

**Florida DEP - Division of Waste Management - Petroleum Restoration Program**

**CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM**

\_\_\_ **TA/PO Completion Performance Evaluation**      or      \_\_\_ **Interim Performance Evaluation**

Contractor Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Contractor ID No: \_\_\_\_\_

Contract No.: \_\_\_\_\_ TA/PO No.: \_\_\_\_\_ TA/PO Task No(s). (if interim eval.): \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Period: \_\_\_\_\_ to: \_\_\_\_\_ DEP Facility No.: \_\_\_\_\_

Facility/Project Name & Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Description of Work Performed: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Team/LP: \_\_\_\_\_ Position Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluation Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**I. Performance Rating and Ranking:** The Performance Rating outlined below is based on the corresponding contractor rating details in Section II and, if a PO Completion Performance Evaluation, the attached Site Owner/Responsible Party Contractor Performance Survey. *Note, if any of the performance categories do not apply to a specific evaluation (i.e. Owner/RP Input does not apply to the Task Completion Evaluation), it should be omitted and the weight factor for the remaining categories adjusted proportionately.*

<i>Performance Category</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Weight Factor</i>	<i>Weighted Rating</i>	<u><i>Ranking</i></u>
1. <i>Project Timeliness</i>		<b>10%</b>		<b>Top Performer:</b> Overall Weighted Rating of > 1.5 to 2.0  <b>Good Performer:</b> Overall Weighted Rating of > 1.0 to 1.5 (with no "0" un-weighted ratings)  <b>Marginal Performer:</b> Overall Weighted Rating of > 0.5 to 1.0 (with no "0" un-weighted ratings)  <b>Poor Performer:</b> Overall Weighted rating of ≤ 0.5 (or any "0" un-weighted ratings)
2. <i>Invoicing</i>		<b>15%</b>		
3. <i>Reports</i>		<b>15%</b>		
4. <i>Communication</i>		<b>10%</b>		
5. <i>Cost Control</i>		<b>15%</b>		
6. <i>Quality and Technical Competence</i>		<b>25%</b>		
7. <i>Owner/RP Input</i>		<b>10%</b>		
<b>Overall Weighted Performance Rating:</b> (sum of weighted ratings for all categories)				
<b>Performance Ranking:</b>				___ <i>Poor</i> ___ <i>Marginal</i> ___ <i>Good</i> ___ <i>Top</i>

**II. Contractor Performance Evaluation Questionnaire**

**1. Project Timeliness:**

- a. Excepting for circumstances beyond the contractor's control, tasks and deliverables were completed on time or ahead of the schedule in the PO.  
(Always = 2, < 3 weeks late = 1, ≥ 3 weeks late = 0)

2    1    0  
 n/a

Florida DEP - Division of Waste Management - Petroleum Restoration Program

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

- b. Notices of upcoming field work were provided within the time frames required by applicable rules. 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Consistently = 2, All provided before field work, but some untimely notices = 1, Notices generally not within timeframes or provided before field work = 0)*

- c. Contractor responses to Department comments and requests were provided within the timeframes stipulated in the review/request and program guidance. 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Consistently = 2, Some untimely responses, but timely requests for extensions = 1, Consistently untimely responses = 0)*

Section Total = \_\_\_\_\_

Section Score (Section Total / No. of Relevant Items) = \_\_\_\_\_

2. **Invoicing:**

- a. The contractor's invoices were correct, accurate, and contained all required information and backup documentation in accordance with the contract, PO and applicable program guidance. 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Always = 2, Limited invoice errors = 1, Multiple invoice errors caused significant delays in invoice processing = 0)*
- b. The invoices were submitted within the contract time frames following written approval of the interim or final deliverable. 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Consistently = 2, Within <2 weeks = 1, Within ≥ 2 weeks = 0)*

