amended cost for: Overrun	r1		Number of Ame	ndments: <u>2</u>	-
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	roject Manager				
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality		X			
2. Work Performance		×			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		×			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		×			
5. Project related cooperation	X				
6. QA/QC plan conformance	X				
7. Contract administration cooperation		\times			
8. Invoices and progress reports		\times			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		×			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

n Ezeles Project Manager: -(Arlen Ottman) Print Name

Total Points <u>29</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: iter E. U. Canhhe

(Victor E. Crabbe) Print Name

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

W. F. M. C. E. F.

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898
Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Contractor Name: EVS, Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A62220
Project Name (if applicable): BAP 101 – Conversion to Freeway	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 86309	Project Duration (Dates): 6/15/2004 – 1/31/2006
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ This contract was necessary to deliver the pre analysis, environmental documents, etc.) for t in Wright County because there were not suff legislated time constraints.	eliminary design engineering (ir he high priority Bonding Accele	ncluding geometric layouts, hydraulics erated Project on Trunk Highway (TH) 101
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
5895	Contract: \$612,761.20	BAP Funds
If this was a single source contract, explain w		
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti		or s timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau	-	3-27-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 86309	_ Type of v	work <u>Prelimi</u>	nary Design Eng	ineering	-
District/Office 3	Work Ty	pe Code 🚛	PD PD		_
S.P. <u>8608-21</u> T.H. <u>101</u>			to Mississippi R	iver in Wright	
County				1214157	6774
Contractor <u>EVS, Inc.</u>				ATT A	e i le
Subcontractor				65 MAR 20	
Subcontractor	<u></u>				
Contract Period: <u>6/15/2004</u> ;	2/25/2006	; 4/28/200	6	CO CONSULTAN	t ser
Work Start Date	-	-			679
Total Contract Cost: $\frac{613,577.28}{2}$ =				29,9/4:93 12,02	100
Amended cost for: Additional Work	k Number	of Amendment	s <u>1</u>		_
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting		
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality	X				
2. Work Performance	X				
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	X				
5. Project related cooperation	X	5			
6. QA/QC plan conformance		X			
7. Contract administration cooperation	X				
8. Invoices and progress reports		X			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		X			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manage (Craig Robinson)

Total Points <u>32</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator:

Am (Tony Hughes)

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

1 4 ig 1

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Contractor Name: CFMS Contract Number: Ar5015 Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. Ar5015 Project Name (if applicable): MDODT Agreement No.: S7205 – 12/31/06 Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: ArcIMS is a software product within Mn/DOT's standard family of GIS products for delivering data via a map interface through a web browser. There have been eleven requests for web-mapping capabilities over the past year through the Department. Phase 1 of this project will build the ArcIMS infrastructure and an ArcIMS enterprise web interface through a web browser. Phase 1 of this project will also deliver an enterprise spatial data varehouse that will supply data to ArcGIS clients throughout the Department, in addition to providing data sources for ArcIMS web services. An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billeble Hours (if applicable): 600.25 Total Arnount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50 Source of Funding: Trunk Highway If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping a		te ocrateco occuent, man otop	out along with the final involce.		
Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. A75015 Project Name (if applicable): Mn/DOT Agreement No.: \$7634 SUMMARIZE the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: ArCIMS is a software product within Mn/DOT's standard family of GIS products for delivering data via a map interface through a web browser. There have been eleven requests for web-mapping capabilities over the past year through the Department. Phase 1 of this project will build the ArCIMS infrastructure and an ArCIMS enterprise web interface template. This will ensure a consistent e-government look and feel for Mn/DOT is data delivery via a map interface template. This will ensure a consistent e-government look and feel for Mn/DOT is data delivery via a map interface through a web browser. Phase 1 of this project will addition to providing data sources for ArcIMS web services. An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on 6 Funding: Tounk Highway Contract: \$122,082.50 Trunk Highway ArcIMS is ESR's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data wate the veb. The Transportation Engineering Application Evenoment datos from ESRI, to feetively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT is one internet-based mapping applications of ArcIMS has exporting and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mi/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS Software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS he a	Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. A75015 Project Name (if applicable): Mn/DOT Agreement No.: \$7634 SUMMARIZE the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: ArCIMS is a software product within Mn/DOT's standard family of GIS products for delivering data via a map interface through a web browser. There have been eleven requests for web-mapping capabilities over the past year through the Department. Phase 1 of this project will build the ArCIMS infrastructure and an ArCIMS enterprise web interface template. This will ensure a consistent e-government look and feel for Mn/DOT is data delivery via a map interface template. This will ensure a consistent e-government look and feel for Mn/DOT is data delivery via a map interface through a web browser. Phase 1 of this project will addition to providing data sources for ArcIMS web services. An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on 6 Funding: Tounk Highway Contract: \$122,082.50 Trunk Highway ArcIMS is ESR's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data wate the veb. The Transportation Engineering Application Evenoment datos from ESRI, to feetively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT is one internet-based mapping applications of ArcIMS has exporting and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mi/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS Software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS he a	Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:		
P701 Spatial Index User Interface for Right 87834 5/2/05 - 12/31/06 of Way Maps Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: ArcIMS is a software product within Mn/DOT's standard family of GIS products for delivering data via a map interface through a web browser. There have been eleven requests for web-mapping capabilities over the past year through the Department. Phase 1 of this project will build the ArcIMS infrastructure and an ArcIMS enterprise web interface template. This will ensure a consistent e-government look and feel for Mn/DOT's data delivery via a map interface through a web browser. Phase 1 of this project will also deliver an enterprise spatial data warehouse that will supply data to ArcGIS clients throughout the Department, in addition to providing data sources for ArcIMS web services. An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50 Source of Funding: Trunk Highway ft is use a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS feasibility & scoping AnylOCT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as t	Environmental Systems Research Institute, In	IC.			
of Waps Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: ArcIMS is a software product within Mn/DOT's standard family of GIS products for delivering data via a map interface through a web browser. There have been eleven requests for web-mapping capabilities over the past year through the Department. Phase 1 of this project will build the ArcIMS infrastructure and an ArcIMS enterprise web interface template. This infrastructure will be the foundation for other business areas to deliver their own data via the enterprise web interface template. This will ensure a consistent e-government look and feel for Mn/DOT's data delivery via a map interface through a web browser. Phase 1 of this project will also deliver an enterprise spatial data warehouse that will supply data to ArcGIS clients throughout the Department, in addition to providing data sources for ArcIMS web services. An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Arnount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50 Trunk Highway If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and	Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: ArcIMS is a software product within Mn/DOT's standard family of GIS products for delivering data via a map interface through a web browser. There have been eleven requests for web-mapping capabilities over the past year through the Department. Phase 1 of this project will build the ArcIMS infrastructure and an ArcIMS enterprise web interface template. This infrastructure will be the foundation for other business areas to deliver their own data via the enterprise web interface template. This will ensure a consistent e-government look and feel for Mn/DOT's data delivery via a map interface through a web browser. Phase 1 of this project will also deliver an enterprise spatial data warehouse that will supply data to ArcGIS clients throughout the Department, in addition to providing data sources for ArcIMS web services. An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50 Trunk Highway If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project level of web mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS software, the development mark as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT develop	P701 Spatial Index User Interface for Right	87834	5/2/05 – 12/31/06		
ArclMS is a software product within Mn/DOT's standard family of GIS products for delivering data via a map interface through a web browser. There have been eleven requests for web-mapping capabilities over the past year through the Department. Phase 1 of this project will build the ArclMS infrastructure and an ArclMS enterprise web interface template. This infrastructure will be the foundation for other business areas to deliver their own data via the enterprise web interface template. This will ensure a consistent e-government look and feel for Mn/DOT's data delivery via a map interface through a web browser. Phase 1 of this project will also deliver an enterprise spatial data warehouse that will supply data to ArcGIS clients throughout the Department, in addition to providing data sources for ArcIMS web services. An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on 600.25 Source of Funding: 700.0000000000000000000000000000000000	of Way Maps	<i>'</i>			
through a web browser. There have been eleven requests for web-mapping capabilities over the past year through the Department. Phase 1 of this project will build the ArcIMS infrastructure and an ArcIMS enterprise web interface template. This infrastructure will be the foundation for other business areas to deliver their own data via the enterprise web interface template. This will ensure a consistent e-government look and feel for MnDOT's data delivery via a map interface through a web browser. Phase 1 of this project will also deliver an enterprise spatial data warehouse that will supply data to ArcIMS sube services. An understanding of the ArcIMS sube of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50 Source of Funding: Trunk Highway If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's project elevel of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT development may be based on a platforms with artive versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to dis	Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	iter into a contract:		
through a web browser. There have been eleven requests for web-mapping capabilities over the past year through the Department. Phase 1 of this project will build the ArcIMS infrastructure and an ArcIMS enterprise web interface template. This infrastructure will be the foundation for other business areas to deliver their own data via the enterprise web interface template. This will ensure a consistent e-government look and feel for MnDOT's data delivery via a map interface through a web browser. Phase 1 of this project will also deliver an enterprise spatial data warehouse that will supply data to ArcIMS sube services. An understanding of the ArcIMS sube of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50 Source of Funding: Trunk Highway If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's project elevel of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT development may be based on a platforms with artive versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to dis	ArcIMS is a software product within Mn/DOT's	s standard family of GIS produc	ts for delivering data via a man interface		
Department. Phase 1 of this project will build the ArcIMS infrastructure and an ArcIMS enterprise web interface template. This infrastructure will be the foundation for other business areas to deliver their own data via the enterprise web interface through a web browser. Phase 1 of this project will also deliver an enterprise spatial data warehouse that will supply data to ArcGIS clients throughout the Department, in addition to providing data sources for ArcIMS web services. An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50 Source of Funding: Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50 ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT's projectel level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements olution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard data wile web apping applications with early versions of ArcIMS software, the development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire retures and with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was fe					
template. This infrastructure will be the foundation for other business areas to deliver their own data via the enterprise web interface template. This will ensure a consistent e-government look and feel for Mn/DOT's data delivery via a map interface through a web browser. Phase 1 of this project will also deliver an enterprise spatial data warehouse that will supply data to ArcGIS clients throughout the Department, in addition to providing data sources for ArcIMS web services. An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50 Ge0.25 Trunk Highway If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of A					
web interface template. This will ensure a consistent e-government look and feel for Mh/DOT's data delivery via a map interface through a web browser. Phase 1 of this project will also deliver an enterprise spatial data warehouse that will supply data to ArcGIS clients throughout the Department, in addition to providing data sources for ArcIMS web services. An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50 Source of Funding: Trunk Highway If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's project level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It					
interface through a web browser. Phase 1 of this project will also deliver an enterprise spatial data warehouse that will supply data to ArcGIS clients throughout the Department, in addition to providing data sources for ArcIMS web services. An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50 Source of Funding: Trunk Highway If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common meds. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the					
supply data to ArcGIS clients throughout the Department, in addition to providing data sources for ArcIMS web services. An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools and technology and being able to make modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50 Source of Funding: Trunk Highway if this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology part discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS Software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line					
enhancements to applications is required for this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50 Source of Funding: Trunk Highway If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the					
Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$122,082.50 Source of Funding: Trunk Highway If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost	An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools	and technology and being able	to make modifications and minor		
660.25 Contract: \$122,082.50 Trunk Highway If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of t	enhancements to applications is required for t	this project.			
660.25 Contract: \$122,082.50 Trunk Highway If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of t					
If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:		
ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performa	660.25	Contract: \$122,082.50	Trunk Highway		
ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delivering maps and spatial data via the Web. The Transportation Engineering Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performa	If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:		
Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	3 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	,			
Application Development Unit of the Office of Information Technology has undertaken a ArcIMS feasibility & scoping study, which includes recommendations from ESRI, to effectively determine the infrastructure required to support Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	ArcIMS is ESRI's proprietary product for delive	ering maps and spatial data via	the Web. The Transportation Engineering		
Mn/DOT's projected level of web mapping activities. ArcIMS was ranked highest in the project team's selection evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION					
evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution. Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION					
Mn/DOT has owned several licenses of ArcIMS software since it was first made available in the late 1990's. Mn/DOT developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION 3-27-0.6					
developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION 3-27-0.6	evaluation matrix as the best for serving maps and spatial data, and for our project requirements solution.				
developed some internet-based mapping applications with early versions of ArcIMS. In April of 2004, business areas met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION 3-27-0.6					
met with staff from the Office of Information Technology to discuss their common needs. It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION 3-27-06					
It was felt that a centralized development of infrastructure for web mapping would yield benefits to the entire enterprise and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION					
and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Carel Malage, La Saurage/Segmentics.	met with staff from the Office of Information I	echnology to discuss their com	mon needs.		
and increase the efficiency of business areas building their services. It was also agreed that while long term web mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Carel Malage, La Saurage/Segmentics.		for the stars for each an each is a set			
mapping development may be based on a platform other than ArcIMS, the availability of ArcIMS software, the development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION $3-27-06$					
development already taking place with it, and ArcIMS being part of the same product line as Mn/DOT's standard GIS software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AuguManagement development development of development of development d					
software all suggested it would be an excellent starting point for immediate development of web mapping capabilities within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION 3-27-06					
within the department. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Gamed Malager Lt Segmentationary					
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Carel Melany, ht Converses/Commissioner	within the department	it starting point for immediate d	evelopment of web mapping capabilities		
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Canal Malague 14 Segmentations					
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Canal Malague 14 Segmentations	Evaluate the performance of the work includin	a an appraisal of the contractor	r's timeliness quality cost and overall		
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Canal Malman 3-27-06			r s timenness, quanty, cost, and overall		
Carolmonau 3-27-06					
Carolmonau 3-27-06	SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION		
Corol Molnoy, 14 Covernor/Commissioner					
Corol Molnoy, 14 Covernor/Commissioner					
Corol Molnoy, 14 Covernor/Commissioner	1ºa da		4		
Corol Molnoy, 14 Covernor/Commissioner	Mol molnau		3-27-06		
	Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner				

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

cc:

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>87834</u>	Type of we	ork <u>IT</u>	mputer	services
District/Office <u>Central Office</u>			· · ·	
S.P. <u>N/A</u> T.H. <u>N</u>	<u>N/A</u> I	Location <u>N/A</u>	<u>4</u>	
Contractor _Environmental Systems	Research Instit	ute, Inc.		
Subcontractor <u>N/A</u>				
Subcontractor <u>N/A</u>				
Contract Period: <u>May 2, 2005</u> ;; Work Start Date	December 31, 20 Work Completion	06; <u>December 3</u> Date Expiration	n Date	
Total Contract Cost: \$_122,082.50 C *This project came in under budget a				
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	\sim Additional	Work Nun	nber of Amendr	nents
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	iting	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	4		·	·
2. Work Performance	4	· · · ·		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		3		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		3		
5. Project related cooperation	4			· · · · · ·
6. QA/QC plan conformance	4			
7. Contract administration cooperation		3		
8. Invoices and progress reports		3		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: Crystal illips-Mustain Print Name

Total Points (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: 21106 Print Name

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Contractor Name: ADDCO, Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A63115				
Project Name (if applicable): Duluth TOCC Expansion	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 86389	Project Duration (Dates): 6/22/04 – 12/31/05				
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ	ding why it was necessary to en	iter into a contract:				
There was need for additional cameras on the I-535 (Blatnik) and T.H.2 bridge for traffic and security monitoring. Two variable message signs and a communications link between Duluth and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation was needed. This type of expertise did not exist and a contract was necessary for design and installation.						
		, ,				
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$464,715.61	Source of Funding: State and Federal				
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:				
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objection		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall				
	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION				
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	u	3 27-06 Date				
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration						

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Contract No. <u>86389</u> Typ		Type of work <u>ITS</u>			
District/Office <u>One</u>	Wo	Work Type Code <u>MC</u>			
S.P. <u>8821-118</u> T.H. <u>999</u>	Loo	cation <u>Blatnik</u>	& Bong Bridg	es in Duluth	
Contractor ADDCO, Inc.					
Subcontractor				2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	
Subcontractor				RECEIVED	<u>م</u> ۲
Contract Period: <u>6/22/04</u> ;		: <u>12/31/05</u> Date Exp	viration Date	OFFICE OF K	Ĵ
Total Contract Cost: <u>\$464,715.61</u> =	= Orig Cost: \$	<u>352,546.61</u> + A	Amended Cost	\$147,169.00	
Amended cost for: Overrun	Additional Wo	rk Number o	of Amendments	s <u>2</u>	
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ing		
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality		X			
2. Work Performance		X			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time				Х	
5. Project related cooperation		X			
6. QA/QC plan conformance		X			
7. Contract administration cooperation		X			
8. Invoices and progress reports		X			
9. Cost estimation/budget management				X	

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: (James Miles

Print Name

Total Points <u>23</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: eal Roberta Dwyer

Print Name

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
 - Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
 - Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

• Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.

- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Deliverables Complete and on time

This project had an initial project expiration date of June 30, 2005. A contract amendment was executed to change the project expiration date to December 31, 2005. When the contract expired on December 31, not all of the deliverables required by the Contract had been completed. Consequently only 40% of the final Video Sharing item was paid for on the final invoice.

There are specific instances during the project where work was not completed in a timely manner. Five cameras to be installed under this project had an initial completion date of September 2004. The cameras were not operational until midsummer of 2005. A changeable message sign that was reconfigured had a requirement that the sign could not be out of service for more than two weeks and not during a legal holiday. The sign ended up being out of service for an extended length of time including a legal holiday. There are other instances similar to this that occurred during the duration of the project.

Cost estimation/budget management

The original contract was for \$352,546.61. According to ADDCO, one of the assumptions this figure was based on was using bridge navigation lights or decorative lights as the power source for the cameras. Mn/DOT did not permit this on the final design and required routing power from another location increasing costs. This final design was completed early in 2005. ADDCO notified Mn/DOT of the cost overruns in early August 2005. The cost overrun resulted in a contract amendment increasing the total cost of the project to \$499,715.61. This overrun should have been presented to Mn/DOT immediately after the assumptions used for budgeting changed.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Sto	p 680 along with the final invoice.				
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Contractor Name: Toltz, King, Duvall, Anderson & Associates, Ir	1 <u>C.</u>	CFMS Contract Number: A75612				
Project Name (if applicable): Bridges 27V80 and 27V81	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87636	Project Duration (Dates): May 23, 2005 to February 25, 2006				
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:				
The Contract was for final construction plans preparation for Bridge 27V80, Ramp (35S62E) & Ramp (35S62W) over 60 TH Street and Bridge 27V81, T.H. 35W over 60 Th Street. Both bridges are part of the Crosstown renovation project in the City of Richfield. A Contractor was used because Mn/DOT did not have design personnel available and it enabled Mn/DOT to meet scheduled construction letting date.						
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$187,306.13	Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget as allocated to Bridge Office.				
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined the	re was only a single source for the services:				
	- -					
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall				
SEE ATTACHED CON	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION				
Carol Dolnai	L	3-27-06				
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date				
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sec						

File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>87636</u>	Type of work	: <u>Bridge De</u>	sion		
-		Code <u>BD</u>	<u>51511</u>		
District/Office: Bridge Office					
S.P. <u>2782-27V80</u> T.H. <u>35W</u>			<u>mp (35S62E) & F</u>		2
<u>2782-27V81</u>	over 60 TH St	reet. Bridge 27	<u>V81, T.H. 35W o</u>	ver 60 Th Street.	A Company
Contractor: Toltz, King, Duvall, Ander	son & Associates	s, Inc.		N 21222	3425262
Subcontractor: <u>N/A</u>				AND RE	ES ann
Subcontractor: <u>N/A</u>				E MAR!	
Contract Period: <u>May 23, 2005;</u> Work Start Date	February 25, 200 Work Completion		<u>ber 1, 2006.</u> ration Date	CONSU	JED SHAV.
Total Contract Cost: $\$187,306.13 =$	Orig Cost: <u>\$187</u>	7 <u>,306.13</u> + Ar	nended Cost:	<u>50.00</u> 41016	
Amended cost for: Overrun		Work Nu	mber of Amend		8 Lander
Item Rating		Ra	ting		
1 - 6 by Project Manager					
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above		Below	[-
	Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality		V			
2. Work Performance		V			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		V			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		V			
5. Project related cooperation	V				
6. QA/QC plan conformance		V			
7. Contract administration cooperation					
8. Invoices and progress reports		\checkmark			
9. Cost estimation/budget management					

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: (Jihshya Kin) Print Name

Total Points 28 (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: ble

(Victor E. Crabbe) Print Name

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Vorked very . W/ area Cooperated

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

1 1 1 0 1		0 11 10 1	0 11 10 10 01	000 1	g with the final invoice.
Instructions' Sur	nmit this torm to	Concultant Sonvicos	Soction Mail St	<u>nn 6xii sinn</u>	A WITH THA TING I INVOICA
manuchona, our		Consultant Services	Section, man St		

instructions. Submit this form to consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	ood along with the final involce.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Edwards and Kelcey, Inc.		A77073
Project Name (if applicable):Final Design	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Bridges 27V67 and 27V69	87637	July 15, 2005 to February 22, 2006
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include		
The Contract was for final construction plans p Bridge 27V69, Ramp from T.H. 121 northbour Crosstown renovation project in the City of Ric personnel available and it enabled Mn/DOT to	nd to T.H. 62 westbound over T chfield. A Contractor was used	Γ.Η. 121. Both bridges are part of the because Mn/DOT did not have design
		RECEIVED MAR 29 2006 DEPARTMENT OF ADMANN OFFICE OF THE
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
N/A	Contract: \$205,091.75	Consultant Services Budget as allocated
		to Bridge Office.
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the second se	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
- AG Mayo		
*		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE I	EVALUATION
Carol molno	u	3-27-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
L		
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No.: <u>87637</u>	Type of w	ork: <u>Bridge De</u>	sign		
District/Office: <u>Bridge Office</u>	Work Typ	be Code BR	<u>)</u>		
S.P. <u>2782-27V67</u> T.H. <u>35W</u>	Location:	Bridge 27V67, 7	T.H. 62 westbour	nd over T.H. 121	L
<u>2782-27V69</u>		Bridge 27V69,]	Ramp from T.H.	121 northbound	l
Contractor: Edwards and Kelcey, Inc.		to T.H. 62 west	bound over T.H.	121	122775
Subcontractor: <u>N/A</u>				AN IN IS A	& ^{~~} {?
Contract Period: <u>July 15, 2005;</u> Work Start Date	<u>February 22,</u> Work Completi	on Date	October 1, 2006 Expiration Date		2006
Total Contract Cost: $$205,091.75 = 0$	Drig Cost: <u>\$169</u>	<u>,482.07</u> + Ame	nded Cost: <u>\$30</u>	152.63CONSULT	ANT SERV
	+ Overrun Co				
Amended cost for: X Overrun	X Additi	onal Work N	umber of Ame	ndments:	9.5 2
Item Rating		Rat	ting]
1 - 6 by Project Manager7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator					
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above		Below		-
	Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality		V			
2. Work Performance		V			1
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	V				
4. Deliverables Complete and on time					
5. Project related cooperation	V				
6. QA/QC plan conformance		a Vas			
7. Contract administration cooperation					
8. Invoices and progress reports					
9. Cost estimation/budget management					

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: (Jilshya Lin) Print Name

Total Points <u>29</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: inter E. H. Cable

(Victor E. Crabbe) Print Name

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments.

