CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Weight Factor</th>
<th>Weighted Rating</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Timeliness</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top Performer: Overall Weighted Rating of &gt; 1.5 to 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Invoicing</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good Performer: Overall Weighted Rating of &gt; 1.0 to 1.5 (with no “0” un-weighted ratings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reports</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marginal Performer: Overall Weighted Rating of &gt; 0.5 to 1.0 (with no “0” un-weighted ratings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communication</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor Performer: Overall Weighted rating of ≤ 0.5 (or any “0” un-weighted ratings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cost Control</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quality and Technical Competence</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Owner/RP Input</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Weighted Performance Rating: (sum of weighted ratings for all categories)

Performance Ranking: ___ Poor ___ Marginal ___ Good ___ Top

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
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) = 
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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.
      (Always = 2, Some communications untimely or less helpful = 1, Problems stemming from untimely or poor communications = 0)
      □ 2 □ 1 □ 0
      n/a
   b. The contractor responded within a reasonable time frame to telephone messages and emails from Department staff requesting contact.
      (Generally within two business day = 2, Generally within 3-5 business days = 1, Generally >5 business days or otherwise untimely = 0)
      □ 2 □ 1 □ 0
      n/a

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

      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.
      (Consistently met requirements with no re-work = 2, Mostly met requirements with limited re-work = 1, Substandard work products = 0)
      □ 2 □ 1 □ 0
      n/a
   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.
      (Consistently = 2, Minor ineffective or inaccurate assessment summary or inefficient recommendations = 1, Assessment summaries or recommendations had to be re-worked = 0)
      □ 2 □ 1 □ 0
      n/a
   c. The contractor proposed appropriate changes to monitoring points, parameters, and/or frequency based on changing site conditions.
      (Consistently = 2, Minor changes missed/not proposed = 1, Changes were not proposed even though warranted based on site conditions = 0)
      □ 2 □ 1 □ 0
      n/a
   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.
      (Consistently suitable RAP = 2, Minor inconsistent or unsuitable RAP considerations = 1, RAP unusable or inconsistent with remediation goals/had to be re-worked = 0)
      □ 2 □ 1 □ 0
      n/a
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)

\[ \square 2 \square 1 \square 0 \square \text{n/a} \]

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)

\[ \square 2 \square 1 \square 0 \square \text{n/a} \]

**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: _________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________________
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