Section Total = \_\_\_\_\_

Section Score (Section Total / No. of Relevant Items) = \_\_\_\_\_

3. **Reports:**

- a. The reports were well organized, free from errors or omissions that compromised the purpose of the PO, with minimal minor errors. 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Inconsequential errors not requiring correction = 2, Limited minor errors that required correction = 1, Errors or omissions that otherwise would have compromised the purpose of the PO = 0)*
- b. The reports complied with the contract, PO scope of work, rules and applicable program guidance. 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Always = 2, Limited concerns = 1, Report quality limited by failure to follow contract, guidance, etc. = 0)*
- c. The contractor correctly submitted required ADaPT laboratory and field data QA reports in accordance with program guidance. 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Consistently = 2, Limited ADaPT errors or delays resolved = 1, Repeated ADaPT errors or delays impacted invoicing or site rehabilitating progress = 0)*

Section Total = \_\_\_\_\_

Section Score (Section Total / No. of Relevant Items) = \_\_\_\_\_

Florida DEP - Division of Waste Management - Petroleum Restoration Program

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

4. **Communication:**

- a. The contractor communicated and proposed solutions to project changes, problems, delays and issues to the Department as they occurred and ahead of deadlines. 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Always = 2, Some communications untimely or less helpful = 1, Problems stemming from untimely or poor communications = 0)*
  
- b. The contractor responded within a reasonable time frame to telephone messages and emails from Department staff requesting contact. 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Generally within two business day = 2, Generally within 3-5 business days = 1, Generally >5 business days or otherwise untimely = 0)*

Section Total = \_\_\_\_\_

Section Score (Section Total / No. of Relevant Items) = \_\_\_\_\_

5. **Cost Control:**

- a. The contractor notified the Department of changes that merit a savings in cleanup work and cost. 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Yes = 2, Some minor reduction opportunities missed = 1, No, contractor did not communicate opportunity for one or more significant reductions = 0)*
  
- b. The contractor requested change orders for additional work/cost only for issues outside of their control or where warranted by site specific conditions 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Consistently = 2, Rare and minor exception = 1, One or more significant exceptions = 0)*

Section Total = \_\_\_\_\_

Section Score (Section Total / No. of Relevant Items) = \_\_\_\_\_

6. **Quality and Technical Competence:**

- a. The contractor/subcontractor work products complied with the contract, PO scope of work, rules and applicable program guidance. 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Consistently met requirements with no re-work = 2, Mostly met requirements with limited re-work = 1, Substandard work products = 0)*
  
- b. The contractor performed site assessment tasks efficiently and effectively, proposed cost-effective changes in scope, provided an accurate assessment summary and proposed cost-effective recommendations for future work and course of action. 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Consistently = 2, Minor ineffective or inaccurate assessment summary or inefficient recommendations = 1, Assessment summaries or recommendations had to be re-worked = 0)*
  
- c. The contractor proposed appropriate changes to monitoring points, parameters, and/or frequency based on changing site conditions. 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Consistently = 2, Minor changes missed/not proposed = 1, Changes were not proposed even though warranted based on site conditions = 0)*
  
- d. The remedial action plan adequately and cost-effectively addressed the site conditions, provided a viable remedial design and did not exceed what was necessary to meet the site rehabilitation goals in rules and applicable program guidance. 2 1 0  
n/a  
*(Consistently suitable RAP = 2, Minor inconsistent or unsuitable RAP considerations = 1, RAP unusable or inconsistent with remediation goals/had to be re-worked = 0)*

Florida DEP - Division of Waste Management - Petroleum Restoration Program

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

e. The contractor implemented remedial action in accordance with the approved remedial action plan, rules and applicable program guidance. (Consistently = 2, Limited implementation concerns, all resolved = 1, Implementation not in accordance with RAP = 0) [ ]2 [ ]1 [ ]0 [ ]n/a

f. The contractor proposed site closure when the closure criteria in rules and applicable program guidance were met. (Yes = 2, Only after prompting by Department = 1, Site closure was not proposed even though warranted or appropriate = 0) [ ]2 [ ]1 [ ]0 [ ]n/a

Section Total = \_\_\_\_\_
Section Score (Section Total / No. of Relevant Items) = \_\_\_\_\_

List Name/Date of Supporting Documentation Used for Ratings:

- 1. Project Timeliness: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Invoicing: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Reports: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Communication: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Cost Control: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Quality and Technical Competence: \_\_\_\_\_