Common(b)
Pointed out problems in the preliminary design plans
Pointed out problems in the preliminary design plans early and worked closely with PM.
Put extra effort in design to save construction costs
in piles and footings w/ great suggestions to Bridge Office, Need to use drafting technicians to draw plans to lower cost to Mn/20T. Jikshya J. L.
Need to use drafting technicians to draw plans to lower
cost to Mn/00T. Gilshung Li

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	it Services Section, Mail Stop	b 660 along with the final involce.		
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: City of Monticello		CFMS Contract Number: A75206		
Project Name (if applicable): CSAH 18 Interchange	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87877 Work Order (1)	Project Duration (Dates): May 9 th , 2005 to October 3 rd , 2005		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:		
The City of Monticello was the lead agency additional work. The most efficient way to Monticello's work.				
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
• • • • • • • • • • • •				
	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding: State Funds		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Contract: \$190,366.50	otato i unao		
Billable Hours (if applicable): If this was a single source contract, explain w				
	hy the agency determined there or on designing a new intercha	ange on I94. Mn/DOT requested		
If this was a single source contract, explain where the city of Monticello was the lead agency additional work. The most efficient way to	hy the agency determined there or on designing a new intercha	ange on I94. Mn/DOT requested		
If this was a single source contract, explain where the city of Monticello was the lead agency additional work. The most efficient way to	hy the agency determined there or on designing a new intercha	ange on I94. Mn/DOT requested		
If this was a single source contract, explain where the city of Monticello was the lead agency additional work. The most efficient way to	hy the agency determined there or on designing a new intercha	ange on I94. Mn/DOT requested		
If this was a single source contract, explain where the city of Monticello was the lead agency additional work. The most efficient way to	hy the agency determined there or on designing a new intercha	ange on I94. Mn/DOT requested		
If this was a single source contract, explain where the city of Monticello was the lead agency additional work. The most efficient way to	hy the agency determined there or on designing a new intercha	ange on I94. Mn/DOT requested		
If this was a single source contract, explain where the city of Monticello was the lead agency additional work. The most efficient way to	hy the agency determined there or on designing a new intercha	ange on I94. Mn/DOT requested		
If this was a single source contract, explain where the city of Monticello was the lead agency additional work. The most efficient way to	hy the agency determined there or on designing a new intercha	ange on I94. Mn/DOT requested		
If this was a single source contract, explain where the city of Monticello was the lead agency additional work. The most efficient way to	hy the agency determined there y on designing a new intercha design the additional work w ng an appraisal of the contracto	ange on I94. Mn/DOT requested vas to include it with the City of		
If this was a single source contract, explain with The City of Monticello was the lead agency additional work. The most efficient way to Monticello's work.	hy the agency determined there y on designing a new intercha design the additional work w ng an appraisal of the contracto	e was only a single source for the services: ange on I94. Mn/DOT requested vas to include it with the City of		
If this was a single source contract, explain with The City of Monticello was the lead agency additional work. The most efficient way to Monticello's work.	hy the agency determined there y on designing a new intercha design the additional work w g an appraisal of the contracto ves of the contract:	e was only a single source for the services: ange on I94. Mn/DOT requested vas to include it with the City of		

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

nstructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.				
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:A81895		
Kadramas Lee and Jackson Inc.		А.		
Project Name (if applicable): HARN Observations	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88791	Project Duration (Dates): 10/05 – 6/06		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:		
High Accuracy Reference Networking was ne	eded in Detroit Lakes.			
	•			
· · · · ·				
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:		
	Contract:\$98,000.00	OLM Budget		
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
	*			
	•			
· · · · ·		н - С. — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —		
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
Carae Moen	au	3-23-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date		
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration				

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

	te of these ocotion, man otop			
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:		
Precision Appraisals of Minnesota, Inc.		A72960		
Project Name (if applicable): S.P. 8611-18 (TH 24) Appraisal Services	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87720	Project Duration (Dates): 02/28/05 To 01/25/06		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu-				
The purpose of this agreement was to provide directed by the State Project Manager. It was appraisal staff available within the district. In a district, including the Metro District, or within t	necessary to enter into this agr addition, it was found that no ap	reement because there was insufficient		
м. Т				
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding: Consultant Services		
N/A	Contract: \$99,750.00	Budget Allotment for District 3		
If this was a single source contract, explain w				
N/A				
		~		
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
Carol Moen	au	3-23-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date		
,				
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration				

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	o 680 along with the final invoice.	
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:A81895	
Kadramas Lee and Jackson Inc.			
Project Name (if applicable): HARN Observations	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88791	Project Duration (Dates): 10/05 – 6/06	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include			
High Accuracy Reference Networking was ne	eded in Detroit Lakes.	×	
к.			
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:	
3	Contract:\$98,000.00	OLM Budget	
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:	
		, ,	
and the second			
Evaluate the performance of the work includir		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract.		
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
<u></u>			
Caral Boln		2 2 2 4	
Clirac / John	au	3-23-06	
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date	

cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. g 8791	Туре с	f work: Surv	eying		
District/Office: Detroit Lakes			Work Type Code	: SR 56	180
S.P. ###- T.H.:		Location:		A Contraction	
Contractor: Kadrmas Lee & Jackson				MAR MAR	2006
Subcontractor					EVED .
Subcontractor				CONSULTA	VT SERV
Contract Period: 10/05 Work Start Date	2/06 Work Comj	oletion Date	6/06 Expiration Date	15.23 Star 19	12 R. El.E
Total Contract Cost: \$98,000.00 =	Orig Cost: \$98	,000.00	+ Amended	Cost: \$	
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager	~ Additional		mber of Amendn ating	nents	
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality	X				
2. Work Performance	X				
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	X		· · ·		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	X				
5. Project related cooperation	X				
6. QA/QC plan conformance	X	·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
7. Contract administration cooperation	÷ X				
8. Invoices and progress reports	• X				
9. Cost estimation/budget	X	ter e Alfred (1997) e constante e const			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: John Barke) Print Name

Total Points ____ _36 (Maximum points 36) Contract Administrate (Cathie Ashlin) Print Name

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Contractor Name: CFMS Contract Number: Precision Appraisals of Minnesota, Inc. A72980 Project Name (if applicable): Mn/DOT Agreement No.: Project Numation (Dates): S.P. 8611-18 (TH 24) Appraisal Services 87720 02/28/06 To 01/28/06 Summarize the purpose of this agreement was to provide Right-of-Way Appraisal assistance on the above named State Project, as directed by the State Project Manager. It was necessary to enter into this agreement because there was insufficient appraisal staff available within the district. In addition, it was found that no appraisal staff was available in any other district, including the Metro District, or within the Central Office. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$99,750.00 Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget Allotment for District 3 If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: N/A Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner 3-23-0.6 Date Date	Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Project Name (if applicable): Mn/DOT Agreement No.: Project Duration (Dates): 02/28/05 To 01/25/06 SJP. 8611-18 (TH 24) Appraisal Services 87720 02/28/05 To 01/25/06 Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: The purpose of this agreement was to provide Right-of-Way Appraisal assistance on the above named State Project, as directed by the State Project Manager. It was necessary to enter into this agreement because there was insufficient appraisal staff available within the district. In addition, it was found that no appraisal staff was available in any other district, including the Metro District, or within the Central Office. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$99,750.00 Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget Allotment for District 3 If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: N/A V/A Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Budget Allotment to Generations 3-23-06		CFMS Contract Number:		
S.P. 811-18 (TH 24) Appraisal Services 87720 02/28/05 Too 1/25/06 Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: The purpose of this agreement was to provide Right-of-Way Appraisal assistance on the above named State Project, as directed by the State Project Manager. It was necessary to enter into this agreement because there was insufficient appraisal staff available within the district. In addition, it was found that no appraisal staff was available in any other district, including the Metro District, or within the Central Office. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$99,750.00 Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget Allotment for District 3 If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: N/A Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: See ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: The purpose of this agreement was to provide Right-of-Way Appraisal assistance on the above named State Project, as directed by the State Project Manager. It was necessary to enter into this agreement because there was insufficient appraisal staff available within the district. In addition, it was found that no appraisal staff was available in any other district, including the Metro District, or within the Central Office. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$99,750.00 Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget Allotment for District 3 If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: N/A Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
directed by the State Project Manager. It was necessary to enter into this agreement because there was insufficient appraisal staff available within the district. In addition, it was found that no appraisal staff was available in any other district, including the Metro District, or within the Central Office. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$99,750.00 Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget Allotment for District 3 If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: N/A Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Gene Melter Monager (Consumption) 3-23-06		ding why it was necessary to en	iter into a contract:	
N/A Contract: \$99,750.00 Budget Allotment for District 3 If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: N/A N/A N/A Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Budget Molecu, Lt Coursers' Commissions 3-23-06	directed by the State Project Manager. It was appraisal staff available within the district. In a	necessary to enter into this agr addition, it was found that no ap	eement because there was insufficient	
N/A Contract: \$99,750.00 Budget Allotment for District 3 If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: N/A N/A N/A				
If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: N/A Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Construction 3-23-06				
N/A Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION 3-23-06				
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Carel Malaeu Lt Caurmer/Commissioner		a an appraisal of the contracto	r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	
Carol Molnau 3-23-06				
Caral Malnau Lt. Cavarner/Commissioner	SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner Date	Carol Molnau		3-23-06	
	Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date	

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

CC:

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>87720</u>	Type of work <u>Appraisal Services</u>
District/Office District 3 – Baxter	Work Type Code 🚟 A P
S.P. <u>8611-18</u> T.H. <u>24</u>	Location Annandale to I-94 in Clearwater
Contractor Precision Appraisals of Minn	
Subcontractor	MAR 2006
,,,,,,, _	ary 25, 2006 ; December 1, 2006 k Completion Date Expiration Date CONSULTANT SERV.

Total Contract Cost: $\underline{100,000.00} = \text{Orig Cost: } \underline{100,000.00} + \text{Amended Cost: } \underline{0.00}$

Amended cost for: \sim Overrun \sim Additional Work Number of Amendments <u>0</u>

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		3		
2. Work Performance		3		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		3		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		3		
5. Project related cooperation		3	· · · ·	
6. QA/QC plan conformance				
7. Contract administration cooperation		3		
8. Invoices and progress reports		3		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		3		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

)

Total Points **2** (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager:

(Skip Pitzen Print Name

ntract Administrator: Gregor Thompso

E82129292429

Print Name

- Above Average:
 - Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
 - Contractor performs beyond expectations.
 - Deliverables exceed standards.
 - Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
 - Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
 - Contractor needs little or no direction.
 - Contractor responsive to requests.
 - Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

CFMS Contract Number: A75206 Project Duration (Dates): May 9 th , 2005 to October 3 rd , 2005 er into a contract: nge on I94. Mn/DOT requested is to include it with the City of Source of Funding: State Funds was only a single source for the services nge on I94. Mn/DOT requested is to include it with the City of
May 9 th , 2005 to October 3 rd , 2005 er into a contract: nge on I94. Mn/DOT requested is to include it with the City of Source of Funding: State Funds was only a single source for the services nge on I94. Mn/DOT requested
nge on I94. Mn/DOT requested as to include it with the City of Source of Funding: State Funds was only a single source for the services nge on I94. Mn/DOT requested
s to include it with the City of Source of Funding: State Funds was only a single source for the service: nge on I94. Mn/DOT requested
State Funds was only a single source for the service nge on I94. Mn/DOT requested
State Funds was only a single source for the service nge on I94. Mn/DOT requested
State Funds was only a single source for the service nge on I94. Mn/DOT requested
State Funds was only a single source for the service nge on I94. Mn/DOT requested
State Funds was only a single source for the service nge on I94. Mn/DOT requested
State Funds was only a single source for the service nge on I94. Mn/DOT requested
nge on I94. Mn/DOT requested
s timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
/ALUATION
3-23-06 Date

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 87877 Work Order	(1) Type of work Detailed Design
District/Office 3B	Work Type Code DD
S.P. 8680-138 T.H. 194	Location At CSAH 18 in Monticello
Contractor City of Monticello	2006
Subcontractor WSB and Associates	NAR AVED
Subcontractor	OFFICE OFFICE
	Location At CSAH 18 in Monticello MAR 2005 October 3 rd , 2005 ; December 31, 2007 Work Completion Date Expiration Date
Total Contract Cost: \$190,366.50 = 6	Orig Cost: \$+ Amended Cost: \$
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	➤ Additional Work Number of Amendments 0
Item Rating	Rating
1 - 6 by Project Manager7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	

7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator				
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		X		
2. Work Performance	X			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X		
5. Project related cooperation	X			
6. QA/QC plan conformance		X		
7. Contract administration cooperation		×		
8. Invoices and progress reports		X		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		X		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points <u>29</u> (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager: Terrence J. Humbert Print Name

Contract Administrator: Terrence J. Humb Print Name

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: Horizons, Incorporated. Martinez Corporation Martinez Corporation				
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Mapping	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 89002	Project Duration (Dates): 11/23/05 to 02/26/06		
Summarize the purpose of the contrac	t, including why it was necessary to	enter into a contract:		
The Purpose of this contract was f Model for this project.	or the Contractor to compile Pla	nimetric Features and create a Digital Terrain		
This Photogrammetric Mapping pronumber 2785E.	oject is for TH 494, from TH 10	0 to Minnesota River in Metro West / Project		
		pose but they are already too busy with work. nent and personnel capacity constraints		
Billable Hours (if applicable): No.	Total Contract Amount: \$86,500.00	Source of Funding: Consultant Mapping		
Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently:				
Performing this work ourselves would be for more expense. Capital costs for necessary equipment and ongoing costs for personnel for this type of work are prohibitive for the State.				
If this was a single source contract, ex	plain why the agency determined th	ere was only a single source for the services:		
No.				
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
Please see the attached evaluation form.				
Canemoes	nau	3-22-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commission	UNER	Date		

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Tuture consultant selection procedui	es. Audressico	minents on Dat	k, keep comm	ins lactual.	
Agreement No. <u>89002</u>	Type of w	ork Phot	offaha	metria	Rappin
District/Office Metro W	. Work Typ	be Code <u>M</u>	2V		
S.P. 2785E T.H. I	_494 L	ocation <u>free</u>	m TA 10	o to MNI	River
Contractor Martinez	()			137	3242520
Subcontractor	•			- Aller	
Subcontractor					2006
Contract Period: $11 - 23 - 05$; Work Start Date					ISUNIANT SERV. N
Total Contract Cost: \$ <u>86,500</u> =	= Orig Cost: \$ <u>{</u>	<u>36,500</u> +1	Amended Cost:	\$ Ø 8 00	SULL SERVICE
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	\sim Additional	Work Nun	nber of Amend	ments	<u>68</u>
Item Rating		Ra	ting	-	7
1 - 6 by Project Manager ' 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		· .	-		
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality	·				- -
2. Work Performance	\checkmark				
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	V				
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		\checkmark			
5. Project related cooperation		\checkmark			
$6 \Omega A / \Omega C$ nlan conformance		······			1

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager: Milhe Print Name

Contract Administrator; RTAS Print Name

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Cons	ultant Se	rvices, Mail Stop 680, with the	e final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTAT	ΓΙΟΝ		
Contractor Name : Horizons, Incorp Martinez (CFMS Contract Number: A-82940
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Mapping		Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 89002	Project Duration (Dates): 11/23/05 to 02/26/06
Summarize the purpose of the contra	act, inclu	ding why it was necessary to	enter into a contract:
The Purpose of this contract was Model for this project.	for the	Contractor to compile Plan	nimetric Features and create a Digital Terrain
This Photogrammetric Mapping p number 2785E.	project is	s for TH 494, from TH 100) to Minnesota River in Metro West / Project
			pose but they are already too busy with work. nent and personnel capacity constraints
Billable Hours (if applicable): No.	Total C	ontract Amount: \$86,500.00	Source of Funding: Consultant Mapping
efficiently:	ould be :	for more expense. Capital co	e its services or products better or more osts for necessary equipment and ongoing
If this was a single source contract, e	explain w	hy the agency determined the	ere was only a single source for the services:
No.			
Evaluate the performance of the wor performance in meeting the terms an			tor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Please see the attached evaluation i	form.		
			•
Caremoe	nau		3-22-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date	
cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin		*	

J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPOR	TATION				
Contractor Name: Aero Metric (d/b/a) Ma	arkhurd Inc.	CFMS Contract Number: A-84298			
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Mapping	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 89078	Project Duration (Dates): 12/22/05 to 2/15/06			
Summarize the purpose of the contract, in	cluding why it was necessary to	enter into a contract:			
The Purpose of this contract was for the create a Digital Terrain Model for this		Triangulations, Compile Planimetric Features,			
This Photogrammetric Mapping project 3. Project number 7106-73F.	t is for Trunk Highway 169, (fro	m 227 th . Ave. NW. to TH 95, Princeton), District			
"Advances a transportation purpose", we have employees for this purpose but they are already too busy with work. In house we run two shifts for Photogrammetric Mapping, but equipment and personnel capacity constraints require us to contract out.					
Billable Hours (if applicable): No. Tota	al Contract Amount: \$88,715.00	Source of Funding: Consultant Mapping			
Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently: Performing this work ourselves would be for more expense. Capital costs for necessary equipment and ongoing costs for personnel for this type of work are prohibitive for the State.					
If this was a single source contract, explai	n why the agency determined the	ere was only a single source for the services:			
No.					
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:					
Please see the attached evaluation form	•				
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissio		3-22-04 Date			

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>29078</u>	True of m	$rate Pla \pm$	ad co hata	etrict	10 ping
	Type of w		mp	CN CT-	
District/Office $D - 3$		e Code 10-			
S.P. <u>7/06-73F</u> T.H. <u>16</u>	27 L	ocation <u>27</u>	7Th AUe. 1	JUNTO TH	95 (Princeton
Contractor Markhurd	(0.552	99011-0))	10.00	7977755
Subcontractor				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	a course
Subcontractor	A		Λ		MADON S
Contract Period: $\frac{12 - 22 - 05}{\text{Work Start Date}}$					
Total Contract Cost: \$ <u>88,715</u> -=	= Orig Cost: \$ <u>{</u>	<u>38,7/S</u> +A	Amended Cost:	\$ <u>\$</u>	SERV.
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	\sim Additional V	Work Nur	ber of Amend	ments	S. & S. L. L.
	Auditional				and the second se
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager ' 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting	-	
					11
• •	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality		Average 3 Points		Poor 1 Point	- - -
 Product Quality Work Performance 	Average		Average		- - -
2. Work Performance	Average		Average		-
	Average		Average		-
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and 	Average		Average		-
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 	Average		Average		
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation 	Average		Average		
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance 	Average		Average		
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation 	Average		Average		
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration 	Average		Average		
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration cooperation Invoices and progress reports Cost estimation/budget 	Average		Average		
 Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration cooperation Invoices and progress reports 	Average		Average		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager FILGA 5 Print Name

Total Points 30 (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: 12 Print Name

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSF	PORTATION			
Contractor Name: Aero Metric (d/b/a) Markhurd Inc.	CFI	MS Contract Number: A-84298	
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Mapping	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 89078	Pro	oject Duration (Dates): 12/22/05 to 2/15/06	
Summarize the purpose of the contract	ct, including why it was necessary	to ente	er into a contract:	
The Purpose of this contract was for the Contractor to complete Aerial Triangulations, Compile Planimetric Features, create a Digital Terrain Model for this project.				
This Photogrammetric Mapping pro 3. Project number 7106-73F.	oject is for Trunk Highway 169, (from 2	27 th . Ave. NW. to TH 95, Princeton), District	
"Advances a transportation purpose", we have employees for this purpose but they are already too busy with work. In house we run two shifts for Photogrammetric Mapping, but equipment and personnel capacity constraints require us to contract out.				
Billable Hours (if applicable): No.	Total Contract Amount: \$88,715.0	0	Source of Funding: Consultant Mapping	
Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently:				
Performing this work ourselves would be for more expense. Capital costs for necessary equipment and ongoing costs for personnel for this type of work are prohibitive for the State.				
If this was a single source contract, ex	plain why the agency determined	there v	was only a single source for the services:	
No.				
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
Please see the attached evaluation for	orm.			
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commis	ssioner		3-22-04 Date	

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Sandy Lueth

Го:	Steve.Gustafson@state.mn.us Monday, March 20, 2006 7:51 AM Steve.Gustafson@state.mn.us; Sandy.Lueth@state.mn.us Vendor Evaluation Form
	of your feedback form. It was submitted by ate.mn.us) on Monday, March 20, 2006 at 07:51:29
id_part1: T79 id_part2: 1368 cfms: A58226 vendor: SDK Software agency: TRANSPORTATIO evaluator: Dan Ross eval_date: 4/30/2005 purpose: Minnesota De tool/report development development needs wer ensure the continued and reporting, Mn/DOP and documentation for maintain and report a stored in the current relying on these tool Analysis, Geographic Management, Bridge, F	and Implementation of Data Maintenance and Tools PN DEPT epartment of Transportation (Mn/DOT) currently had multiple ent needs that required technical expertise and support. These re part of Mn/DOT's Information Technology (IT) investment plan. To implementation and support for enterprise tools for data maintenance T sought assistance with the technical design, development, testing, r tools and reports that allows business areas within Mn/DOT to against data t enterprise environment. Business offices Is include Transportation Data and Analysis (Traffic Forecasting and Information and Mapping, Roadway Data), Traffic Engineering, Pavement Freight Rail and Waterways, Maintenance, Construction, and Districts. a contract as there were not internal expertise or resources the the tasks needs to produce the deliverables. /2004 05
cost_effective: Bring needed to enahnace ar Knowledge they did no	ging a vendor in to assist Mn/DOT allowed staff to gain knowledge and maintain the deliverables provided as part of this project. but have prior to the contract. The contract also allowed the project elivered in a manner consistent with dfefned project timelines and
amended: Yes	the needed delivererables were able to be provided in the estimated original contract.
engage_e: The contrac in their approach to	ctor provided very qualified and knowledgeable staff who were flexible delivering the needed software. They delivered components as are Mn/DOT staff understood what was delivered and how to maintain it.

1

Sandy Lueth

Steve.Gustafson@state.mn.us From: ent: Friday, March 17, 2006 12:34 PM ſo: Steve.Gustafson@state.mn.us; Sandy.Lueth@state.mn.us Subject: Vendor Evaluation Form Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by (steve.qustafson@state.mn.us) on Friday, March 17, 2006 at 12:34:12 config: ot/vendeval2 project: Location Data Manager (LDM) User Training id part1: T79 id_part2: 1511 cfms: A67616 vendor: Bentley Systems agency: TRANSPORTATION DEPT evaluator: Dan Ross eval date: 06/30/2005 purpose: Provide technical training to Mn/DOT users so they have the skills to operate the Location Data Manager software efficiently and effectively, including best practice methods for using features and applying functionality. A contract was entered for this service as Mn/DOT did not have the expertise to provide the training. accomplished: Yes contract date: 06/30/2005 actual date: 06/30/2005 contract cost: \$24,950 actual cost: \$24,950 cost effective: This was cost effective as Mn/DOT was able to have the training in-house with the software running in our environment. Having the training onsite also reduced the cost as we could have up to 15 people in the class at no additional charge. There were lso no additional travel costs involved. amended: No terminated: No engage: Yes engage e: Customized training and materials met agency needs. _____ _____

Sandy Lueth

From:Steve.Gustafson@state.mn.usient:Friday, March 17, 2006 12:14 PMfo:Steve.Gustafson@state.mn.us; Sandy.Lueth@state.mn.usSubject:Vendor Evaluation Form	
Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by (steve.gustafson@state.mn.us) on Friday, March 17, 2006 at 12:14:15	
_config: ot/vendeval2 project: Design of a Transactional Database id_part1: T79 id_part2: 1572 cfms: A-67615	
vendor: Environmental Systems Research Institute agency: TRANSPORTATION DEPT evaluator: Dan Ross eval date: 06/30/2005	N. N.
purpose: ConTract was to provide assistance with the technical configuration de documentation for a spatial database that will allow business areas within the maintain and report against data stored in the developed enterprise spatial da environment.	Mn/DOT to
A contract was necessary as Mn/DOT did not have the resource or expertise avaia deliver the required functionality. accomplished: Yes	lble to
contract_date: 06/30/2005 actual_date: 06/30/2005 contract_cost: \$25,000 actual_cost: \$24788	1.
cost_effective: Vendor had the resources and the expertise avaialble to provide unctionality in the required time frame. If Mn/DOT had done this it would hav much longer. amended: No	the need e taken
terminated: No engage: Yes engage_e: They provided quality work and it was completed on time.	
Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

nstructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

instructions. Submit this form to consultan	t dervices dection, mail stop	oov along with the final involce.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Short Elliot Hendrickson, Inc.		A 71436
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
	87372	
Miller Trunk EA		12/22/04 - 1/31/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	aing why it was necessary to en	nter into a contract:
This contract was to provide an environmenta	l assessment, public involveme	ent and traffic modeling. State needed
assistance in preparing documents, meetings		
exist in the area.		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
984.49	Contract: \$91,684.74	State
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
)		
		•
	(
*		
	5	
Evolute the performance of the work inclusion	a on onnoised of the contracts	the timeliness quality cash and suprat
Evaluate the performance of the work includir		or s timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and object	ives of the contract:	
SEE ATTACHED CON	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
12 Una 1		201
Carol Molnai	4 /	3-9-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
		·
c: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

	i vices, mail otop ooo, with the			
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	CFMS Contract Number:		
Service Environmental & Engineering Group		A48069		
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):		
Contaminated soil corrective action	81339 W.O. 10	4-29-03 to 6-30-05		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu-				
The purpose of this contract was to provide a	ssistance to Mn/DOT in design	ning and completing corrective actions for		
treatment of contaminated soil encountered during highway construction.				
	0 0 9			
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Contract Amount:	Source of Funding:		
	\$84,093.00	Trunk Highway		
Explain why this amount was a cost effective	way for the agency to provide	its services or products better or more		
efficiently:				
There are state employees in Mn/DOT and th				
work, but they are not available to be on-call t				
specific OSHA safety training which many sta Contractor for this type of work which does no				
equipped team within Mn/DOT.	toccul frequentity enough on i	lighway projects to have a trained and		
If this was a single source contract, explain w	by the agency determined ther	e was only a single source for the services:		
N/A				
* · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · ·			
·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Evaluate the performance of the work includir		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall		
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ives of the contract:			
Attached				
		*		
		·		
Λ ,				
Caral Molna		3-9-06		
	hu i	0100		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date		
L		1		
cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin				
J. Brunner, MS 680				
File				

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: Short Elliot Hendrickson, Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A 71436		
Project Name (if applicable): Miller Trunk EA	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87372	Project Duration (Dates): 12/22/04 - 1/31/06		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include				
This contract was to provide an environmenta assistance in preparing documents, meetings exist in the area.				
Billable Hours (if applicable): ૧૯૫-૫૧	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$91,684.74	Source of Funding: State		
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
	Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:			
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
Carol Molnai	C	3-9-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date		
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration				

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Contract No <u>87372</u> T	ype of work _	Pre-Design			·
District/OfficeOne	Work T	ype Code	PD	_	
S.P. <u>8821-48</u> T.H	53	_ Location \underline{N}	<u>filler Trunk in</u>	Duluth	23450
Contractor <u>SEH</u>				53 ¹	MAR 2096
Subcontractor			,	Rel	MAR 2006 C
Subcontractor				282	OFFICE OF
Contract Period: <u>12/22/04</u> ; Work Start Date Wo Total Contract Cost: \$ <u>91,684.74</u>	$\frac{1/31/06}{\text{rk Completion Data}}$	ate Expiration Da : \$ <u>91,684.74</u>	+ Amended C	ost: \$_0	2026181 BL
Amended cost for: ~ Overrun Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager	~ Additional	ander som att Report of Report of Report of Report	er of Amendm ting	ents <u>0</u>	
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	-
1. Product Quality	X				
2. Work Performance	X				
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	Х				·
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	X				
5. Project related cooperation	X				
6. QA/QC plan conformance	X				
7. Contract administration cooperation	X				
8. Invoices and progress reports		X			
9. Cost estimation/budget management	X				
Contractor's rating for this contract:		Total Poin	ts35	_	

Project Manager:

(Roberta P. Dwyer Print Name (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator:

Robert

Print Name

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

SEH performed superbly in meeting deadlines and working with private developers and the public. They earned the trust of the public and met Mn/DOT needs. Cooperation and products exceeded expectations.

