

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

CONSULTANT EVALUATION: CS-235 Planning and Engineering, Southeast Plant Biosolids Digester Facilities			
Consultant Name: BROWN AND CALDWELL	Type of Evaluation: Annual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/>	Date of Evaluation: 11/30/2023	
Consultant Address: 1390 Market Street, Suite 1025 San Francisco, CA 94102	Evaluation No.: 8	Evaluation Period: 08/01/2022 – 07/31//2023	
	Agreement No.: CS-235	Enterprise/Division: Wastewater Enterprise/ Infrastructure PMB	
Name and Phone of Consultant Lead Manager: Tracy Stigers (925) 210-2358	Type of Consultant Agreement: Program/Project Management <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering (Planning & Design) <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Management <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>		
Agreement Name: Planning and Engineering, Southeast Plant Biosolids Digester Facilities	Original Agreement Duration: 10 years		
Original Agreement Start Date: 08/05/2013	Original Agreement End Date: 07/28/2023		
Original Agreement End Date: 07/28/2023	Revised Agreement End Date: 07/28/2029	Original Agreement Value: \$80 million	Revised Agreement Value: \$ 208.5 million
1. QUALITY OF SERVICE: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you rate the quality of the services provided by the consultant? How do you rate the quality of the work product and deliverables provided by the consultant? Did the consultant provide the level of expertise and skills required to do the work? Was the consultant able to provide the required as-needed expertise to address unexpected issues? Were the consultant work products reviewed and validated as part of a thorough QA/QC program? Was a management plan developed and used to ensure the quality of the services provided? Were the findings and recommendation of the consultant adequately supported by facts and analyses? Did the consultant identify and promptly notify the SFPUC of issues or conditions that could impact the quality, schedule and/or cost of the work, and did it assist the SFPUC to resolve or mitigate them? Was the consultant knowledgeable on the industry's latest standards, trends, and technologies? Was the consultant responsive to the SFPUC's needs and did it address any concerns raised? Did the consultant follow the directives issued by the SFPUC? Did the consultant compromise the quality of a work product or deliverable to make a deadline? Did the SFPUC formally notify and/or take actions against the consultant due to the consultant's poor performance? 			
Comments (required for Fair and Unsatisfactory ratings): Consultant scope of work at this time focused mostly on engineering support during construction (ESDC), such as collaborating with the SFPUC, construction contractor and the construction management (CM) staff, and responding/reviewing Requests from Information (RFI), Submittals and Change Orders, as appropriate. The Consultants also supported the SFPUC staff in the development of the procurement of the Public-Private Partnership (P3) for the Biogas Utilization Project (a subset of the larger Biosolids Digester Facilities Project)			

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

2. SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Did the consultant meet the time requirements outlined in the agreement?• Did the consultant submit work products and deliverables according to the pre-established deadlines?• Was the project delayed in any way due to the timeliness or performance of the consultant?• Did the consultant timely take actions or implement a recovery plan to avoid or minimize delays?• Did the consultant promptly make requests for required time extensions?• If the consultant was granted extensions of time, were these extensions reasonable?• If applicable, was the consultant timely in obtaining the internal and external approvals required to perform the work?
<p>Comments (required for Fair and Unsatisfactory ratings):</p> <p>The Consultant team has provided review and responses to RFI, Submittals and./or Change Orders for the construction management/ CMGC team. In collaboration with the SFPUC staff, Consultant should better strive to meet or exceed the response time goals set by the ESDC/CM team. To meet anticipated future ESDC workload, additional resources will be needed to continue to meet response time goals.</p>
3. COST MANAGEMENT: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Did the consultant provide the required work products and services within the allocated budget?• Did the consultant make reasonable efforts to contain costs?• Did the performance of the consultant result in any increased costs for the services provided?• Did the consultant accurately forecast the cost for the services to be provided throughout the duration of the agreement?• Did the consultant make timely requests for budget increases?• If the consultant was granted budget increases, were these increases reasonable?
<p>Comments (required for Fair and Unsatisfactory ratings):</p>




CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

4. SCOPE MANAGEMENT: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Were all proposed scope changes brought to the attention of the SFPUC timely?• Did the consultant make reasonable efforts to minimize scope changes?• Did the consultant establish and use a formal business process to control change?• Did the performance of the consultant result in additional scope?• Did the consultant obtain all required approvals before proceeding with additional work?
Comments (required for Fair and Unsatisfactory ratings):
5. STAFF AND RESOURCES: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Did the consultant adequately staff the project/assignment to ensure successful delivery?• How do you rate the performance of the consultant manager(s) in charge of the work?• How do you rate the overall performance of sub-consultants?• Did the consultant provide adequate coordination and oversight for the work performed by its sub-consultants, and did it take ownership of that work?• Did the consultant provide the individuals that were identified in their proposal?• Did the consultant maintain continuity in its staff assignments?• Was the consultant staff courteous and helpful in dealings with the general public, other agencies/organizations?• Was the consultant staff cooperative, and easy and pleasant to work with?• Did the consultant staff use the latest tools (resources, systems, technologies, etc.) available in the industry?• Was the consultant responsive to SFPUC requests for staffing adjustments?• Was any of the consultant staff replaced because of poor performance or other issues?
Comments (required for Fair and Unsatisfactory ratings): <p>Brown and Caldwell have effectively utilized the available staff resources as needed to support the construction. The construction activities will be ramping up significantly this year and will last through construction substantial completion in 2027. It is expected that the Consultant will continue to provide the resources to effectively support the construction. Additional resources will be available as needed to meet the project demands.</p> <p>The input and expertise from the Consultant team in the SFPUC's evaluation of the P3 delivery approach for the Biogas Utilization Project also have been helpful.</p>

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

6. VALUE OF SERVICES: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How do you rate the value of the services provided by the consultant? Do you feel the costs of the benefits realized as a result of the services provided were reasonable?• Did the consultant identify innovative options, make recommendations that led to cost savings, and/or offer proposals to increase efficiencies?• In the course of its work, did the consultant come across issues that were not in the scope of the agreement but nonetheless pro-actively offered advice and recommendations that may benefit the SFPUC?
<p>Comments (required for Fair and Unsatisfactory ratings):</p> <p>The Brown and Caldwell team, with their understanding of their design and site conditions continue to be valuable to the construction phase. They have been striving for continuous improvement along with the construction contractor and construction management teams.</p>
7. ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Was the consultant diligent at meeting all the contractual requirements?• Did the consultant secure all needed approvals before proceeding with the work requiring these approvals?• How do you rate the communication effectiveness of the consultant? Was the consultant diligent about raising issues in a timely manner? Was the consultant staff sensitive on how they documented issues in writing?• Did the consultant maintain thorough and accurate records of the work performed to support the content of the deliverables submitted to the SFPUC?• Were the progress reports submitted by the consultant accurate, timely and thorough?• Were the invoices submitted by the consultant accurate, timely and adequately justified?• Did the consultant pay its sub-consultants promptly?• Did the consultant meet the Local Business Enterprise (LBE) participation goals it committed to? If applicable, did the consultant perform all work safely and maintain a safe working environment at all times?
<p>Comments (required for Fair and Unsatisfactory ratings):</p> <p>Brown and Caldwell understand SFPUC administrative systems (SOLIS, Unifier, etc.) and continue to meet contractual requirements and provide thorough contract documents.</p>

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

OVERALL RATING: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	
Based on the rating for the seven (7) evaluation categories and your overall assessment of the services provided, how would you qualify the consultant's overall performance?	
Would you have reservations working with this consultant on other assignments in the future? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Comments (required for Fair and Unsatisfactory ratings, or if answered Yes to above question): To date, the Brown and Caldwell team continues to do a good job supporting the large and complex Biosolids Project.	
EVALUATOR AND DEPARTMENT HEAD	
Evaluator's Name: Carolyn Chiu Foon	Evaluator's Title: Senior Project Manager
Evaluator's Phone: 415-597-6984 (cell)	Evaluator's E-mail: cchiu@sfgwater.org
Department's Head Name: Howard Fung	Department's Head Title: Manager – Project Management Bureau
Evaluator's Signature and Date:  12-27-2023	Department's Head Signature and Date:  1/8/2024
CONSULTANT RESPONSE	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we agree with the findings of this performance evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> No, we do not agree with the findings of this performance evaluation
Signature of Consultant Lead Manager: 	Did Consultant submit written response? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>