

**Table of Contents**

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
5.1 OVERVIEW.....	5-1
5.2 CLOSEOUT DOCUMENTS .....	5-2
5.2.1 Forms and Templates.....	5-2
5.3 A/E PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS .....	5-4
5.3.1 Forms and Templates.....	5-4

**List of Exhibits**

<b><u>Exhibit</u></b>		<b><u>Page</u></b>
Exhibit 5.3-A	STANDARD FORM 1421 .....	5-5
Exhibit 5.3-B	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT .....	5-7

**Forms and Templates**

<b><u>Exhibit</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
5.2.1 ROUTE SLIP FOR SF 1034 A/E SERVICES	5-2
5.2.1 SF 1034 VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES	5-2
5.2.1 INSTRUCTIONS TO CLOSEOUT A FIRM FIXED PRICE TASK ORDER	5-2
5.2.1 RELEASE OF CLAIMS (FIRM FIXED PRICE)	5-2
5.2.1 LETTER TO A/E CONSULTANT (FIRM FIXED PRICE)	5-2
5.2.1 FINAL REPORT MEMORANDUM (FIRM FIXED PRICE)	5-2
5.2.1 INSTRUCTIONS TO CLOSEOUT A LABOR HOUR TASK ORDER	5-2
5.2.1 RELEASE OF CLAIMS (LABOR HOUR)	5-2
5.2.1 LETTER TO A/E CONSULTANT (LABOR HOUR)	5-2
5.2.1 FINAL REPORT MEMORANDUM (LABOR HOUR)	5-2
5.2.1 INSTRUCTIONS TO CLOSEOUT A COST PLUS FIXED FEE TASK ORDER	5-2
5.2.1 RELEASE OF CLAIMS (COST PLUS FIXED FEE)	5-2
5.2.1 FINAL INDIRECT COST RATES AND COSTS (COST PLUS FIXED FEE)	5-2
5.2.1 LETTER TO A/E CONSULTANT (COST PLUS FIXED FEE)	5-3
5.2.1 FINAL REPORT MEMORANDUM (COST PLUS FIXED FEE)	5-3
5.3.1 SF 1421 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (ARCHITECT ENGINEER)	5-4
5.3.1 A/E CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT	5-4

# CHAPTER 5

## TASK ORDER CLOSEOUT

### 5.1 OVERVIEW

Following the final acceptance of work, the Division closes out the task order file. The closeout process involves the CO, COTR, Programs Manager, Finance Manager and A/E consultant.

The COTR plays an important role in determining whether the A/E consultant has satisfactorily performed the required work and has met contractual obligations. The task order is physically complete when the A/E consultant has completed the required services and the Government has inspected and accepted the deliverables. A primary objective of the closeout is to identify and resolve any outstanding obligations or pending liabilities of either the Government or the A/E consultant and to ensure proper documentation of all contract-related decisions.

Following the COTR's indication by formal documents that the contract is physically complete, individuals acting on behalf of the CO begin administration of the closeout.

As part of the closeout process, the COTR also submits an evaluation of the A/E consultant's performance. This information becomes part of the official record and serves as the basis for evaluating the contractor's past performance in future source selections. The CO may provide the consultant with a copy of the evaluation, and the consultant may submit a response to an evaluation reflecting poor performance.

## 5.2 CLOSEOUT DOCUMENTS

Each of the three types of task orders (Firm Fixed Price, Labor Hour, and Cost Plus Fixed Fee) requires a set of forms to be completed for closeout of the task order. These required forms are listed below. A paper sample of completed forms to use as a guide can be obtained from the WFLHD A/E Contracting Team.

### 5.2.1 Forms and Templates

To view or download forms or templates, use the links below:

#### All Task Order Types

- [Route Slip for SF-1034 A/E Services](#) Filled out by the COTR and used to route the closeout package to Acquisition and Finance for processing.
- [SF 1034 Voucher for Purchases and Services](#) Final Payment Voucher completed by the COTR, reviewed by the A/E consultant and signed by the CO.
- [SF-1421 Performance Evaluation \(Architect-Engineer\)](#) See Section 5.3.
- [Consultant Performance Evaluation Report](#) See Section 5.3.

#### Firm Fixed Price Task Orders

- [Instructions for the COTR to Closeout a Firm Fixed Price Task Order](#)
- [Release of Claims \(Firm Fixed Price\)](#) Filled out by the COTR and signed by the A/E consultant.
- [Letter to A/E Consultant \(Firm Fixed Price\)](#) The COTR completes this cover letter transmitting to the consultant the SF-1034 and release of claims.
- [Final Report Memorandum \(Firm Fixed Price\)](#) The COTR's Final Report to the CO, completed by the COTR .