 $: \verb|user|consult|forms|evaluation.898|$

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Service Environmental & Engineering Group		A48069
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Contaminated soil corrective action	81339 W.O. 10	4-29-03 to 6-30-05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
The purpose of this contract was to provide assistance to Mn/DOT in designing and completing corrective actions for treatment of contaminated soil encountered during highway construction.		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Contract Amount: \$84,093.00	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
Explain why this amount was a cost effective efficiently: There are state employees in Mn/DOT and th work, but they are not available to be on-call t specific OSHA safety training which many sta Contractor for this type of work which does no equipped team within Mn/DOT. If this was a single source contract, explain w N/A	way for the agency to provide it e MPCA that have much of the o work on a Mn/DOT construct te employees do not have. It is ot occur frequently enough on h hy the agency determined there	ts services or products better or more knowledge and experience to do this ion project. Also, this work requires most cost effective to hire an outside highway projects to have a trained and e was only a single source for the services:
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Attached		
Carol Molno	au .	3-9-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
	·	Leanne

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>81339</u> W.O. 1 District/Office S.P. <u>3509-18</u> T.H. <u>75</u> Contractor <u>Service Ehuiron</u> Subcontractor Subcontractor Contract Period: <u>Apr 29, 2003</u> ; Work Start Date	Work Typ 5 La <u>mental</u> ¢	e Code <u>EL</u> ocation <u>Hal</u> Eng. Bre	lock		e action
Total Contract Cost: \$ <u>84,093,00</u> =	Orig Cost: \$ <u></u>	5409300+A	mended Cost: \$	0.00	
Amended cost for: ~ Overrun	~ Additional V TIME	Work Nurr	ber of Amendm	ents	
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting		
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality	X		· .		
2. Work Performance	×				
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	×				
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	×				
5. Project related cooperation	×	. •			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	X				
 Contract administration cooperation Invoices and progress reports 	an tangan ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang an	× ×			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		×	4		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: lanci Print Name

Total Points _____ (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: 106 Print Name

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.

.

.

• Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: Horizons, Incorporated.		CFMS Contract Number: A-82838		
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Mapping	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88893	Project Duration (Dates): 11/09/05 to 02/15/06		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu	iding why it was necessary to	enter into a contract:		
The Purpose of this contract was for the Contractor to produce Aerial Triangulations, compile Planimetric Features and create a Digital Terrain Model for this project.				
This Photogrammetric Mapping project is	for TH 71, (JCT of TH 71 a	& CR 90), District 8 / Project number 3412-70.		
"Advances a transportation purpose", we In house we run two shifts for Photogram require us to contract out.		pose but they are already too busy with work. nent and personnel capacity constraints		
Billable Hours (if applicable): No. Total C	Contract Amount: \$70,125.00	Source of Funding: Consultant Mapping		
Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently: Performing this work ourselves would be for more expense. Capital costs for necessary equipment and ongoing costs for personnel for this type of work are prohibitive for the State.				
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined the	ere was only a single source for the services:		
No.				
Evaluate the performance of the work includi performance in meeting the terms and object		tor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall		
Please see the attached evaluation form.				
	- -			
Carol moen	an	3-7-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date		
cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin				

J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		·		
Contractor Name: Horizons, Incorporated.		CFMS Contract Number: A-82838		
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Mapping	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88893	Project Duration (Dates): 11/09/05 to 02/15/06		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu	ding why it was necessary to	enter into a contract:		
The Purpose of this contract was for the Contractor to produce Aerial Triangulations, compile Planimetric Features and create a Digital Terrain Model for this project.				
This Photogrammetric Mapping project is	for TH 71, (JCT of TH 71 a	& CR 90), District 8 / Project number 3412-70.		
In house we run two shifts for Photogram		pose but they are already too busy with work. Thent and personnel capacity constraints		
require us to contract out.	15 4 年1月1日日			
Billable Hours (if applicable): No. Total C	contract Amount: \$70,125.00	Source of Funding: Consultant Mapping		
efficiently: Performing this work ourselves would be	Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently: Performing this work ourselves would be for more expense. Capital costs for necessary equipment and ongoing costs for personnel for this type of work are prohibitive for the State.			
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined the	ere was only a single source for the services:		
No.				
Evaluate the performance of the work includi performance in meeting the terms and object		tor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall		
Please see the attached evaluation form.				
Carol Boen	an	3-7-86		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date		

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 8893 District/Office D_{-8} S.P. $34/2-70$ T.H. 7 Contractor 40 70 Subcontractor $-$ Subcontractor $-$ Contract Period: $11-9-(15)$; Work Start Date	Work Typ <u></u> L <u></u> L	be Code MF ocation $\underline{\neg}C$	+ TH71	metric ACR90	· ·
Total Contract Cost: $\frac{70.125}{}$ =	= Orig Cost: \$	70,125-+1	Amended Cost:	\$ <u>_</u>	•
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	\sim Additional	Work Nun	nber of Amend	ments	
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting	-	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality		V			
2. Work Performance		·V			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		<u>у</u> л			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		J.	-		
5. Project related cooperation		J	•		
6. QA/QC plan conformance		J			
7. Contract administration .					
8. Invoices and progress reports					
9. Cost estimation/budget management		Ź			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points $2\mathcal{E}$ (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager: Mille Class Print Name

Contract Administrator: Print Name

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATIO		CFMS Contract Number:
EnecoTech Midwest, Inc.		A60178
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Contaminated soil monitoring for TH 14	86402	3-24-04 to 12-30-05
Summarize the purpose of the contract,		
		erly monitoring the excavation, handling, encountered during the TH14 construction
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Contract Amount:	Source of Funding:
Explain why this amount was a cost effe efficiently:	\$83,726.00 ctive way for the agency to provide	Trunk Highway its services or products better or more
There are state employees in Mn/DOT a experience to do this work, but they are it	not available to be on-call to work	on a Mn/DOT construction project.
ffective to hire an outside Contractor fo rojects to have a trained and equipped this was a single source contract, expla	r this type of work which does not o team within Mn/DOT.	
offective to hire an outside Contractor fo projects to have a trained and equipped f this was a single source contract, expla	r this type of work which does not o team within Mn/DOT.	occur frequently enough on highway
ffective to hire an outside Contractor fo rojects to have a trained and equipped this was a single source contract, expla	r this type of work which does not o team within Mn/DOT.	occur frequently enough on highway
offective to hire an outside Contractor fo projects to have a trained and equipped f this was a single source contract, expla	r this type of work which does not o team within Mn/DOT.	occur frequently enough on highway
offective to hire an outside Contractor fo projects to have a trained and equipped this was a single source contract, expl I/A	r this type of work which does not o team within Mn/DOT. ain why the agency determined the	occur frequently enough on highway
ffective to hire an outside Contractor fo rojects to have a trained and equipped this was a single source contract, expla I/A	r this type of work which does not o team within Mn/DOT. ain why the agency determined the cluding an appraisal of the contrac	occur frequently enough on highway
ffective to hire an outside Contractor fo rojects to have a trained and equipped this was a single source contract, explain I/A	r this type of work which does not o team within Mn/DOT. ain why the agency determined the cluding an appraisal of the contrac	occur frequently enough on highway are was only a single source for the services
ffective to hire an outside Contractor fo rojects to have a trained and equipped this was a single source contract, explain I/A	r this type of work which does not o team within Mn/DOT. ain why the agency determined the cluding an appraisal of the contrac	occur frequently enough on highway are was only a single source for the services
ffective to hire an outside Contractor fo rojects to have a trained and equipped this was a single source contract, expla- I/A valuate the performance of the work ind erformance in meeting the terms and o	r this type of work which does not o team within Mn/DOT. ain why the agency determined the cluding an appraisal of the contrac	occur frequently enough on highway
ffective to hire an outside Contractor fo rojects to have a trained and equipped this was a single source contract, expla- l/A valuate the performance of the work ind erformance in meeting the terms and o	r this type of work which does not o team within Mn/DOT. ain why the agency determined the cluding an appraisal of the contrac	occur frequently enough on highway
ffective to hire an outside Contractor fo rojects to have a trained and equipped this was a single source contract, explain I/A	r this type of work which does not o team within Mn/DOT. ain why the agency determined the cluding an appraisal of the contrac	occur frequently enough on highway are was only a single source for the services
N/A	r this type of work which does not o team within Mn/DOT. ain why the agency determined the cluding an appraisal of the contrac	occur frequently enough on highway are was only a single source for the services
effective to hire an outside Contractor fo projects to have a trained and equipped f this was a single source contract, expla N/A	r this type of work which does not of team within Mn/DOT. ain why the agency determined the cluding an appraisal of the contrac bjectives of the contract:	occur frequently enough on highway are was only a single source for the services

C: P.Stembler, 112 Admir J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Foth & Van Dyke		A81048
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
TH 169 Identification	82692 WO 3	4/14/03 – 12/30/05
Summarize the purpose of the contract	t, including why it was necessary to	enter into a contract:
This contract was for the identificat necessary to consider the effects or 106 of the National Historic Preserv resources.	n cultural resources of any project	with FHWA funding according to Section
		·
•	м х х	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
921.1 f this was a single source contract, ex Fhe contractor was selected becaus	e of on-going work on the TH 169	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services project and because the results of this t conducted under another contract.
f this was a single source contract, ex The contractor was selected becaus	Contract: \$60,611.04 plain why the agency determined the se of on-going work on the TH 169	Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services project and because the results of this
921.1 f this was a single source contract, ex The contractor was selected becaus	Contract: \$60,611.04 plain why the agency determined the se of on-going work on the TH 169	Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services project and because the results of this
921.1 f this was a single source contract, ex The contractor was selected becaus	Contract: \$60,611.04 plain why the agency determined the se of on-going work on the TH 169	Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services project and because the results of this
921.1 f this was a single source contract, ex Fhe contractor was selected becaus	Contract: \$60,611.04 plain why the agency determined the se of on-going work on the TH 169	Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services project and because the results of this
921.1 f this was a single source contract, ex Fhe contractor was selected becaus	Contract: \$60,611.04 plain why the agency determined the se of on-going work on the TH 169	Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services project and because the results of this
921.1 f this was a single source contract, ex The contractor was selected becaus	Contract: \$60,611.04 plain why the agency determined the se of on-going work on the TH 169	Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services project and because the results of this
921.1 this was a single source contract, ex he contractor was selected becaus	Contract: \$60,611.04 plain why the agency determined the se of on-going work on the TH 169	Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services project and because the results of this
921.1 f this was a single source contract, ex the contractor was selected becaus project were integrated into the repo	Contract: \$60,611.04 plain why the agency determined the se of on-going work on the TH 169 ort on another aspect of the projec	Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services project and because the results of this of conducted under another contract.
921.1 f this was a single source contract, ex The contractor was selected becaus project were integrated into the repo	Contract: \$60,611.04 plain why the agency determined the se of on-going work on the TH 169 ort on another aspect of the project	Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services project and because the results of this
921.1 f this was a single source contract, exp The contractor was selected becaus project were integrated into the report valuate the performance of the work i erformance in meeting the terms and	Contract: \$60,611.04 plain why the agency determined the se of on-going work on the TH 169 ort on another aspect of the project	Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services project and because the results of this ct conducted under another contract.
921.1 f this was a single source contract, ex The contractor was selected becaus project were integrated into the repor- evaluate the performance of the work in performance in meeting the terms and SEE ATTACHE	Contract: \$60,611.04 plain why the agency determined the se of on-going work on the TH 169 ort on another aspect of the project of the projectives of the contract objectives of the contract: D CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE	Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services project and because the results of this ct conducted under another contract.
921.1 f this was a single source contract, exp The contractor was selected becaus project were integrated into the report vertice of the work integrate of the work integrated of	Contract: \$60,611.04 plain why the agency determined the se of on-going work on the TH 169 ort on another aspect of the project of the projectives of the contract objectives of the contract: D CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE	Trunk Highway re was only a single source for the services project and because the results of this ct conducted under another contract.

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Two Pines Resource Grou	lb.	CFMS Contract Number: A69128
Project Name (if applicable): TH 14	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 86891	Project Duration (Dates): 10/4/2004 – 12/31/2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includidentify and evaluate any archaeological and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation project.	architectural resources within	the area of potential effect of the project.
	•	
Billable Hours (if applicable): 5,313.75	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$385,744.72	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
A single source was chosen because it is mor contractors are used. The consultant was cho		
	* * * *	
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objection		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION
Carol moeno	u	3-7-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sect File	ion	

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	3		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:	
EnecoTech Midwest, Inc.		A60178	
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):	
Contaminated soil monitoring for TH 14	86402	3-24-04 to 12-30-05	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	aing why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:	
The purpose of this contract was to provide as treatment and disposal of contaminated soil a project.			
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Contract Amount: \$83,726.00	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway	
Explain why this amount was a cost effective efficiently:			
There are state employees in Mn/DOT and the MPCA, MDH and DOA that have much of the knowledge and experience to do this work, but they are not available to be on-call to work on a Mn/DOT construction project. Also, this work requires specific OSHA safety training which many state employees do not have. It is most cost effective to hire an outside Contractor for this type of work which does not occur frequently enough on highway projects to have a trained and equipped team within Mn/DOT.			
If this was a single source contract, explain w N/A	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	
Attached			
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		3 - 7 - 06 Date	
	······································		

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>86402</u>	Type of wo	ork Constr	ruction E	xc. Moniforin
District/Office Work Type Code				
S.P. 8103-47 T.H. 14 Location Waseca, Janesville				
Contractor Groundwater Environmental Services, Inc.				
Subcontractor	<u>\</u>			
Subcontractor N	À			
Contract Period: Apr 8, 200\$; Work Start Date	Dec. 30,7 Work Completion	Date Expiration	, 30, 2009 n Date	2
Total Contract Cost: \$ <u>63,726,0</u> 0=	: Orig Cost: \$ <u>4</u>	3,272,04 A	mended Cost:	<u>\$40,454,00</u>
Amended cost for: ~ Overrun	Additional	Work Num	iber of Amendr	nents <u>Ø</u> L
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	×			
2. Work Performance	×			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	X			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	×		· · ·	
5. Project related cooperation	X			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	×			
7. Contract administration cooperation				
8. Invoices and progress reports	s de la companya de la compan			
9. Cost estimation/budget management	X			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager: Print 1

02 mare il Contract Administrator: CALVEREC Roberton (Print Name

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
 - Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.

.

• Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

 $r \sin ($

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Sto	p 680 along with the final invoice.
Agency:		
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Contractor Name:	CFMS Contract Number:	
Foth & Van Dyke		A81048
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
TH 169 Identification	82692 WO 3	4/14/03 – 12/30/05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ling why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:
This contract was for the identification of a necessary to consider the effects on cultur 106 of the National Historic Preservation A resources.	ral resources of any project	with FHWA funding according to Section
ан сайтаан ал	· · ·	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
921.1 If this was a single source contract, explain whether the second	Contract: \$60,611.04	Trunk Highway
The contractor was selected because of or project were integrated into the report on a		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE	
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISOLTAINT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION
Carol moena	u -	3-7-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
		<u> </u>

cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 82692 WO #3	Гуре of work	Archaeology id	entification	
District/Office 3 Work Type C	ode CR			
S.P. 1804-50 T.H. 169 Location		ounty		
Contractor Foth & Van Dyke		5		
Subcontractor				
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: 4/14/03		005 12/3 2 /20 Date Expiration		
Total Contract Cost: \$ Orig	r Cost: کام؟م	-Amended Co	^{ost:} 53,577. 4	3
Amended cost for: ~ Overrun	∼ Additional	Work Num	ber of Amendm	nents S 2
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ing	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		X		
2. Work Performance	· ·	X		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X		
5. Project related cooperation		X		
6. QA/QC plan conformance		Х		
7. Contract administration cooperation		X		
8. Invoices and progress reports		×		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		*		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: Crai ohnson Print Name

Total Points (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: Print N ame

Definitions:

- Above Average:
 - Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
 - Contractor performs beyond expectations.
 - Deliverables exceed standards.
 - Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
 - Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
 - Contractor needs little or no direction.
 - Contractor responsive to requests.
 - Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

The consultant completed all of their work within the time and budget limits. They did not need much direction for Mn/DOT in performing their work. They kept the project manager informed of progress through monthly reports and other communication. The reason that much of their budget went unspent was because they did not get private landowner permission to survey their land for archaeological resources.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name: Two Pines Resource Grou	CI.	CFMS Contract Number: A69128	
racio Name. Two Fines Resource Group		CFMS Contract Number: A09120	
Project Name (if applicable): TH 14	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 86891	Project Duration (Dates): 10/4/2004 – 12/31/2005	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu dentify and evaluate any archaeological and Section 106 of the National Historic Preserva project.	architectural resources within the	ne area of potential effect of the project.	
		÷	
		·	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:	
5,313.75 f this was a single source contract, explain w A single source was chosen because it is mo contractors are used. The consultant was ch	re efficient, faster, and requires	less coordination than if multiple	
5,313.75 f this was a single source contract, explain w A single source was chosen because it is mo	/ hy the agency determined ther re efficient, faster, and requires	e was only a single source for the services	
5,313.75 f this was a single source contract, explain w A single source was chosen because it is mo	/ hy the agency determined ther re efficient, faster, and requires	e was only a single source for the services	
5,313.75 f this was a single source contract, explain w A single source was chosen because it is mo	/ hy the agency determined ther re efficient, faster, and requires	e was only a single source for the services	
5,313.75 f this was a single source contract, explain w A single source was chosen because it is mo	/ hy the agency determined ther re efficient, faster, and requires	e was only a single source for the services	
5,313.75 f this was a single source contract, explain w A single source was chosen because it is mo	/ hy the agency determined ther re efficient, faster, and requires	e was only a single source for the services	
5,313.75 f this was a single source contract, explain w A single source was chosen because it is mo	/ hy the agency determined ther re efficient, faster, and requires	e was only a single source for the services	
5,313.75 f this was a single source contract, explain w A single source was chosen because it is mo	/ hy the agency determined ther re efficient, faster, and requires	e was only a single source for the services	
5,313.75 f this was a single source contract, explain w A single source was chosen because it is mo	/ hy the agency determined ther re efficient, faster, and requires	e was only a single source for the services	
5,313.75 If this was a single source contract, explain was single source was chosen because it is mo contractors are used. The consultant was ch	hy the agency determined ther re efficient, faster, and requires osen in a competition among fo	e was only a single source for the service less coordination than if multiple our other firms.	
5,313.75 f this was a single source contract, explain w A single source was chosen because it is mo	hy the agency determined ther re efficient, faster, and requires osen in a competition among fo ng an appraisal of the contracto	e was only a single source for the service less coordination than if multiple our other firms.	
5,313.75 If this was a single source contract, explain we a single source was chosen because it is motion tractors are used. The consultant was chosen because it is motion tractors are used. The consultant was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source and	hy the agency determined ther re efficient, faster, and requires osen in a competition among fo ng an appraisal of the contracto	e was only a single source for the services less coordination than if multiple our other firms.	
5,313.75 this was a single source contract, explain we a single source was chosen because it is mo- contractors are used. The consultant was ch Evaluate the performance of the work including berformance in meeting the terms and object SEE ATTACHED COL	hy the agency determined ther re efficient, faster, and requires osen in a competition among for ng an appraisal of the contractor tives of the contract:	e was only a single source for the services eless coordination than if multiple our other firms.	
5,313.75 If this was a single source contract, explain we a single source was chosen because it is motion tractors are used. The consultant was chosen because it is motion tractors are used. The consultant was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source was chosen because it is motion to be a single source and be single source and be a single source and be a singl	hy the agency determined ther re efficient, faster, and requires osen in a competition among for ng an appraisal of the contractor tives of the contract:	e was only a single source for the services less coordination than if multiple our other firms.	

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 86891 Type of work Archaeology and Architectural History.

Vork Type Code CK
ì

S.P. 5200-03 T.H. 14 Location Nicollet County

Contractor Two Pines Resource Group

Subcontractor HDR Engineering, Inc.

