**Partnering Evaluation Process (PEP)**

**Summary Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| **Contract Number:** | **NDOT 3576** | |  | |  | |  |
| **Project Description:** | **SR147 – Lake Mead Boulevard** | | | | | |  |
| **Period Being Evaluated:** | **March 25 – May 15, 2015** | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Goals** | **Evaluation Criteria and Scores** | | | |  |  |  |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **(1) Safety** | Non-compliant | Meeting minimum requirements, but not consistently | Meeting requirements | Pro-active regarding requirements and assuring safety | **Don’t Know** |  | | The **process** to assure that safe work practices are being followed and traffic safety is maintained is: | 1.0 2.0 3.0 4.0  **2 3 1** | | | | |  | | **Comments:** | **Average = 3.6** | | | |  | | SUB-GOALS: Zero incidents, no lost time accidents; No crashes – public or team; No public or company damage; Monthly safety meetings with all team members | * With the assistance of employees and NDOT recognizing hazards with traffic we changed the method we assist public traffic through our work zone. * All team members invited to Monday safety meetings. | | | | |  | |  | | | | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | |
| **(2) Schedule** | Unresponsive | Marginally successful | | Meeting expectations | Exceeding expectations | **Don’t Know** |  |
| The **process** to monitor and assure the project's completion is: | 1.0 2.0 3.0 4.0  **1 3 1** | | | | | **1** |  |
| **Comments:** | **Average = 3.0** | | | | |  |
| SUB-GOALS: Complete the project on time; Communication of updates in advance; Punch list and agreement of quantities within 15 days of punch list completion; Close out job within 4 months | * Great improvement in productivity during the last couple weeks. Optimistic going forward. * With added scope to the project we have openly communicated our understanding of required time. Does not mean we will get the time, but we are talking. | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| **(3) Cost** | Below levels needed to meet budget | At marginally acceptable levels | | At expected levels | Exceeding expectations | **Don’t Know** |  |
| The **process** of maintaining cost controls and budget management is:  : | 1.0 2.0 3.0 4.0  **4 2** | | | | | |  |
| **Comments:** | **Average = 3.0** | | | | |  |
| SUB-GOALS: Complete project on budget (plus required contract modifications); No claims | * Changes have been encountered on the project, but open communication has allowed us to find solutions. * No claims | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |
| **(4) Quality** | Unresponsive | Marginally successful | | Meeting expectations | Exceeding expectations | **Don’t Know** |  |
| The **process** to construct and  document quality is: | 1.0 2.0 3.0 4.0  **5 1** | | | | | |  |
| **Comments:** | **Average = 3.0** | | | | |  |
| SUB-GOALS: Meet or exceed all specs; No questionable material or production performance; No NCRs or LDs; Nice looking job we can all be proud of: Nice tie-in to LMNRA road | * We did encounter a substandard product and it was remediated with the assistance of both parties. We introduced additional material to make the substandard a product that met spec and was accepted | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **(5) Team Work & Relationships** | Not yet been achieved | Occurred in a few cases | Met expectations | | Exceeded expectations | | | **Don’t Know** |  |
| Interrelationships of team members are  understood and an open and coordinated effort by all members have: | 1.0 2.0 3.0 4.0  2 4 | | | | | | | |  |
| **Comments:** | **Average = 3.67** | | | | | | |  |
| SUB-GOALS: Resolve discrepancies or issues at the field level; No letter writing without first talking to each other; Meet DBE goal; Keep up on LCP Tracker (no penalties); Maintain effective communication with the public | * I am happy with cooperation * It appears that the escalation ladder has been working at the lowest level and any issues that have arisen have been resolved that same day. * Good, open communication. Great team. | | | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  |  | |  | | |  |  |
| **(7) Environmental Protection** | Unresponsive | Marginally successful | Meeting expectations | | Exceeding expectations | | | **Don’t Know** |  |
| The **process** to assure that environmental requirements are being met is: | 1.0 2.0 3.0 4.0  **1 4 1** | | | | | | | |  |
| **Comments:** | **Average = 3.0** | | | | | | |  |
| SUB-GOALS: No environmental incidents; No harm to protected animals or plants - especially tortoises and Bear Poppy (except where approved) | * No incidents that I am aware of. The issues that need attention have been addressed immediately. * No incidents * One non-compliance issue was brought to our attention in a timely manner to be resolved. * Other environmental concerns were observed in the field that were not otherwise reported on Daily Biological Reports (DBRs). These concerns were eventually corrected, but longer than anticipated and required additional follow up communication. * **TAKE ACTION:** DBRs have a two week or more delay in getting to NDOT Environmental staff. I would like to see this improved (Katie K.) | | | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |
| **Additional Comments:** |  | | | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | **Evaluator Type** | | | |  | **# Responses** | |  |
|  |  |  | | **NDOT** | |  | 3 | |  |
|  |  | **Aggregate Industries** | | | |  | 3 | |  |
|  |  | | | **Sub / Supplier** | |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | | **Other** | |  |  | |  |