#### Labor Hour Task Orders

- [Instructions for the COTR to Closeout a Labor Hour Task Order](#)
- [Release of Claims \(Labor Hour\)](#) Filled out by the COTR and signed by the A/E consultant.
- [Letter to the A/E Consultant \(Labor Hour\)](#) The COTR completes this cover letter transmitting to the consultant the SF-1034, release of claims, and the definitization modification prepared by the A/E Coordinator.
- [Final Report Memorandum \(Labor Hour\)](#) The COTR's Final Report to the CO, completed by the COTR.

#### Cost Plus Fixed Fee Task Orders

- [Instructions for the COTR to Closeout a Cost Plus Fixed Fee Task Order](#)
- [Release of Claims \(Cost Plus Fixed Fee\)](#) Filled out by the COTR and signed by the A/E consultant.
- [Final Indirect Cost Rates and Costs \(Cost Plus Fixed Fee\)](#) Completed by the COTR and signed by the A/E consultant. Ask the A/E Coordinator for assistance.

- [Letter to the A/E Consultant \(Cost Plus Fixed Fee\)](#) The COTR completes this cover letter transmitting to the consultant the SF-1034, release of claims, final indirect costs, and the definitization modification prepared by the A/E Coordinator.
- [Final Report Memorandum \(Cost Plus Fixed Fee\)](#) The COTR's Final Report to the CO, completed by the COTR.

## 5.3 A/E PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

The COTR conducts the performance evaluation of the A/E consultant. Generally, the COTR conducts these performance evaluations at the following times:

- When the COTR is changed.
- When the task order is completed (included with the closeout package).
- When interim evaluations are needed during long projects.
- When poor performance is identified.

The COTR considers all the circumstances of the project when rating the performance of an A/E consultant, including the complexity of the project, the environment (for example, hostile public, difficult partner agency or remote locations), the Government's performance (for example, reviews and comments) and other project-related factors.

Evaluating the performance of an A/E consultant is a process similar to a Federal Government supervisor evaluating the performance of a Federal employee. In other words, SF 1421 (see [Exhibit 5.3-A](#)) should include more than just checkmarks in the applicable boxes. It should tell the "story" of the project. The COTR should always include some narrative in the last box of the form or on a continuation/attachment page.

The performance rating form SF 1421 is completed by the COTR, who then provides the completed form to the CO. The CO then signs the form and determines whether to provide copies of the documents to the A/E consultant, allowing the consultant to submit a response to the rating.

The COTR should also complete the A/E Consultant Performance Evaluation Report (see [Exhibit 5.3-B](#)).

### 5.3.1 Forms and Templates

To view or download the forms, use the links below:

- [SF 1421 Performance Evaluation \(Architect-Engineer\)](#)
- [Consultant Performance Evaluation Report](#)

**Exhibit 5.3-A STANDARD FORM 1421**

<b>PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (ARCHITECT-ENGINEER)</b>				1. PROJECT NUMBER	
				2. CONTRACT NUMBER	
IMPORTANT: Be sure to complete Performance section on reverse. If additional space is necessary for any item, use Remarks section on reverse.					
3. TYPE OF REPORT <i>(Check one)</i>			4. REPORT NUMBER		5. DATE OF REPORT
<input type="checkbox"/> INTERIM <input type="checkbox"/> COMPLETION OF DESIGN OR STUDY <input type="checkbox"/> COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION <input type="checkbox"/> TERMINATION					
6. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR			7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION		
<b>8. OFFICE RESPONSIBLE FOR:</b>					
A. SELECTION OF CONTRACTOR		B. NEGOTIATION/AWARD OF CONTRACT		C. ADMINISTRATION OF CONTRACT	
<b>9. CONTRACT DATA</b>					
A. TYPE OF WORK			B. TYPE OF CONTRACT		
			<input type="checkbox"/> FIXED-PRICE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <i>(Specify)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> COST-REIMBURSEMENT		
C. PROJECT COMPLEXITY		D. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT			
<input type="checkbox"/> DIFFICULT <input type="checkbox"/> ROUTINE  <input type="checkbox"/> SIMPLE		INITIAL FEE	AMENDMENTS		CLAIMS BY CONTRACTOR
			NO.	AMOUNT	NO.
		\$		\$	\$
E. DATE CONTRACT AWARDED		F. CONTRACT COMPLETION DATE <i>(Including extensions)</i>		G. ACTUAL COMPLETION DATE OF CONTRACT	
<b>10. KEY CONSULTANT DATA</b>					
A. NAMES		B. ADDRESS		C. SPECIALTY	
11. CONSTRUCTION COSTS		A. INITIAL ESTIMATE	B. AWARD		C. ACTUAL
		\$	\$		\$
12. CONSTRUCTION CHANGES AND DEFICIENCIES			NUMBER		TOTAL
A. CONSTRUCTION CHANGES					\$
B. CONSTRUCTION CHANGES RESULTING FROM DEFICIENCIES IN A-E PERFORMANCE					\$
C. DEFICIENCIES PAID FOR BY A-E					\$
D. DEFICIENCIES PAID FOR BY GOVERNMENT					\$
13. OVERALL RATING			14. RECOMMENDED FOR FUTURE CONTRACTS?		
<input type="checkbox"/> EXCELLENT <input type="checkbox"/> AVERAGE <input type="checkbox"/> POOR			<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <i>(If "NO," explain in REMARKS on reverse)</i>		
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF RATING OFFICIAL			16A. NAME AND TITLE OF REVIEWING OFFICIAL		
15B. SIGNATURE		15C. DATE	16B. SIGNATURE		16C. DATE
NSN 7540-01-155-3244			<b>STANDARD FORM 1421</b> (10-83) Prescribed by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 5.236-2(d)		