Subcontractor Strata Morph

Contract Period: 10/4/2004 Work Start Date 12/31/2005 7/31/2006 Work Completion Date Expiration Date

Total Contract Cost: \$385,744.72 419,039.00 Orig Cost: \$271,920.00 + Amended Cost: \$113,824.72

Number of Amendments 4

Amended cost for: \sim Overrun

Additional Work

Item Rating	Rating			
1 - 6 by Project Manager7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator				
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		X		
2. Work Performance	· ·	X		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		Х		· .
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X		
5. Project related cooperation	· · · ·	X		
6. QA/QC plan conformance		Х		
7. Contract administration cooperation		×		
8. Invoices and progress reports		X		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		×		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

Craig Johnson Print Name

Total Points (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: 106

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Two Pines Resource Group did a good job of completing their archaeology report and integrating it with the geomorphology within their schedule and under budget. They coordinated the work between them and the consultants in an efficient manner and kept the project manager informed of project progress. However, the architectural historian from HDR, Daniel Pratt, did not adequately establish the criteria for evaluation. As a result, their contract obligations in the form of a final report were not completed and another firm, Gemini Research, was hired at additional cost and delay to complete the Phase II architectural history evaluations. The Two Pines contract was amended to reflect the removal of their obligations to evaluate the architectural properties. Due to these and other problems beyond their control, Two Pines was given average scores on their performance evaluation and was not penalized.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Cook County		A84641
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Cook County Thin Overlay	87659 W.O. 2	8/1/05 – 2/16/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include		
The purpose of the contract was to have bituminous overlay on a mile of T.H. 61. these services.	Cook County inspect and ma	ake payments to a contractor for a thin
	*	
	a	
		с.
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
	Contract: \$128,969.11	State
If this was a single source contract, explain w		
	ing the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services.
<i>i i i i i i i i i i</i>		
3		
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and object		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED	CONSULTANT PERFORMANC	CE EVALUATION
Caral Boenan		3-6-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date

cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Contract No. <u>87659 W.O. 2</u>	Type of work <u>Field Inspection and Contractor</u>				
		Pay	yments		
District/Office <u>One</u> Work Type Code _			_IN		
S.P. <u>1601-61</u> T.H. <u>61</u>	Location <u>R.P. 86 - 87 in Cook County</u>				
Contractor Cook County					
Subcontractor				1551505 PT 20	321
Subcontractor	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			FED.	
Contract Period: <u>8/1/05</u> ;;;;		: <u>5/31/06</u> Date Ex	piration Date	CONSULT	
Total Contract Cost: <u>\$128,969.11</u> =	= Orig Cost: \$_	132,969.28 +	Amended Cost:		SERV
Amended cost for: Overrun	Additional Wo	rk Number	of Amendments		A Verent
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting		
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality	X				
2. Work Performance	X				
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	X				
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	x				
5. Project related cooperation	X				
6. QA/QC plan conformance	X				
7. Contract administration cooperation	X				
8. Invoices and progress reports	X				
9. Cost estimation/budget management	X				

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: Kouleda (Roberta Dwyer

Print Name

Total Points <u>36</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator:

Roberta Dwyer (Print Name

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
 - Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
 - Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

<u>Cook County was able to provide a thin overlay and inspection on a remote section of T.H. 61.</u> <u>This resulted in an improved driving surface at a reasonable cost.</u> The work was completed in a very timely manner.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultar	nt Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	·	
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Cook County		A84641
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Cook County Thin Overlay	87659 W.O. 2	8/1/05 – 2/16/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
The purpose of the contract was to have	Cook County inspect and ma	ake payments to a contractor for a thin
bituminous overlay on a mile of T.H. 61.	State had no other work in the	ne area and County was able to provide
these services.		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
* · · · · · ·		
	· ·	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
Billable Hours (II applicable).	Contract: \$128,969.11	State
If this was a single source contract, explain w		
In this was a single source contract, explain w	my the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services.
·	×	
		·
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
/		
	· / ·	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir	a an appraisal of the contracto	r's timeliness quality cost and overall
performance in meeting the terms and object	ives of the contract.	r s timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and object		
SEE ATTACHED	CONSULTANT PERFORMANC	EEVALUATION
Carol Boenan		3-4-04
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sec File		

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Contractor Name: Aero Metric (d/b/a) Markhurd Inc. CFMS Contract Number: A-82840 Project Name (if applicable): Mn/DOT Agreement No .: Project Duration (Dates): 11/9/05 to 2/15/06 **Photogrammetric Mapping** 88892 Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: The Purpose of this contract was for the Contractor to complete Aerial Triangulations, Compile Planimetric Features, create a Digital Terrain Model and also produce an Ortho-Photo for this project. This Photogrammetric Mapping project is for Trunk Highway 94, (from TH 694 to Lowery Tunnel), Metro West District / Project number 2781. "Advances a transportation purpose", we have employees for this purpose but they are already too busy with work. In house we run two shifts for Photogrammetric Mapping, but equipment and personnel capacity constraints require us to contract out. Billable Hours (if applicable): No. Total Contract Amount: \$89,877.00 Source of Funding: Consultant Mapping Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently: Performing this work ourselves would be for more expense. Capital costs for necessary equipment and ongoing costs for personnel for this type of work are prohibitive for the State. If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: No. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:

Please see the attached evaluation form.

molnau Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner

3-1-06 Date

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 88892 District/Office Metro We S.P. 2781 T.H. 97	Type of w	pork <u>Pho</u> pe Code <u>H7</u> ,	togram. t MP	metric	Mapp
S.P. <u>278</u> T.H. <u>9</u>	<u>4</u> L	ocation <u>F</u>	om TH 69.	-1 to Lou	2e JTi
Contractor MarkHurch	L EnCo				
Subcontractor					
Subcontractor					
Contract Period: $\frac{11-9-05}{\text{Work Start Date}}$;	$\frac{2-1}{2}$	<u>06; 6 -</u>	30-06	_	
Total Contract Cost: \$ <u>87,8777</u> =					
$\frac{1}{10} \cos \cos \frac{1}{10} \cos \frac{1}{10$	- Ong Cost. 9 <u>7</u>	$2/D(1^{+})$		Ψ_Ψ	
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	\sim Additional	Work Nur	nber of Amend	ments	
Itom Deting					٦
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager		Ka	iting	· -	
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator			• •		
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality					
2. Work Performance					1
					li i
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT					-
					-
 Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time]			
 Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation).			
 Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation 		<i>J</i> .			
 Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation 		<i>J.</i>			
 Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration 		<u> </u>			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points <u>35</u> (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager: Print Name

MEHPHANS

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANS	PORTATION	
Contractor Name: Aero Metric (d/b/a) Markhurd Inc.	CFMS Contract Number: A-82840
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates): 11/9/05 to 2/15/06
Photogrammetric Mapping	88892	
Summarize the purpose of the contra	ct, including why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:
The Purpose of this contract was for create a Digital Terrain Model and		Friangulations, Compile Planimetric Features , is project.
This Photogrammetric Mapping p District / Project number 2781.	roject is for Trunk Highway 94, (fr	om TH 694 to Lowery Tunnel), Metro West
		ose but they are already too busy with work. ent and personnel capacity constraints
Billable Hours (if applicable): No.	Total Contract Amount: \$89,877.00	Source of Funding: Consultant Mapping
Explain why this amount was a cost e efficiently:	ffective way for the agency to provide	its services or products better or more
Performing this work ourselves wo costs for personnel for this type of		sts for necessary equipment and ongoing
If this was a single source contract, ex	kplain why the agency determined the	e was only a single source for the services:
No.		
Evaluate the performance of the work performance in meeting the terms and		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Please see the attached evaluation for	orm.	
Carol mol	nau	3-1-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commi	ssioner	Date
D Stampler 112 Admin		

C: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.	
Agency: Department of Transportation			
		OFMO Construct Number	
Contractor Name: Insight Public Sector	CFMS Contract Number: A68099		
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):	
LAN/WAN Development and Tech support	86390	9/7/2005 - 6/30/2005	
	¥.		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	hter into a contract:	
Needed expertise was not present among sta staff, improving skill set.	ff. Entered into contract to acc	complish necessary tasks and to mentor	
,			
	* ×		
÷			
	•		
	· · · ·		
	. ×		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:	
885.25	Contract:\$132,787.50	Trunk Highway	
If this was a single source contract, explain w			
N/A			
		·	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Evaluate the performance of the work includin		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall	
performance in meeting the terms and objecti			
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:		
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION	
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION	
performance in meeting the terms and objecti SEE ATTACHED CON Caral Mochae	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION 2-27-06	
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION	
performance in meeting the terms and objecti SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION 2-27-06	

Jeff Brunner, Co File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Cons	ultant Services Section, Mail Stor	o 680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	1	
Contractor Name: HNTB Corporation		CFMS Contract Number: A69408
Project Name (if applicable): Revisions to Design-Build Templates	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 83591 WO#10	Project Duration (Dates): 10/2004 – 09/2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract,	including why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:
There were three major tasks associa	ted with this work order:	
	n of the design-build white paper f the design-build template for sp pre-letting users guide	
		•
	• • · · ·	
Billable Hours (if applicable): 572.75	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$80,781.27	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, expla	ain why the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
N/A		
Evaluate the performance of the work inc performance in meeting the terms and of		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED	CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION
Carol Moes	nau	2-37-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commission		Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administra Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services File		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.		
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:		
Parsons Brinkerhoff		A73637		
Project Name (if applicable): Tunnel Alarm Systems	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87416	Project Duration (Dates): 3/18/05 – 1/31/06		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include				
The purpose of the contract was to provide a and to upgrade navigation lights for a major b specialized nature of the work.	design plan for upgrading the fi	ire alarm system in three highway tunnels		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
		* · · · ·		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:		
1.716	Contract: \$197,252.37	State		
If this was a single source contract, explain w		·		
N/A	.,			
•				
· · ·				
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objection		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall		
SEE ATTACHED CON	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	au	2-27-06 Date		
		240		
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sec				

File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency:				
Department of Transportation				
Contractor Name: Insight Public Sector		CFMS Contract Number: A68099		
Project Name (if applicable): LAN/WAN Development and Tech support	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 86390	Project Duration (Dates) 9/7/2005 – 6/30/2005	:	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu	I iding why it was necessary to e	enter into a contract:		
Needed expertise was not present among sta	aff. Entered into contract to ac	complish necessary tasks a	and to mentor	
staff, improving skill set.				
Billable Hours (if applicable): 885.25	Total Amount Spent on Contract:\$132,787.50	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway		
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined the	re was only a single source	for the service	
		×.		
N/A				
Evaluate the performance of the work includi		tor's timeliness, quality, cos	t, and overall	
performance in meeting the terms and object				
SEE ATTACHED CO	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION		
A. Maria	i a construction of the second se			
Parl Dolna	u	2-27-04	e	
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrate future consultant selection procedure			, keep comme	
Agreement No86390	Type of v	vork_LAN/WA	N Network Co	onsulting
District/Office_OIT	Work Typ	e Code <u>CP</u>		
S.P. NA T.H. N	A Lo	ocationC.O	•	
Contractor _Insight Public Sector	· .			
Subcontractor	•		· · ·	
Subcontractor				,
Contract Period: <u>917109</u> ; Work Start Date	613010	5: 613	2105	• .
			•	6797 50
Total Contract Cost: \$_132,787.50 =	Ung Cost: 5_1	.20,000+ AII	iended Cost: 5	_0/8/.30_
Amended cost for: 🖸 Overrun	ΞAdditional V	Vork Numb	er of Amendn	nents
Itom Dather	T	Def		
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager	Rating			
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator				·
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	4			
2. Work Performance	4			·
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT	4		·	
Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and	4			
on time				
5. Project related cooperation	4		•	
6. QA/QC plan conformance		3		
7. Contract administration			2	
cooperation 8. Invoices and progress reports			2	
9. Cost estimation/budget		3		
management				

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points ____30___ (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager:

Bob Bennett Print Name

Contract Administrator: un attuinni Melis Print Name

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

<u>Consultant's time reports were very good</u>. Insight only sent me an invoice once and only after loud complaints. Mary Prudhomme would contact me for invoice approval for invoices I had never seen. Mary was kind enough to make copies for me (thank you).

Actual work performed was excellent.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898
Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

	iltant Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.				
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	l					
Contractor Name: HNTB Corporation		CFMS Contract Number: A69408				
Project Name (if applicable): Revisions to Design-Build Templates	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 83591 WO#10	Project Duration (Dates): 10/2004 – 09/2005				
Summarize the purpose of the contract, i	ncluding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:				
There were three major tasks associated with this work order:						
	of the design-build white papers the design-build template for sp pre-letting users guide					
Dillable Heure (if applies he);	Total Amount Spont on Contract	Source of Euroding				
Billable Hours (if applicable): 572.75	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$80,781.27	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway				
If this was a single source contract, expla	in why the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:				
N/A						
Evaluate the performance of the work inc performance in meeting the terms and ob	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall				
Evaluate the performance of the work inc performance in meeting the terms and ob	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
Evaluate the performance of the work inc performance in meeting the terms and ob	ojectives of the contract:					
Evaluate the performance of the work inc performance in meeting the terms and ob SEE ATTACHED	ojectives of the contract:					
Evaluate the performance of the work inc performance in meeting the terms and ob SEE ATTACHED	ojectives of the contract: CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION				

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 83591 Work Order 10			Type of work <u>Design Build</u>		
District/Office Construction and Innovative Contracting			Гуре Code <u>DB</u>		
S.P. <u>N/A</u> T.H. <u>N/A</u> Location <u>N/A</u>	Ī				
Contractor HNTB Corporation					
Subcontractor					
Subcontractor					
Contract Period: <u>10/15/04</u> Work Start Date	<u>09/30/05</u> Work Completie	on Date <u>09/30/(</u> Expiration			
Total Contract Cost: $\$80,781.27$ = O	rig Cost: <u>\$14</u> :	5 <u>,467.84</u> + Amer	nded Cost: <u>-\$53</u>	3,353.99	
Amended cost for: Overrun Add	litional Work	Decrease Wo	ork Number of	f Amendments	
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting		
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality		X			
2. Work Performance		X			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X	,		
5. Project related cooperation		X			
6. QA/QC plan conformance		X			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

7. Contract administration

9. Cost estimation/budget

8. Invoices and progress reports

cooperation

management

Total Points <u>26</u> (Maximum points 36)

X

Project Manager:

Contract Administrator:

Х

Х

(Joseph Gladke)

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average:

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Invoice processing/documentation needs major improvement.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:	2. 2	CFMS Contract Number:
Parsons Brinkerhoff	A.	A73637
Project Name (if applicable): Tunnel Alarm Systems	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87416	Project Duration (Dates): 3/18/05 – 1/31/06
Summarize the purpose of the contract, in	cluding why it was necessary to	enter into a contract:
The purpose of the contract was to provid and to upgrade navigation lights for a majo specialized nature of the work.		e fire alarm system in three highway tunnels ater into a contract due to the highly
Billable Hours (if applicable): 1.716	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$197,252.37	Source of Funding: State
If this was a single source contract, explai	in why the agency determined the	ere was only a single source for the service
N/A		
Evaluate the performance of the work incl performance in meeting the terms and ob		ctor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED	CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE	EEVALUATION
Carol moe	nau	3-37-06

File

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Contract No. <u>87416</u>	Тур	Type of work <u>Detail Design</u>		
District/Office <u>One</u>	Work Type Code			
S.P. <u>8821-111</u> T.H. <u>999</u>	Loc	ation <u>D1 Tur</u>	mels	19/19/202
Contractor <u>Parsons Brinckerhoff</u>			And A	A. A
Subcontractor			14 CO. 94	
Subcontractor			E The	
Contract Period: <u>3/18/05</u> ;; Work Start Date			piration Date	the states of th
Total Contract Cost: <u>\$197,252.37</u> =	= Orig Cost: \$_1	65,639.04 + 4	Amended Cost:	\$ <u>35,741.15</u>
Amended cost for: Overrun	Additional Wo	k Number o	of Amendments	5 _1
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ting	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	X			
2. Work Performance	X			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	X			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	X			
5. Project related cooperation	Х			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	X			
7. Contract administration cooperation	x			
8. Invoices and progress reports	X			
9. Cost estimation/budget				

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points <u>36</u> (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager: · he 202 (Roberta Dwyer Print Name

Contract Administrator: Roberta Duyer

Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

<u>PB delivered an excellent product. The design of the tunnel alarms is highly specialized. They provided</u> <u>a detailed design for the electrical systems and also conformed well to Mn/DOT Standards. The CADD</u> <u>work was excellent. Even after bridge lighting was added to the contract, work was completed on time.</u>

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Barr Engineering Company		A39401
Project Name (if applicable): I-35W Pipe Monitoring/Analysis of Hydraulic Surges.	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 83335	Project Duration (Dates): 8/20/02 – 11/30/05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include The purpose of the contract was to provide statistic intense rainfall events at tunnel drop-shafts ur enter into a contract in order to obtain addition feasible, confirm or refute the design basis of I35W/TH 62 project.	orm water pipe monitoring and nder I-35W at 35 th and 39 th Stre nal pressure, velocity, and video	analysis of hydraulic surges occurring from eets in Minneapolis. It was necessary to o data of surge events to, as much as
Billable Hours (if applicable): 209.90	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$66,690.24	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
The proposed data collection effort was an Engineering at these sites. The existing data inoperative for a while and needed to be in Whereas, Barr Engineering, which is a re- equipment and is very familiar with the di- environment, they were singularly qualified Barr Engineering's sub-consultants was identified that was included in this work. Charles N The University of Minnesota St Anthony I capabilities and expertise in hydraulic sen- storm sewers. The specialized facilities and publication of a number of technical paper (for example, refer to SAFL Technical Pap- and C. Song in Journal of Hydraulic Engine December 1990). Measurements of the m- instrumentation provided by SAFL was to to resist the thrust imposed on it during a Evaluate the performance of the work includin	ata collection and video equi hspected and repaired as nec- cognized regional authority is fficulties of maintaining equi ed to undertake this work. F- leally matched to the installa- elson Associates specializes Falls Laboratory (SAFL) is a sors and monitoring hydraul- nd staff at SAFL have resulted rs about hydraulic surges and per 296-A "Surging in Urba- heering, American Society of agnitude and time duration of be used to confirm the capa surge event.	ipment at these sites had been essary to return it to intended operation. in hydrology, originally installed this ipment in the demanding tunnel urthermore, the area of expertise of tion of hydraulic sensors in a tunnel in tunnel construction and evaluation. hydraulics research center with unique ic surges in large, pressurized, urban ed in the development of expertise and d other complex hydraulic phenomena n Storm Drainage Systems" by Q. Guo <u>f Civil Engineers</u> , Vol. 116 no.12, of pressure surges made possible by city of the proposed diffuser structure
performance in meeting the terms and objecti		

Parol Molnau

Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner

2-21-06

Date

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>83335</u> Type of work <u>Water Resource Engineering</u>

District/Office Metro

____ Work Type Code <u>HY</u>

S.P. <u>2782-281</u> T.H. <u>I-35W</u> Location <u>Under I-35W at 35th and 39th Streets in Minneapolis</u>

Contractor Barr Engineering Company

Subcontractor CNA Consulting Engineering

Subcontractor St. Anthony Falls Laboratory (SAFL)

Contract Period: <u>August 20, 2002;</u> Work Start Date November 30, 2005 ; November 30, 2005 Work Completion Date Expiration Date

Total Contract Cost:* $\underline{92,881.44}$ = Orig Cost: $\underline{92,881.44}$ + Amended Cost: $\underline{N/A}$

* Actual Cost was \$66,690.24 less than contract cost due to less runoff events than anticipated.

Amended cost for: \sim Overrun \sim Additional Work Number of Am

Number of Amendments $\underline{0}$

Item Rating 1 – 6 by Project Manager 7 – 9 by Agreement Administrator	Rating				
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality	x				
2. Work Performance	x				
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		х			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	Х				
5. Project related cooperation	Х				
6. QA/QC plan conformance		X			
7. Contract administration cooperation	×				
8. Invoices and progress reports	×				
9. Cost estimation/budget management	X				

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: Bruce Irish Print Name

Total Points 30 (Maximum points 36) ontract Administrator: Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Barr Engineering did a good job of administering the contract and compiling the final report. The University of Minnesota St Anthony Falls Laboratory staff made significant efforts to keep monitoring equipment operational and download data after storm events in a timely manner. Although there were not as many intense storms to produce hydraulic surge event data within the study period as was hoped (which is the cause of the study not using all budgeted funds), data from the storm events that did occur was captured and did not indicate an approach to the I35W geyser problem different from the previous evaluation.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Paul Schiller met with me to go over invoicing - progress reporting to make Sure their payment requests were Correct. I appreciate his efforts and it paid off in fater processing of invoices. The invoices were correct 's provided in a timely manner. Invoicing was much better quality than what we normally receive from Contractors. Rod Kochn

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

 ϕ

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.					
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Contractor Name: Veit Environmental, Inc.	CFMS Contract Number: A74755				
Project Name (if applicable): S.P. 3002-09 (TH 47) Asbestos Abatement	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87845	Project Duration (Dates): 04/22/05 To 10/22/05			
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:			
The purpose of this agreement was to provide Asbestos Abatement Services on S.P. 3002-09 (TH 47), as directed by the State Project Manager. It was necessary to enter into this agreement because the department did not have the necessary expertise on staff to do the contracted work.					
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$60,710.20	Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget Allotment for District 3			
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:			
N/A					
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall			
SEE ATTACHED CON	SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION			
Carol Molr	rou	2-21-06			
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date			
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration					

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>87845</u>	Type of work _Asbestos Abatement Services
District/Office <u>3-Baxter</u>	Work Type Code <u>9119- AB</u>
S.P. <u>3002-09</u> T.H. <u>47</u>	Location <u>Parcels 15 and 94</u>
Contractor _Veit Environmental, Inc.	
Subcontractor <u>N/A</u>	
Subcontractor <u>N/A</u>	
Contract Period: 04/22/2005 ; 10/22/2 Work Start Date Work	2005; 03/01/2006 Completion Date Expiration Date
Total Contract Cost: $\$100,000.00$ = Orig	Cost: \$ <u>100,000.00</u> + Amended Cost: \$ <u>0.00</u>

Amended cost for: ~ Overrun ~ Additional Work Number of Amendments $\underline{0}$

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager	Rating			
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		×		
2. Work Performance		X		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		×		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X		
5. Project related cooperation		×		
6. QA/QC plan conformance		×		
7. Contract administration cooperation		3		
8. Invoices and progress reports		3		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		3		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

1/24/06 Project Manager (Mark Vogel Print Name

Total Points <u>27</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: Gregory J. Thompson

Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.					
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Contractor Name: Liesch Associates, Inc.	CFMS Contract Number: A57849				
Project Name (if applicable): S.P. 3002-09 & 10 (TH 47) Asbestos Abatement	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 83115 WO2	Project Duration (Dates): 01/23/04 To 12/31/05			
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	hter into a contract:			
The purpose of this agreement was to provide Asbestos Abatement Services on S.P. 3002-09 and 3002-10 (TH 47), as directed by the State Project Manager. It was necessary to enter into this agreement because the department did not have the necessary expertise on staff to do the contracted work.					
\$					
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$182,459.94	Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget Allotment for District 3			
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:			
N/A					
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall			
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION			
Care Moen	an	2-21-06			
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date			
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration					

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>83115 WO #2</u>	Type of wo	ork <u>Asbestos</u> 1	Abatement		
District/Office <u>3 - Baxter</u>	Work Type	e Code <u>_3470-</u>	AB		
S.P. <u>3002-09 & 10</u> T.H. <u>47</u>	_ Location _	Isanti County		A 22 23 24 25 26 3)o
Contractor Liesch Associates, Inc.			J.S.	Pani-	and the second
Subcontractor <u>Veit Environmental</u>				RECEIVED	312 31
Subcontractor <u>N/A</u>				OFFICE OF	N
Contract Period: <u>January 23, 2004</u> ; <u>I</u> Work Start Date		<u>5; January 1,</u> Date Expiration	2000	VINDOLOG	
Total Contract Cost: $\underline{200,000.00} = 0$	Drig Cost: \$_ <u>2(</u>	<u>00,000.00</u> + An	nended Cost: \$	0.00	
Amended cost for: ~ Overrun	∼ Additional V	Work Num	ber of Amendn	nents <u>1</u>	
Item Rating		Rat	ting		
1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator					
	Above		Below		

	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		3		
2. Work Performance		3		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		3		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		3		
5. Project related cooperation	4			
6. QA/QC plan conformance		3		
7. Contract administration cooperation		3		
8. Invoices and progress reports		3		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		3		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager Kevin Schmidt

(Kevin Schmidt Print Name Total Points <u>28</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: Gregory J/ Thompson

Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Contractor Partious and exacting, How Mas ransideration vdaemen nerds hazaro au lours was. p f paint encepsu latine Pead 115 Office Sama ININIE nal board 14-+ools ecure thier and remove the man Linally; Complex :\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898 format. 12:

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

 \mathbf{v}_{i}

}

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	nt Services Section, Mail Sto	p 680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: University of Minnesota - CTS		CFMS Contract Number: A79248
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81655 W.O. 183	Project Duration (Dates): 8/15/05 – 12/31/05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue		
The purpose of this conference is to bring information on traffic safety initiatives and	-	
There was no state employee with the exp research.	ertise or agency with the lab	facilities necessary to conduct this
	· · ·	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$70,000.00	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined ther	e was only a single source for the services:
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined ther	e was only a single source for the services:
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined ther	e was only a single source for the services:
if this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined ther	e was only a single source for the services:
ir this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined ther	e was only a single source for the services:
ir this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined ther	e was only a single source for the services:
ir this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined the	e was only a single source for the services:
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined the	e was only a single source for the services:
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ng an appraisal of the contract	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ng an appraisal of the contract	or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ng an appraisal of the contracte ives of the contract: NSULTANT PERFORMANCE	or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti SEE ATTACHED CON	ng an appraisal of the contracte ives of the contract: NSULTANT PERFORMANCE	or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

[°]Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No81655 W.O. 183	Type of v	workTrainin	g	
District/Office Traffic	Work Type C	ode_TR		
S.P T.H	Lo	ocation		·
Contractor _University of Minnesota	- CTS			
Subcontractor				
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: _8/15/05;; Work Start Date		;4/28/06_ Date Expiration	Date	
Total Contract Cost: \$ 70,000.00 = 0				
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	∼ Additional V	Work Num	ber of Amendm	nents _0
Item Rating		Rat	ting	
1 - 6 by Project Manager7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator				
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	X			
2. Work Performance	X	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	Х			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	Х			
5. Project related cooperation	Х			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	*7			
	Х			
 7. Contract administration cooperation 	X	X		
7. Contract administration	X	× ×		
7. Contract administration cooperation	X	× × ×		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

Loren Hill) (Print Name

Total Points 55 (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: 2/10/00

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: University of Minnesota - CTS		CFMS Contract Number: A79248
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81655 W.O. 183	Project Duration (Dates): 8/15/05 – 12/31/05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	
The purpose of this conference is to bring information on traffic safety initiatives and		
There was no state employee with the exp research.	ertise or agency with the lab	facilities necessary to conduct this
		x
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$70,000.00	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objection	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objection	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
performance in meeting the terms and objective SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract: ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	
performance in meeting the terms and objection	ves of the contract: ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

	e est tiece ecetient, man etep	
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Liesch Associates, Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A57849
Project Name (if applicable): S.P. 3002-09 & 10 (TH 47) Asbestos Abatement	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 83115 WO2	Project Duration (Dates): 01/23/04 To 12/31/05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
The purpose of this agreement was to provide directed by the State Project Manager. It was have the necessary expertise on staff to do th	necessary to enter into this agi	
1		
		а. С
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$182,459.94	Source of Funding: Consultant Services Budget Allotment for District 3
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
N/A		×
		· · · · ·
		×
* .		
•		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objection		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION
Carol Moen	an	2-21-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	1 ×	Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sect File	ion	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1 10		

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Veit Environmental, Inc.	•	A74755
Project Name (if applicable): S.P. 3002-09 (TH 47) Asbestos Abatement	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87845	Project Duration (Dates): 04/22/05 To 10/22/05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to en	ter into a contract:
	,	
The purpose of this agreement was to provide the State Project Manager. It was necessary t necessary expertise on staff to do the contrac	o enter into this agreement bec	
		×
*		· · · ·
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding: Consultant Services
N/A	Contract: \$60,710.20	Budget Allotment for District 3
If this was a single source contract, explain wh	v the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:
	.,	,
N/A		
		, ·
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		1. <i>1</i> . 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.
Evaluate the performance of the work includin		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract.	
	SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	
CEE ATTACHED CON		VALUATION
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Carol Boen	ran	2-21-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
		2410
Paul Stempler Dept of Administration		

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

matuctions. Submit this form to consultan	t ocivices occuoil, man otop	ood along with the infar involce.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Barr Engineering Company		A39401
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
I-35W Pipe Monitoring/Analysis of Hydraulic	83335	8/20/02 – 11/30/05
Surges.		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ		
The purpose of the contract was to provide standard intense rainfall events at tunnel drop-shafts ur	orm water pipe monitoring and	analysis of hydraulic surges occurring from
enter into a contract in order to obtain addition		
feasible, confirm or refute the design basis of		
I35W/TH 62 project.		
Billable Hours (if applicable): 209.90	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$66,690.24	Source of Funding:
209.90	Contract: \$66,690.24	Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain wi	by the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:
	ly the agency determined there	
The proposed data collection effort was an	extension of previous data	collection performed by Barr
Engineering at these sites. The existing date	*	1
inoperative for a while and needed to be in	-	
Whereas, Barr Engineering, which is a re-	· ·	•
equipment and is very familiar with the di		-
environment, they were singularly qualifie		-
Barr Engineering's sub-consultants was id	-	-
that was included in this work. Charles N		
The University of Minnesota St Anthony I	Falls Laboratory (SAFL) is a	hydraulics research center with unique
capabilities and expertise in hydraulic sense	sors and monitoring hydraul	ic surges in large, pressurized, urban
storm sewers. The specialized facilities an	nd staff at SAFL have result	ed in the development of expertise and
publication of a number of technical paper		· ·
(for example, refer to SAFL Technical Pap	, .	
and C. Song in Journal of Hydraulic Engin		
December 1990). Measurements of the m	-	
instrumentation provided by SAFL was to		city of the proposed diffuser structure
to resist the thrust imposed on it during a s		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract: ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISOLIANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
Carol molni		
Carol Morna	au	2-21-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

a contract.		·
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: University of Minnesota	, ,	CFMS Contract Number: A62899
Project Name (if applicable): INV 668: 2004 Minnesota Technology Transfer (T2) LTAP Program	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81655, WO 119	Project Duration (Dates): 4/22/2004 – 12/30/2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	I ding why it was necessary to ei	nter into a contract:
To provide funding for the 2004 LTAP/LRRB Studies, University of Minnesota.		
·		
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$384,000.00	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
		· · ·
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objective	g an appraisal of the contracto /es of the contract:	r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	
Carolnoe	nau	2-21-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
cc: File		

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
University of Minnesota		A62899
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
INV 668: 2004 Minnesota Technology	81655, WO 119	4/22/2004 - 12/30/2005
Transfer (T2) LTAP Program		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
To provide funding for the 2004 LTAP/LRRB ⁻	Technology Transfer Program	managed by the Center for Transportation
Studies, University of Minnesota.	reennology transier rogram	nanaged by the benter for transportation
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
N/A	Contract: \$384,000.00	Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
	.,	
		÷
		· · · · · ·
Evaluate the performance of the work includin	g an appraisal of the contracto	r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objectiv		
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
VAIADMAAD	11011	2 21 21
arochtor	nau	2-21-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date

in an

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Agreement No. 81655, WO 1	19Type of work	Research - KE
District/OfficeInvestment M	anagement	
Contractor University of Min	inesota	
	;12 30 105 12/30/2005	
Start Date	Expiration Date	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Original Contract Cost	Amendment Cost(s)	Final Cost:
\$ <u>334,000.00</u> +	\$ <u>50,000.00</u> =	\$ <u>384,000.00</u>

Item Rating		Ra	ting	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	x			
2. Work Performance		X		
 Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 		x		
 Deliverables Complete and on time 		x		
5. Project related cooperation	x			
 QA/QC plan conformance (N/A) 	N/A			
7. Contract administration cooperation		X		
 Invoices and progress reports 		X		
 Cost estimation/budget management 		X		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

llmar Julie Skallman

Total Points ____26__ (Maximum points 32)

Contract Administrator:

Malt,

ur: apply/palfin = 2/23/010

Clark Moe

Sandy Lueth

From: βent: Γο: Subject:	Steve.Gustafson@state.mn.us Thursday, February 16, 2006 9:35 AM Steve.Gustafson@state.mn.us; Sandy.Lueth@state.mn.us Vendor Evaluation Form
	of your feedback form. It was submitted by tate.mn.us) on Thursday, <mark>February 16, 2006</mark> at 09:34:51
<pre></pre>	12 ial Index User Interface for Right of Way Maps al Systems Research Institute ION DEPT Phillips-Mustain OG a software product within Mn/DOT s standard family of GIS products for a map interface through a web browser. There has been eleven requests abilities over the past year through the Department. Phase 1 of this the ArcIMS infrastructure and an ArcIMS enterprise web interface astructure will be the foundation for other business areas to deliver the enterprise web interface template. This will ensure a consistent e- feel for Mn/DOT s data delivery via a map interface through a web ill also deliver an enterprise spatial data warehouse that will supply hts throughout the Department, in addition to providing data sources ices. An understanding of the ArcIMS suite of tools and technology and modifications and minor enhancements to applications is required for 1/2005 /2005 2005 2005 2005 2005 2005 200
amended: Yes amended_e: The contr	ensured knowledge transfer. ract was amended to for additional time only. We had lost time during
the government shute set with an lengthly terminated: No	down. Additional time was also needed to complete a large raster data y load time.
engage: Yes	
engage_e: The contra contractors worked w expertise.	actors are very professionaly and produced quality deliverables. The well with our staff and helped to build our in-house technical

1

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

Agency:		
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
University of Minnesota		A57989
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
INV 816: Low Temperature Cracking of	81655, WO 114	2/27/2004 - 12/30/2005
Flexible Pavement Due to Thermal Fatigue		
and Combined Effects Temp/Load		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
The new equipment will allow performing adva to better understand the role played by the mi respect to the material resistance to low temp	xture components, the mix des	
		-
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
N/A	Contract: \$154,998.00	Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:
0	,,,	
Evaluate the performance of the work includin	a an appraisal of the contracto	's timeliness, quality, open, and everall
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objectiv		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:	
performance in meeting the terms and objective		
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:	
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:	
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:	
performance in meeting the terms and objective SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract:	2-15-06
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract:	VALUATION

cc: File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

Agency:				
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:		
University of Minnesota		A57989		
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):		
INV 816: Low Temperature Cracking of	81655, WO 114	2/27/2004 – 12/30/2005		
Flexible Pavement Due to Thermal Fatigue				
and Combined Effects Temp/Load Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	l ding why it was necessary to er	ler into a contract:		
	ang why it was necessary to er			
The new equipment will allow performing adva	anced laboratory characterizati	on of asphalt materials used in pavements		
to better understand the role played by the mi				
respect to the material resistance to low temp				
· · · · · · ·				
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:		
N/A	Contract: \$154,998.00	Trunk Highway		
If this was a single source contract, explain w				
	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services.		
		×.		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall				
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
1				
(appl Molna	u	2-15-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	u	2 15-06 Date		

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Agreement No. 81655, WO 12	14	Type of work	Research	
District/Office <u>Investment Ma</u>	nagement	RE		
Contractor <u>University of Minn</u>	<u>esota</u>			STO IT TO TO
Contract Period: <u>2/27/2004</u> Start Date		0/2005 ration Date		FEB 2005
Original Contract Cost	Amendmen	t Cost(s)	Final Cost:	
\$_154,998.00	+ \$ <u>N/A</u>	<u> </u>	\$ <u>154,998.00</u>	CLESS States

Item Rating	Rating			
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	· ·	Χ.		
2. Work Performance		X		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X		
 Deliverables Complete and on time 			X	
5. Project related cooperation		X		
6. QA/QC plan conformance (N/A)	N/A		P	
7. Contract administration cooperation			$\boldsymbol{\lambda}$	
 Invoices and progress reports 		X	· · ·	
 Cost estimation/budget management 		K		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

Shongtao Dai

Deheyftputte Total Points (Maximum points 32) Contract Administrator:

James Klessig

<u>Per project manager</u>: Professor Marasteanu is continually late in providing deliverables as contractually required. This applies to most of his Projects. Repeated attempts to secure the contractually required documents, be they reports or other materials, are usually met with reasons for the delay and a new promised date, which usually goes unmet. Hence the low rating.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

	teel neer eeenen, man erep	s see along that are than a see		
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: Bolton and Menk Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A57774		
Project Name (if applicable): Final Design Plans - TH22/7 at Hutchinson	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 85553	Project Duration (Dates): Jan. 22, 2004 - Feb. 1, 2006		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include				
This Contract provided complete Final Design State did not have sufficient resources to com date for the improvement project.				
	· · · · ·	· · · ·		
•				
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:		
8213.50	Contract: \$743,459.61 (subject to audit)	Trunk Highway		
If this was a single source contract, explain wh		e was only a single source for the services:		
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
Caral Molnau, Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	u_	2-15.0 6 Date		
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File	on .			

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

 $\gamma_{\rm b}$

(m)

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan		680 along with the final invoice
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	it Services Section, Mail Stop	toot along with the final invoice.
Contractor Name: Barr Engineering Company		CFMS Contract Number: A62000
Project Name (if applicable): SPCC Plans	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 86645	Project Duration (Dates): 6/22/04 – 11/15/05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
To provide Spill Prevention and Counterm requirements.	easures (SPCC) Plans for fue	el and oil tanks to meet Federal EPA
Billable Hours (if applicable): 850.9	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$87,644.74	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
	*	
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall

SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

20lnau 0)

Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner

Date

2-15-06

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 86645	Type of wo	ork <u>Devel</u> e Code <u>E</u>	op spill	plans	
District/Office <u>M7</u>	Work Type	e Code 🗲	_	,	
	Lo			51.2425.2625	2
Contractor Barr Engin	eering (0.	L.S.		
Subcontractor J J JAN 2006					
Subcontractor				OFFICE OF	N:
Contract Period: <u>6-22-04</u> ; Work Start Date	11-15-04 Vork Completion	5; <u>11-15</u> Date Expiration	-05 V	CONSULTANT SER	
	Orig Cost: \$			\$ <u>6.8</u>	in Bring to
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun \sim	∼ Additional V	Work Num	ber of Amendn	nents 3(H	me
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Rating				
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality		3			
2. Work Performance		3			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		3			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		3			
5. Project related cooperation		3			
6. QA/QC plan conformance		3			
7. Contract administration cooperation		3			
8. Invoices and progress reports		3			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		3			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Rroject Manager mer Ona Print Name

Total Points _____ (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: lopolo rint N

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments: This contract required 3 time extensions.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	o 680 along with the final invoice.	
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name: Barr Engineering Company		CFMS Contract Number: A62000	
Project Name (if applicable): SPCC Plans	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 86645	Project Duration (Dates): 6/22/04 – 11/15/05	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:	
To provide Spill Prevention and Counterm requirements.	easures (SPCC) Plans for fue	el and oil tanks to meet Federal EPA	
Billable Hours (if applicable): 850.9	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$87,644.74	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway	
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the second se	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:	
·			
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:			
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Carol Molnau 3-15-06			
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date	
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration	on		

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

instructions. Oublint this form to consultan	toor moor oconom, man otop	ooo along with the final involoe.		
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:		
Bolton and Menk Inc.		A57774		
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):		
Final Design Plans - TH22/7 at Hutchinson	85553	Jan. 22, 2004 - Feb. 1, 2006		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:		
This Contract provided complete Final Design				
State did not have sufficient resources to com	plete this work in time to meet	the scheduled construction contract letting		
date for the improvement project.				
×				
· *				
·				
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:		
8213.50	Contract: \$743,459.61	Trunk Highway		
	(subject to audit)			
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall				
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
A. Ma				
Carol Doena	u	2-15.05		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner				
		Date		
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration				
Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No.: 85553 Type of work: Detailed design

District/Office: 8 - Willmar Work Type Code: _____

S.P.: 4302 - 44 T.H.: 7 and 22 Location: At Hutchinson

Contractor: Bolton and Menk Inc.

Subcontractor: LHB, Inc

Subcontractor: Isthmus Engineering

Contract Period: Jan 22, 2004; Work Start Date W

November 30, 2005; February 1, 2006 Work Completion Date Expiration Date 575 144 00

Total Contract Cost: \$743,459.61 = Orig Cost: \$668,315.61 + Amended Cost: \$75,144.00

Amended cost for: Additional Work

Number of Amendments: 3

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Rating			
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		X		
2. Work Performance		X		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X		
5. Project related cooperation		X		
6. QA/QC plan conformance	· · ·	X		
7. Contract administration cooperation		X		
8. Invoices and progress reports	Х			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		X		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

Total Points <u>28</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator:

Gene East

Note: Any rating of below average or noor, conv to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Project Manager(s):

This was a very complex urban detailed design project.

Jon Huseby was Bolton & Menk's Project Manager. Brett Benzkofer was a key person in the design, and the key contact person for the contractor.

The project required a lot of coordination with the City of Hutchinson, various Mn/DOT offices, an aesthetics committee and various utility companies. The contractor did a good job, and was very accessible, by phone and in person, throughout the projects issues

Mn/DOT's survey data required additional work. The contractor did a good job supplying the extra void areas needed and supplying some Digital Terrain Model needed for the design.

Mn/DOT's layout required changes. There were bridge elevation changes, retaining wall modifications, street alignment / profile changes and entrances that needed to be modified. Pond locations could have been identified earlier taking into account the parkland and utility impacts. These issues required that the contract be amended.

The City of Hutchinson provided a comprehensive storm water layout for the drainage area. The storm water plan was outdated and much of the preliminary hydraulics work had to be redone or re-analyzed, requiring an amendment to the contract.

Mn/DOT changed the our project manager in the middle of the design project, the contractor handled this admirably, however, it did cause some delays or confusion at times.

There was a good working relationship between the project managers on the project to try and resolve the issues with the public, the City of Hutchinson's and Mn/DOT's best interests.

The contractor was very open to any changes or comments raised during the 30, 60 and 90 percent reviews; however the contractor could have followed up better, and completed the changes from comments submitted between each review. The complexity and size of the project led to many errors and omissions, and without diligent follow up, the list of corrections became long and difficult to manage. The contract got behind trying to meet these objectives.

The contractor could have done a better job on updating the project schedule as issues occurred. Sometimes scheduling all interested parties became difficult and the time management seemed to get lost or go by quickly and an updated schedule throughout may have helped stay on track.

The conversion from GEOPAK version seven to version eight caused some problems and the Contractors key expert for CADD work was subcontracted out throughout the process.

The subcontractor for walls, LHB Inc., did a nice job on the retaining wall plans. They were very detailed. The aesthetics were taken into account and changes addressed very well.

Mn/DOT changed the letting date on the project due to right of way issues. This made it difficult for the contractor to deliver the plan smoothly. The changes required additional time, leading to another amendment.

Considering everything, the project plan set was very easy to read and met Mn/DOT standards, fulfilling the contract intent.

<u>Agreement Administrator</u>: The contractor's cooperation and skill in the administration aspect of this contract was good, with one exception. This contract required 3 amendments due to additional work at Mn/DOT's request. In the process of getting the amendments in place (establishing that an amendment was actually needed, and establishing cost and/or time needed) the contractor was late and sometimes slow in providing Mn/DOT with input regarding the need for the amendment, and what the details (cost and/or time) of the amendment were to be. In one instance, due to the delays in establishing the need for an amendment, the contract lapsed until the amendment was executed. To their credit, it seemed to be pride in getting the work done on time and on budget that caused their reluctance to accept that additional time or money was needed.

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Contractor Name: Horizons, Incorp	orated.	CFMS Contract Number: A-82186
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Aerial Services	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88825	Project Duration (Dates): 10/20/05 to 01/31/0
Summarize the purpose of the contr	act, including why it was necessary to	enter into a contract:
Bemidji, Marshall and Anoka Air	ports, for FAA requirements. MN/DOT does not own an aerial pl	action Survey for landings and take-offs at hotogrammetric camera and LiDAR (Light,
	Total Contract Amount \$04,000,00	Source of Funding: Office of Aeronautic
Billable Hours (if applicable): No .	Total Contract Amount: \$94,000.00	
Explain why this amount was a cost efficiently: Performing this work ourselves w	effective way for the agency to provide	e its services or products better or more osts for necessary equipment and ongoing
Explain why this amount was a cost efficiently: Performing this work ourselves w costs for personnel for this type of	effective way for the agency to provide ould be for more expense. Capital c f work are prohibitive for the State.	e its services or products better or more
Explain why this amount was a cost efficiently: Performing this work ourselves w costs for personnel for this type of	effective way for the agency to provide ould be for more expense. Capital c f work are prohibitive for the State.	e its services or products better or more osts for necessary equipment and ongoing
Explain why this amount was a cost efficiently: Performing this work ourselves w costs for personnel for this type of f this was a single source contract, o	effective way for the agency to provide ould be for more expense. Capital c f work are prohibitive for the State.	e its services or products better or more osts for necessary equipment and ongoing
Explain why this amount was a cost efficiently: Performing this work ourselves w costs for personnel for this type of f this was a single source contract, o No. Evaluate the performance of the wor	effective way for the agency to provide ould be for more expense. Capital c f work are prohibitive for the State. explain why the agency determined the k including an appraisal of the contract	e its services or products better or more osts for necessary equipment and ongoing
Explain why this amount was a cost efficiently: Performing this work ourselves w costs for personnel for this type of f this was a single source contract, of No. Evaluate the performance of the work performance in meeting the terms and	effective way for the agency to provide ould be for more expense. Capital c work are prohibitive for the State. explain why the agency determined the k including an appraisal of the contract nd objectives of the contract:	e its services or products better or more osts for necessary equipment and ongoing ere was only a single source for the services:
Explain why this amount was a cost efficiently: Performing this work ourselves w costs for personnel for this type of f this was a single source contract, o No.	effective way for the agency to provide ould be for more expense. Capital c work are prohibitive for the State. explain why the agency determined the k including an appraisal of the contract nd objectives of the contract:	e its services or products better or more osts for necessary equipment and ongoing ere was only a single source for the services:
Explain why this amount was a cost efficiently: Performing this work ourselves w costs for personnel for this type of f this was a single source contract, o No. Evaluate the performance of the wor performance in meeting the terms an	effective way for the agency to provide ould be for more expense. Capital c work are prohibitive for the State. explain why the agency determined the k including an appraisal of the contract nd objectives of the contract:	e its services or products better or more osts for necessary equipment and ongoing ere was only a single source for the services:
Explain why this amount was a cost efficiently: Performing this work ourselves w costs for personnel for this type of f this was a single source contract, o No. Evaluate the performance of the wor performance in meeting the terms an	effective way for the agency to provide ould be for more expense. Capital c work are prohibitive for the State. explain why the agency determined the k including an appraisal of the contract nd objectives of the contract:	e its services or products better or more osts for necessary equipment and ongoing ere was only a single source for the services:

J. Brunner, MS 68 File

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Contractor Name: Horizons, Incorpo	CFMS Contract Number: A-82186				
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Aerial Services	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88825	Project Duration (Dates): 10/20/05 to 01/31/06			
Summarize the purpose of the contra	ct, including why it was necessary to	enter into a contract:			
Bemidji, Marshall and Anoka Airp	orts, for FAA requirements. MN/DOT does not own an aerial pl	action Survey for landings and take-offs at notogrammetric camera and LiDAR (Light,			
Billable Hours (if applicable): No .	Total Contract Amount: \$94,000.00	Source of Funding: Office of Aeronautics			
efficiently: Performing this work ourselves we costs for personnel for this type of If this was a single source contract, e No.	ould be for more expense. Capital c work are prohibitive for the State. xplain why the agency determined the	e its services or products better or more osts for necessary equipment and ongoing ere was only a single source for the services:			
Evaluate the performance of the work performance in meeting the terms an		tor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall			
Please see the attached evaluation form.					
chite i i	Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner Date				
cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin		- -			

J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 88825	Type of w	$\frac{pork_photo}{pork_photo} + \frac{photo}{pork_photo} + \frac{photo}{pork_p$	grame	metric	Map
District/Office 2_M 18	Work Typ	be Code _/ <u>().</u> /	AE	Remote	Sens
S.P T.H	Ļ	ocation <u>Air</u>	Ports		
Contractor Horizons		, in the second s			
Subcontractor					
Subcontractor					
Contract Period: $10 - 20 - 05$; Work Start Date	$\frac{1}{3}$ - $\frac{3}{2}$ - $\frac{3}{2}$ - $\frac{3}{2}$ Work Completion	$\frac{1}{1000}$, $\frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$	30 -06 Date	-	
Total Contract Cost: \$ <u>94,000</u> =	= Orig Cost: \$	<u> 74,000</u> + A	mended Cost:	\$	
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	~ Additional			ments	
Item Rating		Rat	ting	-	
1 - 6 by Project Manager *7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		· .			
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
		Average 3 Points		Poor 1 Point	_
 Product Quality Work Performance 	Average		Average		_
 Product Quality Work Performance 	Average		Average		
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 	Average		Average		
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time 	Average		Average		
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation 	Average		Average		
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation 	Average		Average		
 Product Quality Work Performance Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements Deliverables Complete and on time Project related cooperation QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration 	Average		Average		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

Print Name

Total Points (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: HRAN Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

instructions. Submit this form to consultan	i Services Section, Mail Stop	ooo along with the final involce.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
ERES Consultants - ARA		A69617
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
INV 821: Assess Life-Cycle Costs and	86953	11/15/2004 - 12/30/2005
Roadway Surfacing Impacts of Increasing		
Roadway Construction Standards		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ling why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
The primary focus of this study is to compare	the current roadway construction	on and maintenance costs (life-cycle costs)
that city budgets must address under the 6 to		
standard. Life-cycle costs are those costs of	initial construction, maintenanc	e i.e., patching, milling, overlays, and
reconstruction of pavement, curb and gutter, i	ncluding additional grading iter	ns. The time period for life-cycle costs is
estimated at 35 years.		
The objective of this study is to provide a final	report that summarizes the co	mparison of the life-cycle costs for the two
construction standards described above. This	s document will be used to prov	vide a basis for budgets on future projects
and pavement management plans.		
		, · · · ·
		*
		×
· · · · ·		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
N/A	Contract: \$88,878.89	Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
		э
	×	
· ,		
÷		
	· · · ·	
		*
Evaluate the performance of the work includin	g an appraisal of the contracto	r's timeliness quality cost and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objecti		
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	
GEE ATTACHED GOIN		
N 4.		
I ALAD MA MOMA		2-3-06
urre toth		
	u	a 5,00
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	ui	Date
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	ui l	

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: ERES Consultants - ARA		CFMS Contract Number: A69617
Project Name (if applicable): INV 821: Assess Life-Cycle Costs and Roadway Surfacing Impacts of Increasing Roadway Construction Standards	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 86953	Project Duration (Dates): 11/15/2004 – 12/30/2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ The primary focus of this study is to compare that city budgets must address under the 6 to standard. Life-cycle costs are those costs of reconstruction of pavement, curb and gutter, i estimated at 35 years. The objective of this study is to provide a final	the current roadway constructi 7 ton construction standard to initial construction, maintenanc ncluding additional grading iter report that summarizes the co	on and maintenance costs (life-cycle costs) the life-cycle costs of a 9 ton construction e i.e., patching, milling, overlays, and ns. The time period for life-cycle costs is mparison of the life-cycle costs for the two
construction standards described above. This and pavement management plans.	s document will be used to prov	ide a basis for budgets on future projects
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$88,878.89	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services.
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	SULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	ni	2-3-06 Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Agreement No. 86953	Type of work <u>Resea</u>	arch -RE
District/Office Investment Ma	nagement	
Contractor _ERES Consultants	<u>s - ARA</u>	
Contract Period: <u>11/15/2004</u> Start Date	ILSO/05 12/30/2005 Expiration Date	
Original Contract Cost	Amendment Cost(s)	Final Cost:
\$ <u>88,878.79</u> +	\$ <u>N/A</u> =	\$ <u>88,878.89</u>

Item Rating	Rating			
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	×			
2. Work Performance	×			
 Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 	\prec			
 Deliverables Complete and on time 	\times			
5. Project related cooperation	X			
 QA/QC plan conformance (N/A) 	X			
7. Contract administration cooperation	\prec			
 Invoices and progress reports 	\checkmark			
 Cost estimation/budget management 	\checkmark			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: Tom Mathisen

Total Points 30 (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator:

lodahl

Sue Lodahl

When Handfiel

Definitions: Above Average: Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT. Contractor performs beyond expectations. Deliverables exceed standards. Project Manage is informed of project status regularly. Contractor resolves any problems that occurred. Contractor needs little or no direction. Contractor responsive to requests. Contractor suggests improvements. Average Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less. Deliverables meet standards. Project is on time and budget. Project Manager is informed of key milestones. Below Average: Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms. Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply. Project is behind schedule or over budget. Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce. Poor: Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction. Contractor is unresponsive to requests. Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.

- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments: L

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

nstructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number: A70403
Confluence International Inc	· · · · ·	4
Project Name (if applicable): Financial Application Support	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87151	Project Duration (Dates): 12/01/2004 – 12/31/2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include		
The contractor provided technical assistance is State Automated Materials Management Syste Forecasting Information Tool (CFIT). In additi with these systems that were not identified as developers of another financial system that is (SAAS). Mn/DOT did not have the resources with the r within a reasonable timeframe. However, Mn/ developed and will be able to continue suppor	em (SAMMS), Resource Cons ion, the contractor assisted with enhancements. The contractor undergoing a major enhancem equired skills available to comp /DOT does have the skilled res	umption Application (RCA), and Cash h resolving a variety of technical problems or also provided consultation to the key nent for the State Aid Accounting System olete these enhancements in-house and
Billable Hours (if applicable): 1809	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$153,765	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti SEE ATTACHED CON		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	u.	1 - 30 - 06 Date

: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No87151 District/OfficeFinance S.P T.H ContractorConfluence Internation Subcontractor	Work Type			
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: 12/01/2004; Work Start Date				
Total Contract Cost: \$_153,765.00=	Orig Cost: \$_8:	5,000+ Ame	ended Cost: \$6	8,765
Amended cost for: ~ Overrun	EAdditional V	Vork Numb	er of Amendm	ents3
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ing	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	X			
2. Work Performance	Х			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	X			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	Х			
5. Project related cooperation	Х			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	Х			
7. Contract administration cooperation	X			
8. Invoices and progress reports	λ			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		*		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager GHT int Name

Total Points (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: (Melissam Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

This is a top-notch firm for IT development. They quickly learned the how the business worked and understood the needs and then programmed the requirements to work within our business rules. Their project task estimates were accurate and products were delivered on time and accurately developed according to the specifications. I highly recommend this group and would hire them again for another project should the need arise.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency:				
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:		
North Star Land Services Company, Inc.		A28746		
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):		
District-wide	82069 WO1	10/18/2001 To 03/31/2003		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, incluc	ling why it was necessary to en	iter into a contract:		
The purpose of this agreement was to provide district-wide Right-of-Way (R/W) acquisition assistance as directed by the State Project Manager. The projects were assigned within State District 3 by District R/W personnel. It was necessary to enter into this agreement because no personnel with the necessary expertise were available.				
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Contract Amount: \$100,000.00	Source of Funding: Dist. 3 Allotment of Consultant Services Budget.		
Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently:				
This contract was utilized during a period of ex the districts normal program together with the and program delivery deadlines were not bein workload on the district's professional staff an	additional IRC project demand g permitted to slide. It was not	s. District staff was stretched to the limit reasonably possible to increase the		

available to the district to deliver the IRC program as well as our normal program was to utilize consultants. The alternative would have been to miss a letting, thus delaying jobs. The resulting efficiencies were factors of time.

If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services:

available; and there was no chance of increasing staff to accommodate the district's needs. The only acceptable option

Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:

SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

nol moenau

Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner

1-30-06

Date

cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>82069WO#1</u>	Type of w	ork <u>R/W Profes</u>	sional Assistan	ice_
District/Office <u>3/Right-of-Way</u>	Work Type Code <u>RW</u>			
S.P. <u>District-Wide</u> T.H. <u>N/A</u>	Location District-Wide			
Contractor North Star Land Services	, Inc.			
Subcontractor <u>N/A</u>				
Subcontractor <u>N/A</u>				
Contract Period: October 18, 2001 ; M Work Start Date	arch 31, 2003 Work Completion	; June 30, 2 Date Expiration	<u>005</u> Date	
Total Contract Cost: $\frac{100,000.00}{100,000} =$	Orig Cost: \$ <u>5</u>	<u>0,000.00</u> + Ame	ended Cost: \$ <u>5</u>	0,000.00
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	\sim Additional	Work Num	ber of Amendm	nents <u>1</u>
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ting	
	Above		Below	
	Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	4			
2. Work Performance	4			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	4			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	4			
5. Project related cooperation	4			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	4			
 QA/QC plan conformance Contract administration cooperation Invoices and progress reports 	4	V		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

9. Cost estimation/budget

management

33 **Total Points** (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: ect Manage Braddamilton Greg Thompson Jeff Brunner Print Name Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

Contractor provided R/W professional assistance on several jobs in the district over the last 4 years. They have handled field title reports and direct purchase negotiations. All of the work that they have performed for the district has been handled in a timely fashion, and they have always provided a superior quality product.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice. Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION **CFMS Contract Number:** Contractor Name: Anoka County & City of Blaine (Subcontractor SEH) A42063 Project Name (if applicable): Project Duration (Dates): Mn/DOT Agreement No.: Preliminary Design TH 65 & TH 242/CSAH 12/19/02 - 11/30/05 83352 14 in Anoka County Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: Preliminary design services for project to reconstruct TH 65 to a four lane freeway or six lane expressway from just north of TH 10 to Bunker Lake Boulevard/CSAH 116 at 140th Ave. The services also included preliminary design services for reconstruction of TH 242/CSAH 14 to a four lane divided highway from TH 10 to Radisson Road /CSAH 52. Specific tasks included preparation of an Environmental Assessment, noise analysis modeling, air quality analysis, preliminary drainage design, geometric layout, cost estimates and Design Study Report. The contract also included reimbursement for project management, meetings and coordination. It was necessary to enter into this contract because it was a partnership project between Anoka County and the City of Blaine and Mn/DOT. All three partners shared equally in the cost of the project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Source of Funding: 8911 (Not all hours paid because over Contract: \$696,630.88 **Trunk Highway** contract max) (State's Share: \$220,000) If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: Anoka County was managing the design and construction of two projects on TH 242 west of TH 65. The County also owns the section of roadway (CSAH 14) to the east of TH 65 within the project limits. TH 242 to the west of TH 65 is also a potential turnback candidate roadway to Anoka County. An interchange was needed where TH 65 intersects TH 242. The design of TH 242 has a direct impact on the design of TH 65. The projects of TH 65 and TH 242 are within the cities of Coon Rapids, Blaine and Ham Lake and all within Anoka County. To avoid duplication of the project management efforts already underway on TH 242 by Anoka County and to keep continuity of the projects, it was in the best interest of the State to have Anoka County manage the preliminary design for TH 65 and TH 242. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, guality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION arol Molnau 1-30-06 Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner Date

cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 83352	Type of w	ork <u>Preliminar</u>	y Design	
District/Office Metro District	et/Office Metro District Work Type Code PD			
S.P. 0218-118, 0212-44 T.H. 65 & 242/CSAH 14 Location TH 65 just north of TH 10 to				
Bunker Lake Blvd. /CSAH 116 at 14	Bunker Lake Blvd. /CSAH 116 at 140 th Ave. TH 242 /CSAH 14 from TH 10 to Radisson			
Road/CSAH 52				
Contractor <u>Anoka County</u> (Joint Poy	wers Agreemer	<u>tt)</u>		
Subcontractor <u>SEH</u>				
Subcontractor SBP Associates, Inc.				
		; <u>November</u> Date Expiration		
Total Contract Cost: $\frac{696,630.88}{696,630.88} = 0$	Orig Cost: \$ <u>37:</u>	5 <u>,000.00</u> + Ame	ended Cost: \$ <u>32</u>	21,630.88
State's Share: \$220,000.00 =	Orig Cost: \$12	5,000.00 + Ame	ended Cost: \$ 9	95,000.00
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	~ Additional	Work Num	ber of Amendn	nents <u>1</u>
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ing	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	· · ·	3		
2. Work Performance	-	3		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		3		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		3		
5. Project related cooperation	4			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	!	3		
7. Contract administration cooperation		3		
8. Invoices and progress reports			2	and the second
			4	
9. Cost estimation/budget management			2	

Project Manager: <u>Duff</u> <u>levendorf</u> (Beth Neuendorf) Print Name

(Maximum points 36) ontract Administrator: Rod Koehn) Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments: to be back :\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898 Slui in

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.			
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name: Mead and Hunt, Inc.		CFMS Contract Number:	
Project Name (if applicable): S.P. 104-139-05 (Oakland Ave Reconstruction)	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87778	Project Duration (Dates): 4-21-05 to 12-30-05	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:	
cultural resources is being taken into National Historic Preservation Act). employed personnel who meet the Se	behalf of FHWA) needs to en account as per the requirem It is necessary to use a contr ceretary of Interior's Profession	nsure that the effects of the project on ents of 36 CFR 800 (Section 106 of the ract on this project since no state-	
Billable Hours (if applicable): 678	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding: 80-20 Split with City	
	Contract: \$65,227.48	of Austin, Mower County	
If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: The single source contract was used as part of Mn/DOT's Pre-Qualified system. All projects under \$100,000 can be direct selected from the list of pre-qualified individuals for cultural resources work. This project fell into that category.			
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:			
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	an a	/- 30-06 Date	
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sect File		and the defendence of the second s	

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No87778	Type of	work <u>architectu</u>	<u>iral history</u>	
District/Office6	Work T	ype Code <u>CR</u>		
S.P. <u>104-139-05</u> T.HNA	Locat	tion <u>City of A</u>	<u>ustin, Mower C</u>	County
Contractor <u>Mead and Hunt</u>				
Subcontractor ARCH ³ , LLC (Photog	raphy)			
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: <u>4-21-05;</u> Work Start Date		05; <u>12-30-05</u> n Date Expiration		
Total Contract Cost: $\underline{\$65,227.48} = C$	rig Cost <u>: \$65,</u>	<u>227.48</u> + Amen	ded Cost: <u>\$0.00</u>	<u>0</u>
Amended cost for: Overrun	Addition:	al Work Nu	mber of Amend	lments _
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ting	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	X			
2. Work Performance		X		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X		
5. Project related cooperation	X			
6. QA/QC plan conformance		X		
7. Contract administration cooperation		X		
8. Invoices and progress reports	na siyan Burka salahini Maratan Domini Maratan Domini Maratan Salah	X		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		X		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: (Kristen Zschomler)

Print Name

Total Points 29 (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

The consultant performed all the tasks for this project very well. Products were on-time and well done. The above average scores were given because the end product was a type of analysis and evaluation that had not been previously performed for cultural resources work (alternatives analysis to help systematically identified an avoidance alternative). The consultant worked well to address the requests and concerns of our office and the city, and produced a good end product that can serve as a model for future projects.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Contractor Name: Emmons and Olivier Resources, Inc. CFMS Contract Number: A48197	,	
Project Name (if applicable): Mn/DOT Agreement No.: Project Duration (Dates):		
Shingle Creek Chloride Study 84061 May 6, 2003 – October 31, 2005		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:		
The purpose of the contract was to determine the effect of salt from highway runoff, state facilities and other contributors on the environment in the jurisdictional area of the Shingle Creek Water Management Commission. T reason why is was necessary to enter into a contract was that Mn/DOT did not have the resources (staff and equipment) to complete the required tasks.	'ne	
Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Source of Funding:		
2001 Contract: \$231,596.40 Trunk Highway		
If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the service of the	vices:	
Not Applicable	.11	
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:		
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION		
Carol Molnau 1-30-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner Date		
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>84061</u> Type of work <u>Shingle</u>	Creek Chloride Study	ST 12 13 14 75 20
District/Office <u>Metro</u>	Work Type Code SS	
S.P. <u>N/A</u> T.H. <u>N/A</u> Lo	cation Shingle Creek Water Shed	JAN 2006
Contractor Emmons & Olivier Resources, Inc.		
Subcontractor Pace Analytical Laboratories	K.	CONSULTANT SERV.
Subcontractor University of Minnesota	X	E 0E 67 87 17 9 5 4
Contract Period: <u>May 6, 2003</u> ; <u>October 31, 2005</u> ; Work Start Date Work Completion I	October 31, 2005 Date Expiration Date	A VANA

Total Contract Cost: \$231,596.40 =Orig Cost: \$486,144.58 +Amended Cost: \$(254,548.18)

Amended cost for: ~ Overrun ~ Reduction in Work Number of Amendments 2

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	4			
2. Work Performance	4			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	4			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	4			
5. Project related cooperation	4			
6. QA/QC plan conformance	4			
7. Contract administration cooperation		3		
8. Invoices and progress reports		3		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		_3		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Proioot Manager: Cory Johnson Print Name

Total Points (Maximum points 36) ontract Administrator: od Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

<u>I was the project manager since May 2005</u>. During that time the DOT decided to close out this contract before the expected 2008 timeframe. E and O was a pleasure to work with during this phase of the contracting process. Jodi Polzin (E and O's project manager) was very responsive to all of my requests and even suggested several improvements to their deliverables and the DOT approach for future TMDL studies. Overall I was very satisfied with this consultant.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

		680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
Emmons and Olivier Resources, Inc.		A48197
Project Name (if applicable): Shingle Creek Chloride Study	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 84061	Project Duration (Dates): May 6, 2003 – October 31, 2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include		
	• •	
The purpose of the contract was to determine contributors on the environment in the jurisdic reason why is was necessary to enter into a c equipment) to complete the required tasks.	tional area of the Shingle Cree	k Water Management Commission. The
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
2001	Contract: \$231,596.40	Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:
Net Appleable		
Not Applicable		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objection		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract: ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objection	ves of the contract: ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract: ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecting SEE ATTACHED CON	ves of the contract: ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION 1-30-06

File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.			
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:	
Mead and Hunt, Inc.		CI MS Contract Number.	
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):	
S.P. 104-139-05 (Oakland Ave	87778	4-21-05 to 12-30-05	
Reconstruction)	01110	4-21-03 10 12-30-03	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	I ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:	
	5		
This contract was necessary for the p	roject to receive federal fund	ling. Since the project is receiving	
		nsure that the effects of the project on	
		ents of 36 CFR 800 (Section 106 of the	
National Historic Preservation Act).	•		
employed personnel who meet the Se	cretary of Interior's Professi	ional Standards for cultural resource	
investigations on FHWA-funded proj	ects were available to comp	lete the work in a timely manner due to	
work load.	-		
· · ·	,		
		. *	
Pillohla Haura (if appliachla): 679	Total Amount Spont on	Source of Funding: 80-20 Split with City	
Billable Hours (if applicable): 678	Total Amount Spent on		
	Contract: \$65,227.48	of Austin, Mower County	
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the second	w the agonov determined there	was anly a single source for the convises:	
I this was a single source contract, explain wi	ly the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services.	
		* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
*			
The single source contract was used as part of	of Mn/DOT's Pre-Qualified syst	em. All projects under \$100.000 can be	
direct selected from the list of pre-qualified inc			
	•		
×			
· ·			
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall			
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:			
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
	· ·		
I ALLO MALMAL		1-30-06	
wathermal		1 20 000	
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date	
cc: / Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration	en en en		
Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section	ion		
File			

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

	1.00111000 00001011, IIIaii 010p	3	
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:	
Anoka County & City of Blaine (Subcontractor		A42063	
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):	
Preliminary Design TH 65 & TH 242/CSAH	83352	12/19/02 - 11/30/05	
14 in Anoka County			
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include Preliminary design services for project to reconstruction of TH 10 to Bunker Lake Boulevard/CS/ services for reconstruction of TH 242/CSAH 1 Specific tasks included preparation of an Envir preliminary drainage design, geometric layout reimbursement for project management, mee because it was a partnership project between shared equally in the cost of the project.	Instruct TH 65 to a four lane free AH 116 at 140 th Ave. The service 4 to a four lane divided highwar ronmental Assessment, noise , cost estimates and Design St tings and coordination. It was r	eeway or six lane expressway from just ces also included preliminary design ay from TH 10 to Radisson Road /CSAH 52. analysis modeling, air quality analysis, udy Report. The contract also included necessary to enter into this contract	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:	
8911 (Not all hours paid because over	Contract: \$696,630.88	Trunk Highway	
contract max)	(State's Share: \$220,000)	· · · ·	
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:	
Anoka County was managing the design and construction of two projects on TH 242 west of TH 65. The County also owns the section of roadway (CSAH 14) to the east of TH 65 within the project limits. TH 242 to the west of TH 65 is also a potential turnback candidate roadway to Anoka County. An interchange was needed where TH 65 intersects TH 242. The design of TH 242 has a direct impact on the design of TH 65.			
The projects of TH 65 and TH 242 are within the cities of Coon Rapids, Blaine and Ham Lake and all within Anoka County. To avoid duplication of the project management efforts already underway on TH 242 by Anoka County and to keep continuity of the projects, it was in the best interest of the State to have Anoka County manage the preliminary design for TH 65 and TH 242.			
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:			
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Carol Moena	u	1-30-06	
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date	
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section			

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:	
North Star Land Services Company, Inc.		A28746	
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):	
District-wide	82069 WO1	10/18/2001 To 03/31/2003	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ling why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:	
The purpose of this agreement was to provide district-wide Right-of-Way (R/W) acquisition assistance as directed by the State Project Manager. The projects were assigned within State District 3 by District R/W personnel. It was necessary to enter into this agreement because no personnel with the necessary expertise were available.			
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Contract Amount: \$100,000.00	Source of Funding: Dist. 3 Allotment of Consultant Services Budget.	
Explain why this amount was a cost effective efficiently:	way for the agency to provide it	ts services or products better or more	
This contract was utilized during a period of extremely high workload. Staff professionals were being required to deliver the districts normal program together with the additional IRC project demands. District staff was stretched to the limit and program delivery deadlines were not being permitted to slide. It was not reasonably possible to increase the workload on the district's professional staff any further; no other State personnel with the necessary skills were available; and there was no chance of increasing staff to accommodate the district's needs. The only acceptable option available to the district to deliver the IRC program as well as our normal program was to utilize consultants. The alternative would have been to miss a letting, thus delaying jobs. The resulting efficiencies were factors of time.			
If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services:			
· · · · ·			
		·	
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:			
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	u	1-30-06	
		Date	
c <mark>c: P.Stembler, 112 Admin</mark> J. Brunner, MS 680 File			

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

instructions. Submit this form to consultan	i Services Section, Man Stop	ood along with the final involce.	
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number: A70403	
Confluence International Inc			
Project Name (if applicable): Financial Application Support	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87151	Project Duration (Dates): 12/01/2004 – 12/31/2005	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include			
The contractor provided technical assistance State Automated Materials Management Syst Forecasting Information Tool (CFIT). In addit with these systems that were not identified as developers of another financial system that is (SAAS).	em (SAMMS), Resource Cons ion, the contractor assisted with enhancements. The contractor	umption Application (RCA), and Cash h resolving a variety of technical problems or also provided consultation to the key	
Mn/DOT did not have the resources with the r within a reasonable timeframe. However, Mn, developed and will be able to continue suppor	DOT does have the skilled res		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:	
1809	Contract: \$153,765	Trunk Highway	
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:	
This contractor was hired through a competitiv	ve RFP process.		
· · · · · ·		· · · · ·	
	م به ب		
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:			
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Carol Molna	le.	1-30-06	
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	·	Date	
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sect File	on		

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:	
University of Minnesota		A46402	
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):	
Adaptability and DNA Fingerprinting of	84055 NO 58	11/11/0000 10/01/0005	
Native Plant Populations from Diverse Eco- Regions	81655, WO 58	11/11/2002 – 12/31/2005	
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	u ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:	
To determine the amount and distribution of g	enetic diversity throughout Min	nesota within and between native plant	
populations of species of interest to Mn/DOT will provide Mn/DOT with pertinent informatior			
with a method to verify the origin of purchased			
		· · · · ·	
		7	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:	
N/A	Contract: \$105,094.00	Trunk Highway	
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:	
		V E JAN	
		Landon and the second se	
	La serie and the second		
	· · ·		
		~	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
· · · · ·			
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:			
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISUII TANT PERFORMANCE F		
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
2			
P. Mapa	я	1-24-01-	
Cural Molno	uu	1-24-06	
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	ru	1-24-06 Date	

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Agreement No. <u>81655, WO 58</u>		Туре	e of work <u>F</u>	Research	
District/Office <u>Investment Mar</u>	ageme	ent			
Contractor University of Minnes	<u>sota</u>				
Contract Period: <u>11/11/2002</u> Start Date	,	<u>12/31/2005</u> Expiration			
Original Contract Cost	Am	endment Cost	t(s)	Final Cost:	
\$105,094.00	+	\$_N/A	. =	\$_105,094.00	

Item Rating	Rating				
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality	x				
2. Work Performance	x				
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		х			
 Deliverables Complete and on time 		x			
5. Project related cooperation	x				
6. QA/QC plan conformance (N/A)	N/A				
7. Contract administration cooperation	X				
 Invoices and progress reports 	X				
 Cost estimation/budget management 	X		2		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

Jacobson Robert

Total Points <u>3</u> (Maximum points 32)

Contract Administrator:

Barb Lich

Barb Loida



Comments:

	PROJEC	7	WÉNT	SM	007HLY -	PI AND	61ADUATE	STUDKUT DID	,Ą
							Forward.		
					<i>i</i> k				
		···							
								ł	
						<u></u>	<u></u>	······································	
							<u>.</u>		
							<u></u>		

					<u></u>		5		
·					ن				
							<u></u>		
							·		

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.							
Agency:	κ.						
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	-						
Contractor Name:	CFMS Contract Number:						
City of St Paul Park Project Name (if applicable):	A43394 Project Duration (Dates):						
Wakota	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 83302	7/29/02 – 9/27/05					
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include							
To assist the City of St. Paul Park in obtaining preliminary and final design services on Marathon Road in the vicinity of TH 61 from St Paul Park to the North City Limits.							
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:					
	Contract: \$313,151.01	Trunk Highway					
If this was a single source contract, explain w							
This project is within the design responsibilities of the City of St Paul Park. The State assistance with funds expedites construction of the Wakota project on TH 61.							
The City will own and maintain the local street. The City requested that they design their local street project. The City has unique knowledge concerning the design, the affected business interests, and the needs of the citizens. The City utilized their City engineering firm for provide the required services.							
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:							
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION							
Carol Molnau	1-19-06						
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	Date						
d							
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration	tion						

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. __83302_____ Type of work __Prelim and Final Design_____

District/Office _Metro_____ Work Type Code _____

S.P. 194-080-02 T.H. 61 (near) Location St Paul Park

Contractor _City of St. Paul Park

Subcontractor MFRA and SRF

Subcontractor ____American Engineering Testing Inc.____

Contract Period: _7/29/02_____; _9/27/05_____; _6/30/06____; _6/30/06____; Work Start Date Expiration Date

Total Contract Cost: \$_473,110_ = Orig Cost: \$_473,110_ + Amended Cost: \$___0___

Amended cost for: ~ Overrun ~ Additional Work Number of Amendments 1 (no cost)

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Rating				
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality		3			
2. Work Performance		3			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		3			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	4				
5. Project related cooperation	4				
6. QA/QC plan conformance		3			
7. Contract administration cooperation		\checkmark			
8. Invoices and progress reports					
9. Cost estimation/budget management		\checkmark			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

Via email (Adam Josephson Print Name

Total Points 29 (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator:)

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898
Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

(

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	o 680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
City of St Paul Park	•	A43394
Project Name (if applicable): Wakota	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 83302	Project Duration (Dates): 7/29/02 – 9/27/05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
To assist the City of St. Paul Park in obtain vicinity of TH 61 from St Paul Park to the N		sign services on Marathon Road in the
· · · · ·		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
	Contract: \$313,151.01	Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w		e was only a single source for the services:
This project is within the design responsib		Park. The State assistance with funds
expedites construction of the Wakota proj		
The City will own and maintain the local st The City has unique knowledge concernin citizens. The City utilized their City engine	g the design, the affected bu	siness interests, and the needs of the
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objection		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau)	1-19-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	· · · · · ·	Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Sect File	ion	

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Contractor Name: University of Minnesota		CFMS Contract Number: A57563				
Project Name (if applicable): Deployment of a Tracking-Based Monitoring System for Traffic Safety and Operation Analysis at Intersections	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 81655, WO 42	Project Duration (Dates): 11/1/2003 – 10/30/2005				
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ling why it was necessary to en	nter into a contract:				
To develop and deploy a monitoring and data collection system for both rural and urban intersections.						
·						
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$90,000.00	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway & Federal				
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:				
Evaluate the performance of the work includir	ng an appraisal of the contracto	or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall				
performance in meeting the terms and objecti						
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION						
Carol Molna	u	1-19-06				
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	,	Date				

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Agreement No.81655, WC) 42	_ Туре	of work <u>Resea</u>	rch
District/Office Investment	Manage	ement		
Contractor <u>University of I</u>	Minnes	ota		
Contract Period: <u>11/1/2003</u> Start Da			30/2005 iration Date	
Original Contract Cost		Amendmer	nt Cost(s)	Final Cost:
\$ 90,000.00	+	\$N/A	=	\$ 90,000.00