**Exhibit 5.3-A STANDARD FORM 1421**  
(Continued)

STAGES OF SERVICES <i>(As applicable)</i>				PERFORMANCE										RATED BY		
				NOT APPLICABLE	RATING FACTORS/RATING									CODE LEGEND: + EXCELLENT A AVERAGE P POOR N/A NOT APPLICABLE NI NO INFORMATION		
					ACCURACY	COMPLETENESS	COOPERATION	COORDINATION	MANAGEMENT	MEETING SCHEDULE	PERSONNEL ABILITY	WORK QUALITY				
														SIGNATURE AND DATE		
CONCEPTS	SCHEDULE <i>(Mo., day, yr.)</i>	FROM	TO	ARCH.												
				STRU.												
	ACTUAL <i>(Mo., day, yr.)</i>	FROM	TO	MECH.												
				ELEC.												
TENTATIVES	SCHEDULE <i>(Mos. day, yr.)</i>	FROM	TO	ARCH.												
				STRU.												
	ACTUAL <i>(Mo., day, yr.)</i>	FROM	TO	MECH.												
				ELEC.												
WORKING DRAWINGS	SCHEDULE <i>(Mo., day, yr.)</i>	FROM	TO	ARCH.												
				STRU.												
	ACTUAL <i>(Mo., day, yr.)</i>	FROM	TO	MECH.												
				ELEC.												
ESTIMATES				A/S												
				M/E												
CRITICAL PATH METHOD				PRE-AWARD												
				POST-AWARD												
POST CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT SERVICES				SHOP DWGS.												
				MANUALS												
INSPECTION				FIELD												
				OFFICE												
SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS																
REMARKS																

STANDARD FORM 1421 BACK (REV. 10-83)

**Exhibit 5.3-B PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT**

<b>A/E Consultant Performance Evaluation Report</b>						
Consultant:		Performance Period:		To		
Project Number: testing		Report Date:				
Project Name:						
<b>Category</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Rating (A)</b>	<b>Item Factor (B)</b>	<b>Evaluation Rating (C) = A x B</b>	<b>Category Factor (D)</b>	<b>Efficiency Rating (E) = C x D</b>
<b>Time of Delivery</b>	Adherence to Task Order Schedule		0.40	0		
	Action on Anticipated Delays		0.30	0		
	Design Support Submittals (i.e. Geotech, Environ, Wetland Del, etc..)		0.30	0		
				0		
				0		
<b>Total Item Weighted Rating</b>				0.0	0.40	0
<b>Quality of Work</b>	Work Appearance		0.15	0		
	Thoroughness and Accuracy of Work		0.30	0		
	Engineering Competence		0.30	0		
	Liaison Effectiveness		0.15	0		
	Independence and Initiative		0.10	0		
				0		
				0		
<b>Total Item Weighted Rating</b>				0	0.40	0

**Exhibit 5.3-B PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT  
(Continued)**

<b>A/E Consultant Performance Evaluation Report (Continuation)</b>						
Consultant:		Performance Period:		To		
Project Number: testing		Report Date:				
Project Name:						
<b>Effectiveness in Controlling and/or Reducing Costs</b>	Utilization of Personnel		0.5	0		
	Design within Funding Limitation		0.5	0.0		
				0		
				0		
<b>Total Item Weighted Rating</b>				0	0.20	0
				0		
				0		
				0		
				0		
<b>Total Item Weighted Rating</b>				0	0.20	0
				0		
				0		
				0		
				0		
<b>Total Item Weighted Rating</b>				0	0.20	0