Item Rating	Rating			
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	n na ha da da mana ang kana na mana na	Х		
2. Work Performance		Х		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		Х		
 Deliverables Complete and on time 			X	
5. Project related cooperation	Х			
6. QA/QC plan conformance (N/A)	N/A			-
7. Contract administration cooperation	K			
Invoices and progress reports		K		
 Cost estimation/budget management 	X			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: au

Ra &tarr

Total Points (Maximum points 32)

Contract Administrator:

Warzala

Definitions: Above Average:	
•	Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
•	Contractor performs beyond expectations.
٠	Deliverables exceed standards.
•	Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
•	Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
•	Contractor needs little or no direction.
•	Contractor responsive to requests.
•	Contractor suggests improvements.
Average	
۲	Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
•	Deliverables meet standards.
. •	Project is on time and budget.
۲	Project Manager is informed of key milestones.
Below Average:	
•	Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
•	Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
\bullet	Project is behind schedule or over budget.
•	Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.
Poor:	
•	Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
•	Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
•	Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
•	Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
•	Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

.,

Comments:

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Contractor Name: University of Minnesota		CFMS Contract Number: A56166			
Project Name (if applicable): Right of way preservation for future	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates) 1/2/2004 – 9/30/2005			
development of highways	81655, WO 93	tar inte a contracti			
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ	ing why it was necessary to en	iter into a contract.			
To identify circumstances under which it is op sale prices for a sample of rights of way where will be analyzed. This will provide understandi factors such as development patterns, and wh private market. From this information implicit also consider cases where ROW has been put	e land was purchased over a pend ng of how the prices changed nether and how prices paid by N rate(s) of return on land purcha	eriod of time (by Mn/DOT or private parties) over time, how this depended on other Mn/DOT were different from those on the ased can be deduced. (This analysis must			
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$50,000	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway			
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:			
		*			
1					
		×			
Evaluate the performance of the work includin		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall			
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract.				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION					
Carol Molnau		1-19-06			
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date			

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Agreement No81655, W	<u>O 93</u>		Type of work	<u>Research</u>	
District/Office Investment	Manage	ement			
Contractor University of M	innesol	a			
Contract Period: <u>1/2/2004</u> Start Dat	e	.,	0/2005 biration Date		
Original Contract Cost		Amendme	ent Cost(s)	Final Cost:	
\$50,000.00	+	\$_N/A	=	\$_50,000.00_	

Item Rating	Rating			
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		3		
2. Work Performance		3		
 Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements 	:	3		
 Deliverables Complete and on time 		3		
5. Project related cooperation		3		
6. QA/QC plan conformance (N/A)	N/A			
7. Contract administration cooperation		\mathbf{x}		
 Invoices and progress reports 				
 Cost estimation/budget management 		1 X		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points ___24____ (Maximum points 32)

Contract Administrator:

Dan Warzala

Project Manager:

Rabinder Bains

Definitions:



Comments:

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

a contract.					
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:			
University of Minnesota		A57559			
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):			
Adequacy of Future Road Funding	81655, WO 89	11/15/2003 – 6/30/2005			
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:			
To examine the adequacy of the state motor f needs.	uels tax, vehicle registration ta	x, and vehicle sales tax to fund road system			
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$89,100.00	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway			
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined then	e was only a single source for the services.			
		-			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:					
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION					
1 cha					
Care Wolna	11	1-19-06			
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date			
		Date			

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Agreement No.81655, WC) 89		Type of wo	rk <u>Resear</u>	<u>ch</u>
District/Office <u>Investment</u>	Manag	emer	<u>nt</u>		
Contractor University of M	innesota	1			
Contract Period: <u>11/15/20</u> Start Dat			_6/30/2005 Expiration		
Original Contract Cost		Ame	ndment Cos	t(s)	Final Cost:
\$ 89,100.00	+ :	\$ N	/A	=	\$ 89,100.00

Item Rating	Rating				
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality	40				
2. Work Performance	4				
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements	4	·			
 Deliverables Complete and on time 	4 %				
5. Project related cooperation	41				
6. QA/QC plan conformance (N/A)	N/A				
7. Contract administration cooperation	×				
 Invoices and progress reports 		\neq			
9. Cost estimation/budget management	\downarrow	1			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points $\frac{\mathcal{T}}{\mathcal{T}}$ (Maximum points 32)

Project Manager:

Ken Buckeye

Dar

Contract Administrator:

Definitions: Above Average: Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT. Contractor performs beyond expectations. Deliverables exceed standards. Project Manage is informed of project status regularly. Contractor resolves any problems that occurred. Contractor needs little or no direction. Contractor responsive to requests. Contractor suggests improvements. Average Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less. Deliverables meet standards. Project is on time and budget. Project Manager is informed of key milestones. **Below Average:** Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms. Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply. • Project is behind schedule or over budget. Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce. Poor: Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction. Contractor is unresponsive to requests. Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks. Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations. Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

1-7

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	•					
Contractor Name: Bonestroo, Rosene, Anderlik & Associates, In	CFMS Contract Number: A49268					
Project Name (if applicable): Grade Lowering at the Jct. of TH 169 & Mille Lacs CSAH 11	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 83171 (W.O. # 2)	Project Duration (Dates): June 20, 2003 – July 31, 2004				
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include						
The purpose of this contract was to provide for construction administration and management, including the services necessary to assure that proper coordination and management of construction inspection, materials testing, and contract administration activities were coordinated with all parties involved in accomplishing completion of this Mn/DOT construction project. It was necessary to enter into this contract because Mn/DOT did not have the personnel available to provide construction administration, inspection, and testing on this project.						
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$86,964.83	Source of Funding: District 3 Consultant Budget				
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:				
This was not a single source contract.						
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:						
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION						
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		1-12-06 Date				
cc: Paul Stembler Dept of Administration						

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No.	<u>83171 (W.O. # 2)</u>	Type of work Contract Admin. & Const. Inspection		
District/Office <u>I</u>	District 3A – Baxter	Work Type Code <u>CS</u>		
S.P. <u>4812-73</u>	T.H. <u>169</u>	Location At the Int. of TH 169 and Mille Lacs CSAH 11		
Contractor Bone	estroo, Rosene, Ande	rlik & Associates		
Subcontractor American Engineering and Testing and Consulting				

Subcontractor _____

Contract Period: June 20, 2003 ; December 1, 2005 ; July 31, 2004 Work Start Date Work Completion Date Expiration Date

Total Contract Cost: $\underline{\$86,964.83}$ = Orig Cost: $\underline{\$86,964.83}$ + Amended Cost: $\underline{\$0.00}$

Amended cost for: \sim Overrun \sim Additional Work Number of Amendments <u>1</u>

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ting	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality			Х	
2. Work Performance			Х	
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements			Х	
4. Deliverables Complete and on time			Х	
5. Project related cooperation		Х		
6. QA/QC plan conformance	·······	Х		
7. Contract administration cooperation		Х		
8. Invoices and progress reports		Х		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		Х		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points <u>23</u> (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager: ron (Darren Nelson)

Darren Nelson Print Name

Contract Administrator:

(Darren Nelson) Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

The on-site staff that was present was qualified but inexperienced.

Mn/DOT was required to provide substantial direction in regards to contract admin. decisions.

The Schedule of Materials Control testing rates were not met.

Timeliness of final documentation was lacking, as the December 1, 2005 completion date shows.

The addition of Mark Daly to the project team resulted in a marked improvement in project

organization and management.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

nstructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.				
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:		
City of Newport	ity of Newport			
Project Name (if applicable): Wakota	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 83301	Project Duration (Dates): 2/11/02 – 11/10/05		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include				
Preliminary design service for five local Fe	Preliminary design service for five local Federal Aid projects in connection with the TH 61 Wakota project.			
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$574,257	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway		
If this was a single source contract, explain w	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
This project is within the design responsibilities of the City of Newport. The State assistance with funds expedites construction of the Wakota project on TH 61. The City will own and maintain the local street. The City requested that they design their local street project. The City has unique knowledge concerning the design, the affected business interests, and the needs of the citizens. The City utilized their City engineering firm for provide the required services.				
Evaluate the performance of the work including	a an appraisal of the contracto	r's timeliness, quelity, cost, and overall		
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION		
Carol Molnai	l	1-12-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date		
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration				

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>83301</u>	Type of work	Design		
District/Office <u>Metro</u>	Work Typ	e Code <u>DD</u>		
S.P. <u>98-080-15</u> T.H. <u>61</u>	Loc	ation <u>Newpor</u>	rt_(Wakota Br)	
Contractor <u>City of Newport</u>	•			
Subcontractor <u>BDM</u>				
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: <u>2/11/02</u> ; Work Start Date ; W		; <u>2/10/07</u> Date Expiration	Date	
Total Contract Cost: $574,257 = 0$	rig Cost: \$_ <u>57</u> -	4,257_+ Amen	ded Cost: \$	_0
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	∼ Additional	Work Num	ber of Amendn	nents <u>0</u>
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ing	
	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor 1 Deint
1. Product Quality	4 Points	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point
2. Work Performance		3		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		3		
 Deliverables Complete and on time 		3		
5. Project related cooperation			2	
6. QA/QC plan conformance			2	
7. Contract administration cooperation		X		
8. Invoices and progress reports			Х	
9. Cost estimation/budget management		Х		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

<u>Via</u> <u>Email</u> (Adam Josephson Print Name

Total Points <u>24</u> (Maximum points 36) Contract Administrator: Linn Moline)

Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

)

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

All deliverables were completed for detail design services. Project Coordination was expected to extend into 2007, however bulk of needed coordination occurred prior to 11/05. Contract is being closed because state portion of contract was fully used.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice. Agency: **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION** Contractor Name: CFMS Contract Number: Bonestroo, Rosene, Anderlik & Associates, Inc. A49268 Project Name (if applicable): Mn/DOT Agreement No.: Project Duration (Dates): Grade Lowering at the Jct. of TH 169 & Mille Lacs CSAH 11 83171 (W.O. # 2) June 20, 2003 – July 31, 2004 Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: The purpose of this contract was to provide for construction administration and management, including the services necessary to assure that proper coordination and management of construction inspection, materials testing, and contract administration activities were coordinated with all parties involved in accomplishing completion of this Mn/DOT construction project. It was necessary to enter into this contract because Mn/DOT did not have the personnel available to provide construction administration, inspection, and testing on this project. Billable Hours (if applicable): Total Amount Spent on Source of Funding: Contract: \$86,964.83 **District 3 Consultant Budget** 1102.5 If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: This was not a single source contract. Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, guality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION 1-12-06 Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner Date cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: CFMS Contract Number:				
City of Newport	A42430			
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):		
Wakota	83301	2/11/02 – 11/10/05		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract:				
Preliminary design service for five local Federal Aid projects in connection with the TH 61 Wakota project.				
	Tatal Ana avent On ant an	Course of Eunding		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:		
this was a single source contract, explain w	Contract: \$574,257 hy the agency determined ther bilities of the City of Newport	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the services		
f this was a single source contract, explain w This project is within the design responsite expedites construction of the Wakota proj The City will own and maintain the local st The City has unique knowledge concernin	Contract: \$574,257 hy the agency determined ther bilities of the City of Newport ect on TH 61. treet. The City requested that ig the design, the affected but	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the services t. The State assistance with funds at they design their local street project. Isiness interests, and the needs of the		
f this was a single source contract, explain w This project is within the design responsite expedites construction of the Wakota proj The City will own and maintain the local st The City has unique knowledge concernin	Contract: \$574,257 hy the agency determined ther bilities of the City of Newport ect on TH 61. treet. The City requested that ig the design, the affected but	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the services t. The State assistance with funds at they design their local street project. Isiness interests, and the needs of the		
f this was a single source contract, explain w This project is within the design responsit expedites construction of the Wakota proj The City will own and maintain the local st The City has unique knowledge concernin	Contract: \$574,257 hy the agency determined ther bilities of the City of Newport ect on TH 61. treet. The City requested that ig the design, the affected but	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the services t. The State assistance with funds at they design their local street project. Isiness interests, and the needs of the		
f this was a single source contract, explain w This project is within the design responsit expedites construction of the Wakota proj The City will own and maintain the local st The City has unique knowledge concernin	Contract: \$574,257 hy the agency determined ther bilities of the City of Newport ect on TH 61. treet. The City requested that ig the design, the affected but	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the services t. The State assistance with funds at they design their local street project. Isiness interests, and the needs of the		
f this was a single source contract, explain w This project is within the design responsit expedites construction of the Wakota proj The City will own and maintain the local st The City has unique knowledge concernin	Contract: \$574,257 hy the agency determined ther bilities of the City of Newport ect on TH 61. treet. The City requested that ig the design, the affected but	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the services t. The State assistance with funds at they design their local street project. Isiness interests, and the needs of the		
f this was a single source contract, explain w This project is within the design responsite expedites construction of the Wakota proj The City will own and maintain the local st The City has unique knowledge concernin	Contract: \$574,257 hy the agency determined ther bilities of the City of Newport ect on TH 61. treet. The City requested that ig the design, the affected but	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the services t. The State assistance with funds at they design their local street project. Isiness interests, and the needs of the		
f this was a single source contract, explain w This project is within the design responsite expedites construction of the Wakota proj The City will own and maintain the local st The City has unique knowledge concernin	Contract: \$574,257 hy the agency determined ther bilities of the City of Newport ect on TH 61. treet. The City requested that ig the design, the affected but	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the services t. The State assistance with funds at they design their local street project. Isiness interests, and the needs of the		
f this was a single source contract, explain w This project is within the design responsite expedites construction of the Wakota proj The City will own and maintain the local st The City has unique knowledge concernin citizens. The City utilized their City engine	Contract: \$574,257 hy the agency determined ther bilities of the City of Newport ect on TH 61. treet. The City requested that ig the design, the affected but eering firm for provide the re	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the services t. The State assistance with funds at they design their local street project. Isiness interests, and the needs of the quired services.		
f this was a single source contract, explain w This project is within the design responsite expedites construction of the Wakota proj The City will own and maintain the local st The City has unique knowledge concernin citizens. The City utilized their City engine	Contract: \$574,257 Thy the agency determined ther bilities of the City of Newport ect on TH 61. The City requested that by the design, the affected but eering firm for provide the re	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the services t. The State assistance with funds at they design their local street project. Isiness interests, and the needs of the quired services.		
f this was a single source contract, explain w This project is within the design responsite expedites construction of the Wakota proj The City will own and maintain the local st The City has unique knowledge concernin sitizens. The City utilized their City engine sitizens. The City utilized their City engine	Contract: \$574,257 Thy the agency determined ther bilities of the City of Newport ect on TH 61. The City requested that by the design, the affected but eering firm for provide the re	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the services t. The State assistance with funds at they design their local street project. Isiness interests, and the needs of the quired services.		
Billable Hours (if applicable): f this was a single source contract, explain w This project is within the design responsite expedites construction of the Wakota proj The City will own and maintain the local st The City has unique knowledge concernin citizens. The City utilized their City engine Evaluate the performance of the work includir berformance in meeting the terms and objection SEE ATTACHED CON	Contract: \$574,257 thy the agency determined ther bilities of the City of Newport ect on TH 61. treet. The City requested that ag the design, the affected but eering firm for provide the re	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the services t. The State assistance with funds at they design their local street project. Isiness interests, and the needs of the quired services.		
f this was a single source contract, explain w This project is within the design responsite expedites construction of the Wakota proj The City will own and maintain the local st The City has unique knowledge concernin citizens. The City utilized their City engine Evaluate the performance of the work includir berformance in meeting the terms and objection SEE ATTACHED CON	Contract: \$574,257 hy the agency determined ther bilities of the City of Newport ect on TH 61. treet. The City requested that ig the design, the affected but eering firm for provide the re	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the services t. The State assistance with funds at they design their local street project. usiness interests, and the needs of the quired services. or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall EVALUATION		
f this was a single source contract, explain w This project is within the design responsite expedites construction of the Wakota proj The City will own and maintain the local st The City has unique knowledge concernin sitizens. The City utilized their City engine sitizens. The City utilized their City engine	Contract: \$574,257 hy the agency determined ther bilities of the City of Newport ect on TH 61. treet. The City requested that ig the design, the affected but eering firm for provide the re	Trunk Highway e was only a single source for the services t. The State assistance with funds at they design their local street project. Isiness interests, and the needs of the quired services.		

File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

nstructions: Submit this form to EEO/Contract Management, Mail Stop 130, within 30 days of final completion of a contract.

a contract.				
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: University of Minnesota		CFMS Contract Number: A59559		
Project Name (if applicable): INV 645 (2003-2005) (RIC Task 10): Truck	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):		
Weight Compliance Education Program	81655, WO 73	6/9/2003 - 9/30/2005		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:		
Education program for freight shippers, over-the-road freight carriers, and public agency personnel on the proper application of Minnesota Commercial Vehicle Weight Laws and Enforcement Policies.				
,				
	10 ECEI			
Dillahla Llaura (if analiashla)	Tatal Amount Caratan	Course of Funding		
Billable Hours (if applicable): N/A	Total Amount Spent on Contract: 270,000.00	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway		
If this was a single source contract, explain w	Contraction of the Contraction o			
	ing the agency determined the			
		,		
		•		
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
Carol Molm	Du ,	1-12-06		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner				
		Date		

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Retain the original of this document in your contract file and submit a copy of this form with the final invoice. This rating may be considered in future consultant selections. Address comments on the next page keep comments factual. Contractors are entitled to review and respond in writing to this evaluation. Retain Contractor's written comments in file along with this document.

Agreement No.81655, WO 73	Туре о	of work _ <u>I</u>	Research
District/Office _Investment Mana	agement		
Contractor _University of Minner	sota		
Contract Period: <u>6/9/2003</u> ; Start Date	9/30/2005_ Expiration E)ate	
Original Contract Cost	Amendment Cost(s	;)	Final Cost:
\$120,000.00	+ \$150,000.00		\$_270,000.00_

Item Rating	Rating			
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality	X			
2. Work Performance	X			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X		
 Deliverables Complete and on time 				
5. Project related cooperation	X			
6. QA/QC plan conformance (N/A)	N/A			
7. Contract administration cooperation		X		
 Invoices and progress reports 		X		
 Cost estimation/budget management 	X			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points ____28 (Maximum points 32)

Project Manager:

Moe for RICKKJonaas **Rick Kjonaas**

Contract Administrator:

Clark Moe

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: City of Bird Island		CFMS Contract Number: A69535		
Project Name (if applicable): Hydraulics pre- design for storm sewer system through the City of Bird Island.	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87191	Project Duration (Dates): Oct. 21, 2004 - Sept. 30, 2005		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:		
This contract provided preliminary design, and sewer and water re-construction project and s				
This work was performed under this contract (City of Bird Isalnd) sewer and water improve of-sequence" timing of the work, therefore rec	ment project. The State did not	have resources available to meet the "out-		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$77,730.00	Source of Funding:		
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:		
The City of Bird Island had started a complete highway construction project (2007) includes primary construction work.				
Due to the City's need for hydraulics analysis for their work, and their dependence on the State's requirements for storm sewer drainage on the upcoming highway project, it was deemed prudent to enter into this contract with the City to conduct the hydraulics pre-design for the City and State's work in conjunction with each other. Conducting the work under this contract allowed the City project to stay on schedule, and also provided the storm sewer pre-design work that the State needed for its highway project.				
	,	N		
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		1-3-06 Date		
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner Date cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File				

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No.: 87191	Type of work: Storm sewer	r pre-design	
District/Office: 8 - Willmar	Work Type Code	e: PD	12345 EN
S.P.: 6511 - 37 T.H.: 212	Location: At Bird I	sland	
Contractor: City of Bird Island			E a Bar
Subcontractor: N/A			1727
Contract Period: Oct. 21, 2004 Work Start Date	Sept. 9, 2005 Work Completion Date	Sept. 30, 2005 Expiration Date	
Total Contract Cost: \$77,730.00	$= Orig Cost \cdot $42,490,00$	+ Amended Cost	\$35,240,00

Amended cost for: \sim Overrun

 \sim Additional Work

Number of Amendments: 1

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator			ting	
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		X		
2. Work Performance		X		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		Х		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X		·
5. Project related cooperation		Х		
6. QA/QC plan conformance	-	Х		······································
7. Contract administration cooperation			X	
8. Invoices and progress reports		X		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		X		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager:

Paul Jurek

0

Total Points (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: Gene East

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

* This contract provided alternatives for a storm sewer system outlet and storm water pond for the City of Bird Island, and for the State's SP6511-37. It also provided the preliminary hydraulics report for the alternatives.

* The contract was amended at the State's request to include detailed design of the State's portion of the preferred alternative.

* David Palm, an employee of Bolton & Menk Inc., and the City Engineer was the contractor's project manager.

* The Contractor provided good cost estimates that were needed for the cooperative agreement work and for PPMS. Project turn-in was not handled well, but as a whole, the work was well done. The partial government shutdown during this contract period created some stress. Overall the contractor did a satisfactory job, and met the requirements of the contract.

* Getting detailed information for creating the initial scope of services, and the associated budget, from the contractor's Project Manager was difficult. The same was true as we assembled the amendment and its budget. Communications took extra effort, and there seemed to be regular misunderstandings of the State's requirements for consultant contracts.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

nstructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.				
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: City of Osakis		CFMS Contract Number: A68095		
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):		
Water Detention Pond in Osakis Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	86694 ding why it was necessary to en	8-1-02 to 12-31-05 ter into a contract:		
The purpose of this contract was to provide M of a water control pond as well as obtaining R				
The contract was needed as the result of an a	action with the MPCA on a proje	ect administered by the City for MnDOT.		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:		
	Contract: \$139,633.36	District Allocation		
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	was only a single source for the services:		
The project takes place within the City limits. construction. No other City or entity would be		maintainer of the designed pond after		
		•		
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	e	<i>I− 3−06</i> Date		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

cc:

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>86694</u>	Type of we	ork <u>Design</u>	Services and La	und Aquisition
District/Office <u>4- Detroit Lakes</u>	Work Type	Code <u>DD</u>		
S.P. <u>2106-36</u> T.H. <u>27</u>	<u>/</u> Loc	ation <u>City of</u>	Osakis	
Contractor <u>City of Osakis</u>				
Subcontractor				
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: <u>August 1, 2002</u> ;; Work Start Date	Work Completion	; <u>December 3</u> Date Expiration	<u>1, 2005</u> Date	
Total Contract Cost: $\frac{141,342.88}{141,342.88} = 0$	Orig Cost: \$_7	<u>6,151.00</u> + Ame	ended Cost: \$_ <u>(</u>	5,92.88
Amended cost for: Ξ Overrun	∼Additional W	ork Numb	er of Amendme	nts <u>2</u>
Item Rating		Rat	ting	
1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator				
	Above		Below	
	Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality			2.5	
2. Work Performance			2.5	
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT				
Standards/Requirements		3		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time			2.5	
5. Project related cooperation		3		
6. QA/QC plan conformance		3		
7. Contract administration				
cooperation		3		
8. Invoices and progress reports		3		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		3		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points __25.5_ (Maximum points 36)

Project Manager; (Lori Vanderhider

Print Name

(Maximum points 36) Contract Administrator:

(Lori Vanderhider

Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

This project was taken over from the City at the request of the MPCA. The design work the City provided was in AutoCADD. It required extensive rework. However there had not been a contract in place defining project expectations.

The City struggled with making the R/W offer. The District's R/W supervisor had to step in to make contact with the land owner in order to obtain a permit to construct in time for the letting.

There were minor problems with invoicing.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Bolton & Menk Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A74246
Project Name (if applicable): Land surveying for PLS corners in the Marshall area.	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87719	Project Duration (Dates): April 6, 2005 - September 5, 2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
The State required Land Surveying services to right-of-way for several future highway constru- perform this work in time to keep the right-of- This contract provided land surveying for PLS surveying and documentation are required for	uction projects near Marshall M way acquisition process on sch corners in the Marshall area. I	linnesota. State staff was not able to ledule. PLS corner coordinates and the related
68 in and around the Marshall area.		
Billable Hours (if applicable): ארגון	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$124,598.30	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w		e was only a single source for the services:
Evaluate the performance of the work includir performance in meeting the terms and objecti		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	NSULTANT PERFORMANCE	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		1-3-06 Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No.: 87719 Type of work Land Surveying for PLS Corners near Marshall

District/Office: 8 - Willmar Work Type Code: SR

S.P.: various	T.H.: various	Location: Near Marshall	Contractor: Bolton & Menk Inc.
Contract Perio	d: April 6, 2005	September 5, 2005	October 1, 2005
	Work Start Date	Work Completion Date	Expiration Date

Total Contract Cost: \$136,01.85 = Orig Cost: \$136,01.85 + Amended Cost: \$ 0.00

Amended cost for: \sim Overrun

 \sim Additional Work

Number of Amendments: None

Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Rating			
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality		3		
2. Work Performance	4			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		3		
4. Deliverables Complete and on time	4			
5. Project related cooperation	4			
6. QA/QC plan conformance		3		
7. Contract administration cooperation	4			
8. Invoices and progress reports		3		
9. Cost estimation/budget management		3		

Contractor's rating for this contract:

oiect Manager: Barry Anderson

Total Points: 31 (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: Gene East

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments: This contract was for land surveying for PLS corners on several SPs on different highways around Marshall. The work involved all phases of surveying needed to provide land corner information for platting and R/W acquistion. Peter Blethen was the contractors Project Manager. Most of the work was performed from the Sleepy Eye office of Bolton & Menk, under the direction of Larry Zeig. The land corner work was delivered on time with little assistance from Mn/DOT. Bolton & Menk resolved any problems that occurred and needed little or no direction. Bolton & Menk responded to a Mn/DOT request to add 7 additional corners to contract. They were able to perform the extra work without additional money. Bolton & Menk was very good about using email to communicate, which cut down the "phone tag" element. They suggested some good ideas to use in the future. Excellent overall performance.