**Total Weighted Rating:**

Note: Provide supporting data and/or justification for submarginal or outstanding rating. Good – Very Good see attached criteria

[Save Data Only](#)
[Clear Form](#)
[Save Form & Data](#)
[Email Form](#)
[Retrieve Data](#)

**Exhibit 5.3-B PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT  
(Continued)**

		Back				
Performance Evaluation Criteria						
		Submarginal (1)	Marginal (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
Time of Delivery	Adherence to Task Order Schedule	Consistently late on 20% of submittals	Consistently late on 10% of submittals w/o prior agreement.	Occasional submittal late w/o justification	Meets task order schedule	Delivers all submittals & change requirements on schedule
	Action on Anticipated Delays	Does not expose changes or resolve as soon as recognized	Exposes changes but is slow in resolution on submittal	Anticipates changes, advises FHWA but misses completion of submittals	Keeps FHWA posted on delays, resolves independently on submittal	Anticipates in good time, advises FHWA, resolves independently and meets schedule
	Design Support Submittals (i.e. Geotech, ROW, etc..)	Does not complete interrelated submittals/studies concurrently	Support submittals/studies completed but PS&E changes delayed.	Major work items coordinated in time to meet Task Order schedule.	All design revisions recommended by support submittals included in time to meet T. O. schedule	Design revisions, submittal/studies resolved, and test data issued ahead of T.O. schedule.
Quality of Work	Work Appearance	25% of plans not compatible with FHWA processes and use	20% of plans not compatible with FHWA processes and use	10% of plans not compatible with FHWA processes and use	0% of plans not compatible with FHWA processes and use	0% of plans presented (including subs) not compatible with FHWA processes and use
	Thoroughness and Accuracy of Work	Is PS&E package tending to leave questionable situations for FHWA to resolve	Has followed guidance, type and standard drawings	Has followed guidance, type and standard dwgs. questioning and resolving doubtful areas	Work completed with notes and thorough explanation for anticipated questionable areas	Work of highest caliber incorporating all pertinent data required including related activities.
	Engineering Competence	Tendency to follow past practice with no variation to meet requirements of job in hand	Adequate engrg. to use and adapt existing designs to suit job on hand for routine work	Engineered to satisfy specs., guidance, plans and materials provided	Displays excellent knowledge of construction requirements, cost and procurement problems	Exceptional knowledge of FHWA work & use of innovative solutions

**Exhibit 5.3-B PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT  
(Continued)**

Back		Performance Evaluation Criteria				
		Submarginal (1)	Marginal (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
	Liaison Effectiveness	Indifferent to requirements of subconsultants and FHWA advice	Satisfactory but dependent on FHWA to force resolution of problems w/o constructive recommendations to subconsultants	Maintains normal contact with subconsultants depending on FHWA for problem resolution	Maintains independent contact with all subconsultants, keeping them informed to produce compatible submittals w/ little assistance from FHWA	Maintains expert contact, keeping FHWA informed, obtaining information from all subconsultants w/o prompting from FHWA
	Independence and Initiative	FHWA provided constant surveillance to keep job from slipping	Requires occasional prodding to stay on schedule & expects FHWA resolution of most problems	Normal interest and desire to provide workable plans with average assistance & direction by FHWA	Complete/accurate job, free of incompatibilities w/ little or no direction by FHWA	Develops complete/accurate PS&E, seeks/resolves issues ahead of schedule w/ little or no direction by FHWA
Effectiveness in Controlling and/or Reducing Costs	Utilization of Personnel	Planning of work left to designers, management only seen at major milestones, quality control measures almost non-existent	Project Manager sets & reviews work for designers. Numerous modifications to submittals are required after FHWA review	Project Manager sets & reviews work for designers, quality control measures in place	Project Manager sets & reviews work for designers and subconsultants, quality control measures in place for all products.	Modifications to final design limited to less than 5% as a result of lack of engineering or FHWA compatibility
	Design within Funding Limitation	Does not meet funding limit for original work or changes.	Met funding limit w/in 20% for original work or changes with FHWA direction/resolution	Met funding limit w/in 10% for original work or changes with FHWA direction/resolution	Met funding limit for original work or changes. Resolved w/ little or no direction by FHWA	Met funding limitation. Resolved independently.