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency:		p 680 along with the final invoice.		
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
contractor Name: Braun Intertec Corporation		CFMS Contract Number: A75336		
Project Name (if applicable): TH 101 Bonding Project Foundation Borings	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87784	Project Duration (Dates): 5/15/2005 – 10/31/2005		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:		
This contract was for subsurface investigation new grade separated interchanges on TH 101 funded as a Bonding Project and includes the	between CSAH 36 and CSAH	39 In Wright County. This project was		
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$174,511.12	Source of Funding: BAP Funds		
		A		
		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti SEE ATTACHED CON				

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Type of work: Subsurface Investigation Agreement No.: 87784 District/Office: Office of Materials Work Type Code: GT S.P.: 8608-21 T.H.: 101 Location: Wright County Contractor: Braun Intertec Subcontractor: Landwehr Construction, Inc. Subcontractor Contract Period: 5/15/2005; 10/31/2005; 10/31/2005 Work Start Date Work Completion Date Expiration Date Total Contract Cost: <u>\$174,198.24</u> = Orig Cost: <u>\$196,511.12</u> + Amended Cost: Amended cost for: \sim Overrun \sim Additional Work Number of Amendments **Item Rating** Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator Above Below Average Average Average Poor 4 Points 3 Points 2 Points 1 Point 1. Product Quality Χ 2. Work Performance \mathbf{X} 3. Conformance with Mn/DOT X Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and X on time 5. Project related cooperation Χ 6. QA/QC plan conformance Х 7. Contract administration X cooperation 8. Invoices and progress reports X 9. Cost estimation/budget X management

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points: 29 (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: **Rich Lamb** Print Name

Project Manager: Cand 12-5-05 (Rich Lamb) Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Short Elliot Hendrickson, Inc		CFMS Contract Number: A69137
494/694 Sign replacement	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 86992	Project Duration (Dates): 10/6/04 – 10/31/05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includi		
The purpose of the contract was to provide Mn/ years old on identified segments of I-494 and I- interchange. This is due to a shortage of progr	694 from Rice Street/694 inte	
	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$82,224.09	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain why	y the agency determined there	
Evaluate the performance of the work including		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objectiv		
	SULTANT PERFORMANCE E	
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	u	<i>1-3-06</i> Date

cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>56992</u> District/Office <u>Metro Traffic</u> S.P. <u>$5525-101$ T.H.</u> Contractor <u>SEH</u> Subcontractor Subcontractor Contract Period: <u>$10/06/04$</u> ; <u>Work Start Date</u> <u>Work Start Date</u>	1° 31 05 Work Completion 1	$- \frac{12}{2}$	1 / 0.5 Date	DEC DEC	2005 12: 3 2005 12: 15 12: 11ANT 55 12: 0 20
Amended cost for: ~ Overrun	∼ Additional V		ber of Amendi	ments /	7
1 - 6 by Project Manager		,			
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator	Above		Below		-
	Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality		X		N	
2. Work Performance		X			
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		X			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		X			
5. Project related cooperation		×			
6. QA/QC plan conformance		X			
7: Contract administration cooperation					
8. Invoices and progress reports					
9. Cost estimation/budget management		\checkmark			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: Heather L Ø)-Print Name

4

Total Points <u>27</u> (Maximum points 36) Contract Administrator: Linn VIOlino) Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

nstructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Contractor Name: CFMS Contract Numbar: Cambridge Systematic and SRF Consulting Group A S L 5 3 S Project Name (if applicable): Mn/DOT Agreement No.: Project Duration (Dates): Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: The purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: The purpose of the contract was to develop Minnesota first comprehensive performance based Statewide Freight Plan. If was necessary to enter into a contract: with Cambridge Systematic and SRF Consulting Group to obtain data analysis and forecasting expertise that did not have. Billable Hours (if applicable): 1,072 Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$285,850 State Consulting Fund If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: Virtual: \$285,850 Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Carol Moinau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner J- 3 - 0.6 Date			
Cambridge Systematic and SRF Consulting Group A 5653 Project Name (if applicable): Minnesota Statewide Freight Plan MnDOT Agreement No.: 8668 Project Duration (Dates): 12/04 – 3/05 Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: The purpose of the contract was to develop Minnesota first comprehensive performance based Statewide Freight Plan. It was necessary to enter into to contract with Cambridge Systematic and SRF Consulting Group to obtain data analysis and forecasting expertise that did not have. Billable Hours (if applicable): 1,072 Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$285,850 Source of Funding: State Consulting Fund It his was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: Survices of the contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Project Name (if applicable): Minnesota Statewide Freight Plan Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 12/04 – 3/05 Project Duration (Dates): 12/04 – 3/05 Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: The purpose of the contract with Cambridge Systematic and SRF Consulting Group to obtain data analysis and forecasting expertise that did not have. Billable Hours (if applicable): 1,072 Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$285,850 Source of Funding: State Consulting Fund It this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: State Consulting Fund Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION		Group	
The purpose of the contract was to develop Minnesota first comprehensive performance based Statewide Freight Plan. It was necessary to enter into to contract with Cambridge Systematic and SRF Consulting Group to obtain data analysis and forecasting expertise that did not have. Billable Hours (if applicable): 1,072 Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$285,850 Source of Funding: State Consulting Fund If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: Source of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	
Contract: \$285,850 State Consulting Fund If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance is the contractor's timeliness If the performance is the contractor's timeliness SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance is the contractor's timelines SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION	Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue The purpose of the contract was to develop M It was necessary to enter into to contract with	linnesota first comprehensive p	nter into a contract: performance based Statewide Freight Plan.
Contract: \$285,850 State Consulting Fund If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance is the contractor's timeliness If the performance is the contractor's timeliness SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance is the contractor's timelines SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Contract: \$285,850 State Consulting Fund If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance is the contractor's timeliness If the performance is the contractor's timeliness SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance is the contractor's timelines SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION		×	
Contract: \$285,850 State Consulting Fund If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance is the contractor's timeliness If the performance is the contractor's timeliness SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance is the contractor's timelines SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Contract: \$285,850 State Consulting Fund If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance is the contractor's timeliness If the performance is the contractor's timeliness SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance is the contractor's timelines SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Contract: \$285,850 State Consulting Fund If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance is the contractor's timeliness If the performance is the contractor's timeliness SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance is the contractor's timelines SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Contract: \$285,850 State Consulting Fund If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services: Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance is the contractor's timeliness If the performance is the contractor's timeliness SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION If the performance is the contractor's timelines SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Carel Malace, It Compare Comparison	Billable Hours (if applicable): 1,072		
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Carel Malace, It Compare Comparison	If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION <i>Careel Malagered La Companyation</i> 1-3-06			
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION <i>Careel Malagered La Companyation</i> 1-3-06			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION <i>Careel Malagered La Companyation</i> 1-3-06			
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION <i>Careel Malagered La Companyation</i> 1-3-06			
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION <i>Careel Malagered La Companyation</i> 1-3-06			
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION <i>Careel Malagered La Companyation</i> 1-3-06			
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION <i>Careel Malagered La Companyation</i> 1-3-06			
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION <i>Careel Malagered La Companyation</i> 1-3-06			
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION <i>Careel Malagered La Companyation</i> 1-3-06			
performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract: SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION <i>Careel Malagered La Companyation</i> 1-3-06			
Carol Molnan 1-3-06			
			r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner Date	performance in meeting the terms and objection	ves of the contract:	
	performance in meeting the terms and objection	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION

c: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

1	-	-	, I	
Agreement No. 85688	Type of wo	rk PlANN	ing	
District/Office OFCVO			لہ _	
S.P T.H	Lo	cation		
Contractor <u>CAMbridge</u> Sys	stematic	,		
Subcontractor SRF Consult	the Group	7		• •
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: 12-03-03 ;	3-31-05	5; 4-30	0.05	
Work Start Date	-	-		
Total Contract Cost: $\frac{285850}{285850} =$	Orig Cost: \$ <u>7</u>	<u>~2,834</u> + A	mended Cost: \$	323,016
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	\sim Additional V	Vork Num	ber of Amendm	ients
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			·	
Item Rating		Rat	ting	
1 - 6 by Project Manager			8	
7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator			•	
	Above		Below	
	Average	Average	Average	Poor
	4 Points	<u>3 Points</u>	2 Points	<u> </u>
1. Product Quality		\prec		
2. Work Performance	\times	-		
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT		<u>.</u>		-
Standards/Requirements	· · ·	\times		
4. Deliverables Complete and		,		
on time		\times		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
5. Project related cooperation		\times		
6. QA/QC plan conformance		×		
7. Contract administration				
cooperation		X		
8. Invoices and progress reports		K		
9. Cost estimation/budget		•		
management				

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Manager: NSS dhn (OY Print Name

29 Total Points_ (Maximum points 36) ntract Administrator: Meyer Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680
Definitions:

Åbove Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments: onto Actors Accommodation were Ad.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

s#

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: HNTB Corporation	· · ·	CFMS Contract Number: A54390
Project Name (if applicable): Bridges 03007, 03510, & 03X02.	Mn/DOT Agreement No. 85687	Project Duration (Dates): 9/30/03 thru 10/01/05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, in Provide preliminary design services for Bridge Project in Detroit Lakes. State's preliminary b time to meet contract schedules. The Contract were already well under way. They were select the project, including contacts with the many is suited to provide the necessary project coordinates schedule.	es 03007, 03510, & 03X02, that ridge design personnel were un ctor had been selected by the D cted for the preliminary bridge d interested agencies such as sta	t are included in a T.H. 10 Renovation hable to provide the preliminary designs in district to design the project's road plans and designs because their overall familiarity with ate, local, and private, made them best
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$119,544.04	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain w		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and object SEE ATTACHED COI		
Caral Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	u	/-3-06 Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration		

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. 85687	Type of	work: <u>Prelimin</u>	ary Bridge Des	sign	
District/Office Bridge Office	Work Ty	pe Code <u>BD</u>		0 11 12 13	1475 700
S.P. <u>0301-47</u> T.H. <u>10</u>	Locatio	on: <u>Detroit Lake</u>	es	SINT	
Contractor HNTB Corporation	•	· .		Ro RE	canos Es
Subcontractor <u>NA</u>		•		Consult	
Contract Period 9/30/03; Work Start Date	10/01/05; Work Completion	10/01/05 Date Expiration	•		" Save of
Total Contract Cost: \$119,544.04 =	Orig Cost: \$119	9,544.04 + Ame	ended Cost: \$_		
Amended cost for: Overrun	Additional	Work Nu	mber of Ameno	lments 0	
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Rat	ting		
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point	
1. Product Quality		X			
2. Work Performance		×			· · ·
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		×			
4. Deliverables Complete and on time		\times			
5. Project related cooperation	X	· ·			
6. QA/QC plan conformance		\times			
7. Contract administration cooperation		x			
8. Invoices and progress reports		X			
9. Cost estimation/budget management		- X $+$			

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Project Manager: (Ray Cekalla)

Print Name

Total Points <u>28</u> (Maximum points 36)

Contract Administrator: (Bob Miller)

Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Definitions:

Above Average:

- Products/Service delivered correctly, efficiently, timely and without excessive assistance or direction from Mn/DOT.
- Contractor performs beyond expectations.
- Deliverables exceed standards.
- Project Manage is informed of project status regularly.
- Contractor resolves any problems that occurred.
- Contractor needs little or no direction.
- Contractor responsive to requests.
- Contractor suggests improvements.

Average

- Contractor fulfills terms of contract; no more, no less.
- Deliverables meet standards.
- Project is on time and budget.
- Project Manager is informed of key milestones.

Below Average:

- Contractor Minimally or does not meet contract terms.
- Deliverables below standard or needs rework to comply.
- Project is behind schedule or over budget.
- Product/service required direction or assistance by Mn/DOT to produce.

Poor:

- Contractor requires excessive guidance or direction.
- Contractor is unresponsive to requests.
- Contractor unable or unwilling to resolve minor setbacks.
- Deliverables do not follow standards or does not meet requirements or expectations.
- Project is not on time or budget through no fault of Mn/DOT.

Comments:

This was a difficult & unusual project requiring a sump & pumping
System due to the roading being below the ground water table, It involved
much coordination with the vailvoad, district, foundations, Hydraulics,
Construction, City & aesthetic committee. The railroad bridge was handled
well. There were some problems with the abitment walls on the highway
bridge, plans not being complete, & the cost estimate.

:\user\consult\forms\evaluation.898

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANS	PORTATION	
Contractor Name: Horizons, Incorp	prated.	CFMS Contract Number: A-82181
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Aerial Services	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88826	Project Duration (Dates): 10/20/05 to 12/20/05
Summarize the purpose of the contra	ct, including why it was necessary to	enter into a contract:
services in Districts 2, 3, 6, 7 & Me	tro, for mapping and other purpose	rammetric Aerial Vertical Photography s. notogrammetric camera and equipment
Billable Hours (if applicable): No .	Total Contract Amount: \$58,315.00	Source of Funding: District's Consultant
costs for personnel for this type of	work are prohibitive for the State.	osts for necessary equipment and ongoing ere was only a single source for the services:
Evaluate the performance of the worl performance in meeting the terms an		tor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Please see the attached evaluation	form.	
	• •	
Carol Moe		1-3-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commiss	ioner	Date
cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin		- X

J. Brunner, MS 680 File

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services, Mail Stop 680, with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANS	PORTATION	
Contractor Name: Horizons, Incorpo	prated.	CFMS Contract Number: A-82181
Project Name (if applicable): Photogrammetric Aerial Services	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 88826	Project Duration (Dates): 10/20/05 to 12/20/05
Summarize the purpose of the contra	ct, including why it was necessary to	enter into a contract:
services in Districts 2, 3, 6, 7 & Met	tro, for mapping and other purpose	rammetric Aerial Vertical Photography s. notogrammetric camera and equipment
Billable Hours (if applicable): No.	Total Contract Amount: \$58,315.00	Source of Funding: District's Consultant
costs for personnel for this type of	work are prohibitive for the State.	osts for necessary equipment and ongoing ere was only a single source for the services:
Evaluate the performance of the worl performance in meeting the terms an		tor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
Please see the attached evaluation	ı form.	
Carol Mor		1-3-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commiss	sioner	Date
cc: P.Stembler, 112 Admin		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

J. Brunner, MS 680 File

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Submit this form to the Administrator with the final invoice. This rating will be consideration in future consultant selection procedures. Address comments on back, keep comments factual.

Agreement No. <u>88826</u> District/Office <u>2, 3, 6, 7 \$ Metric</u>	Type of wo	ork photo	ogramm	retric A
S.P. <u>Numerous Spir</u> T.H. <u>Nu</u> Contractor <u>Horizons</u> I	Mork Typ Imerous Lo TH's	bcation $\underline{1012}$	L Sit. 2,3,	6, 51 & Met
Subcontractor		·	I	
Subcontractor				
Contract Period: $\frac{10 - 20 - 05}{\text{Work Start Date}}$;	12,20,00 Work Completion	$\frac{5}{\text{Date}}; \frac{6-3}{\text{Expiration}}$	<u>0 _ 06</u> 1 Date	-
Total Contract Cost: \$ <u>58,315-</u> =				\$ <u> </u>
Amended cost for: \sim Overrun	∼ Additional V			nents
Item Rating 1 - 6 by Project Manager ' 7 - 9 by Agreement Administrator		Ra	ting	-
	Above Average 4 Points	Average 3 Points	Below Average 2 Points	Poor 1 Point
1. Product Quality				
2. Work Performance				
-				
3. Conformance with Mn/DOT Standards/Requirements		V		
Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and on time	· · · · · ·		-	
Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and on time 5. Project related cooperation				
4. Deliverables Complete and				
Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and on time 5. Project related cooperation				
Standards/Requirements 4. Deliverables Complete and on time 5. Project related cooperation 6. QA/QC plan conformance 7. Contract administration				

Contractor's rating for this contract:

Total Points $\frac{3}{(Maximum points 36)}$

Project Manager: loyd O Print Name O, Davis)

Contract Administrator: A/ Print Name

Note: Any rating of below average or poor, copy to Jeff Brunner, Director, Consultant Services Section, MS 680

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name:		CFMS Contract Number:
City of Osakis		A68095
Project Name (if applicable):	Mn/DOT Agreement No.:	Project Duration (Dates):
Water Detention Pond in Osakis	86694	8-1-02 to 12-31-05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to er	ter into a contract:
The purpose of this contract was to provide M of a water control pond as well as obtaining R		
The contract was needed as the result of an a	action with the MPCA on a proje	ect administered by the City for MnDOT.
·		·
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
· ·		
Dillahla Haura (if appliachta):	Total Amount Chant on	Courses of Euroding:
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$139,633.36	Source of Funding: District Allocation
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the second se	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
The project takes place within the City limits. construction. No other City or entity would be		maintainer of the designed pond after
		8
		1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
	÷	,
		·
5		
		·
Evaluate the performance of the work includin		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objective	ves of the contract.	
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	VALUATION
2		
(le open		1-3-15
arol Bolnay		1-3-05
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

cc:

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Agency:	t Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Bolton & Menk Inc.		CFMS Contract Number: A74246
Project Name (if applicable): Land surveying for PLS corners in the Marshall area.	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87719	Project Duration (Dates): April 6, 2005 - September 5, 2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, includ	ling why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
The State required Land Surveying services to right-of-way for several future highway constru perform this work in time to keep the right-of-v	iction projects near Marshall M	linnesota. State staff was not able to
This contract provided land surveying for PLS surveying and documentation are required for 68 in and around the Marshall area.		
	· ·	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on	Source of Funding:
ול this was a single source contract, explain wh	Contract: \$124,598.30	Trunk Highway
		× .
Evaluate the performance of the work including performance in meeting the terms and objective		's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
server in the only and to the only objective		VALUATION
SEE ATTACHED CON		

File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Braun Intertec Corporation	1	CFMS Contract Number: A75336
Project Name (if applicable): TH 101 Bonding Project Foundation Borings	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87784	Project Duration (Dates): 5/15/2005 – 10/31/2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to e	nter into a contract:
This contract was for subsurface investigation new grade separated interchanges on TH 101 funded as a Bonding Project and includes the	between CSAH 36 and CSAH	39 In Wright County. This project was
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$174,511.12	Source of Funding: BAP Funds
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
• •		
5		
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objective		or's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	ic .	<i>1− 3−0 €</i> Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration	1	·

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultan	t Services Section, Mail Stop	680 along with the final invoice.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: City of Bird Island		CFMS Contract Number: A69535
Project Name (if applicable): Hydraulics pre- design for storm sewer system through the City of Bird Island.	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 87191	Project Duration (Dates): Oct. 21, 2004 - Sept. 30, 2005
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclue	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
This contract provided preliminary design, and sewer and water re-construction project and S		
This work was performed under this contract (City of Bird Isalnd) sewer and water improver of-sequence" timing of the work, therefore rec	ment project. The State did not	have resources available to meet the "out-
	. · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		1
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$77,730.00	Source of Funding:
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
The City of Bird Island had started a complete highway construction project (2007) includes r primary construction work.	reconstruction of the State's sto	orm sewer system, and will follow the City's
Due to the City's need for hydraulics analysis sewer drainage on the upcoming highway proj conduct the hydraulics pre-design for the City under this contract allowed the City project to that the State needed for its highway project.	ject, it was deemed prudent to and State's work in conjunctior	enter into this contract with the City to n with each other. Conducting the work
	*	
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objective		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau		
		1-3-06
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		Date
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Secti File	ion	

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Contractor Name: Short Elliot Hendrickson, Inc		CFMS Contract Number: A69137
Project Name (if applicable): 494/694 Sign replacement	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 86992	Project Duration (Dates): 10/6/04 – 10/31/05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, include	ding why it was necessary to er	nter into a contract:
The purpose of the contract was to provide M years old on identified segments of I-494 and interchange. This is due to a shortage of prog	I-694 from Rice Street/694 inte	
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$82,224.09	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway
If this was a single source contract, explain whether the source contract, explain wh	ny the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
		2
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objective		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
SEE ATTACHED CON	ISULTANT PERFORMANCE E	EVALUATION
Carol Molnau, Lt. Governor/Commissioner	u	1-3-06 Date

Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

CC:

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

nstructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

	it beivices bection, man blop	680 along with the linal involce.
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	÷.	
Contractor Name: Cambridge Systematic and SRF Consulting (Group	CFMS Contract Number: A 56535
Project Name (if applicable): Minnesota Statewide Freight Plan	Mn/DOT Agreement No.: 86688	Project Duration (Dates): 12/04 – 3/05
Summarize the purpose of the contract, inclu-		
The purpose of the contract was to develop M It was necessary to enter into to contract with and forecasting expertise that did not have.	linnesota first comprehensive p	performance based Statewide Freight Plan.
		3
	*	
		х.
	·	
		· · ·
Billable Hours (if applicable): 1,072	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$285,850	Source of Funding: State Consulting Fund
If this was a single source contract, explain w	hy the agency determined there	e was only a single source for the services:
Evaluate the performance of the work includin performance in meeting the terms and objecti		r's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	
performance in meeting the terms and objecti		
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	
performance in meeting the terms and objecti	ves of the contract:	EVALUATION

Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File

Required by Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c).

Instructions: Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 680 along with the final invoice.

instructions. Submit this form to Consultant Services Section, Mail Stop 660 along with the final invoice.				
Agency: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				
Contractor Name: HNTB Corporation		CFMS Contract Number: A54390		
Project Name (if applicable): Bridges 03007, 03510, & 03X02.	Mn/DOT Agreement No. 85687	Project Duration (Dates): 9/30/03 thru 10/01/05		
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: Provide preliminary design services for Bridges 03007, 03510, & 03X02, that are included in a T.H. 10 Renovation Project in Detroit Lakes. State's preliminary bridge design personnel were unable to provide the preliminary designs in time to meet contract schedules. The Contractor had been selected by the District to design the project's road plans and were already well under way. They were selected for the preliminary bridge designs because their overall familiarity with the project, including contacts with the many interested agencies such as state, local, and private, made them best suited to provide the necessary project coordination with these agencies and complete the preliminary bridge plans on schedule.				
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Amount Spent on Contract: \$119,544.04	Source of Funding: Trunk Highway		
If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined there was only a single source for the services:				
· · ·	1			
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor's timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:				
SEE ATTACHED CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION				
Caral Malna, Lt. Governor/Commissioner		/-3-06 Date		
cc: Paul Stembler, Dept. of Administration Jeff Brunner, Consultant Services Section File				

Minnesota Statutes Section 16C.08, subdivision 4 (c), requires the head of an agency submit a one-page report to the commissioner of Administration upon completion of a professional/technical services contract over \$50,000.00.

istructions: Submit this form to your Department's Contract Officer, Office of Fiscal & Administrative Services, 444 Cedar St., Suite 126, Town Square, St. Paul, wi	/ithin
30 days of contract completion. (A copy of this report will be forward to the MN Dept of Administration & on to the legislative reference library)	

Agency: Department of Public Safety, BCA, CriMNET					
Contractor Name: Deloitte & Touche LLP		CFMS Contract Number: A74525			
Project Name (if applicable <u>)</u> : Security Architecture	Project Number <u>(</u> if applicable):	Project Duration (Dates): May 2, 2005 – November 30, 2005			
Summarize the purpose of the contract, including why it was necessary to enter into a contract: The State is in need of professional/technical services to assist the State to create and assist in implementing a plan for statewide criminal justice security architecture.					
Billable Hours (if applicable):	Total Contract Amount: \$265,000.00	Source of Funding:			
Explain why this amount was a cost effective way for the agency to provide its services or products better or more efficiently: The contractor has provided resources, skills and knowledge that was not available internally. This is a specific work for a short period of time.					
If this was a single source contract, explain why the agency determined	there was only a single source for	the services:			
Evaluate the performance of the work including an appraisal of the contractor=s timeliness, quality, cost, and overall performance in meeting the terms and objectives of the contract:					
Very professional work, delivery on time, in budget, to specs. Very good, comprehensive and high quality deliverables.					
Agency Head Signature: (Rev. 6/03)	Title: Acting Exec Div	Date: 01/03/06			