

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

**INTERIM CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

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

Check One:  Project Interim Review or  Project Completion Review

Contract No.: \_\_\_\_\_ Purchase Order (PO) No.: \_\_\_\_\_ Task Assignment (TA) No.: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

Description of Work Performed for TA/PO: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

**Interim Performance Ranking\*:**

**Top Performer**     **Good Performer**     **Acceptable Performer**     **Poor Performer**

**I. \*Interim Performance Ranking:** is derived from the Interim Performance Rating outlined below that is based on the corresponding contractor rating details in section II, the contractor evaluation questionnaire in section III and the contractor performance category descriptions in section IV.

<i>Performance Category</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Weight Factor</i>	<i>Weighted Rating</i>	<u><i>Ranking</i></u>
1. <i>Quality &amp; Accuracy of the Work</i>		<b>20%</b>		<b>Top Performer:</b> Overall Weighted Rating of 2.75 to 3.0
2. <i>Timeliness of the Work</i>		<b>10%</b>		
3. <i>Financial &amp; Progress Reports</i>		<b>10%</b>		<b>Good Performer:</b> Overall Weighted Rating of 2.0 to 2.75 (with no "0" un-weighted ratings)
4. <i>Invoicing</i>		<b>10%</b>		
5. <i>Communication</i>		<b>15%</b>		<b>Acceptable Performer:</b> Overall Weighted Rating of 1.25 to 2.0 (with no "0" un-weighted ratings)
6. <i>Cost Control</i>		<b>15%</b>		
7. <i>Technical Competence</i>		<b>20%</b>		<b>Poor Performer:</b> Overall Weighted rating of < 1.25 (or any "0" un-weighted ratings)
<b>Overall Weighted Interim Performance Rating:</b> (sum of weighted ratings for all categories)				
<b>Interim Performance Ranking:</b>				<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Acceptable</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Good</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Top</i>

**II. Evaluation Details:** In the terms of each category description, provide details below from the specific project and evaluation period to support the performance rating. Include a summary of any comments

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

**INTERIM CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

received from the site owner/RP pertaining to contractor performance and also incorporate those into the details and rating for each category.

**1. Quality & Accuracy of the Work:** Rating = \_\_\_\_ Details:

**2. Timeliness of the Work:** Rating = \_\_\_\_ Details:

**3. Financial & Progress Reports:** Rating = \_\_\_\_ Details:

**4. Invoicing:** Rating = \_\_\_\_ Details:

**5. Communication:** Rating = \_\_\_\_ Details:

**6. Cost Control:** Rating = \_\_\_\_ Details:

**7. Technical Competence:** Rating = \_\_\_\_ Details:

**Summary of Responsible Party Comments:** Based on an interview with the Responsible Party, summarize their comments in regard to each of the seven contractor performance evaluation categories, as well as their response to the two questions below.

1. Comments for evaluation categories:

2. Overall did the contractor complete the task assignment to the satisfaction of the Responsible Party?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

If no, explain.

3. Did the Responsible Party raise any specific reasons why the Department should not release payment of the retainage for the task assignment to the contractor under the terms of the contract? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

If yes, explain.

**INTERIM CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

**III. Contractor Performance Evaluation Questionnaire**

**1. Quality and Accuracy: Quality, sufficiency, and accuracy of contract-required work, including work or tasks performed by subcontractors.**

- a. Was the contractor familiar with Chapter 62-772 and 62-780, F.A.C., and all other program technical guidance? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)
  
- b. Did the contractor provide an adequate number of qualified personnel? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, For 75% of the tasks = 2, For 50% of the tasks = 1, For less than 50% of the tasks = 0)
  
- c. Were the contractor's personnel knowledgeable, coordinated and efficient? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)
  
- d. Did the contractor assess the site adequately and efficiently to be able to properly evaluate cleanup and/or site closure options? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Minor additional assessment needed = 2, Additional assessment needed = 1, Significant additional assessment needed = 0)
  
- e. Did the contractor perform a detailed file review to fully understand the site history prior to preparing their Task Assignment proposals? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)
  
- f. Did the contractor anticipate possible obstacles and schedule field work accordingly? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)
  
- g. How would you characterize site owner/RP comments pertaining to contractor performance in this category? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Positive = 3, Neutral = 2, Slightly Negative = 1, Strongly Negative = 0)

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

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

**2. Project Timeliness: Timeliness with respect to completing contract-required task assignments and work, including work performed by subcontractors.**

- a. Did the contractor complete tasks/deliverables within the approved timeframes? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Within 1 week = 2, Within 2 weeks = 1, Within >2 weeks = 0)
  
- b. Did the contractor respond to unanticipated problems or issues in a timely manner? 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)
  
- c. Did the contractor respond to DEP requests satisfactorily and in a timely manner? 0 1 2 3  
n/a

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

**INTERIM CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat =1, No = 0)

- d. How would you characterize site owner/RP comments pertaining to contractor performance in this category? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Positive = 3, Neutral = 2, Slightly Negative = 1, Strongly Negative = 0)

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

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

**3. Invoicing: Accuracy, adequacy, and timeliness of invoices, subcontractor payments and other related documents.**

- a. Did the contractor submit complete and correct invoices, including all required backup documentation and change orders? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Average of 1 error or missing item = 2, Average of 2 errors or missing items = 1, Average of >2 errors or missing items = 0)

- b. Were the invoices submitted within 30 days of receipt of written approval of interim and final deliverables? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Within 1 week of deadline = 2, Within 2 weeks of deadline = 1, Within >2 weeks of deadline = 0)

- c. Did the contractor pay subcontractors within required timeframe? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, No = 0)

- d. How would you characterize site owner/RP comments pertaining to contractor performance in this category? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Positive = 3, Neutral = 2, Slightly Negative = 1, Strongly Negative = 0)

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

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

**4. Reports: Accuracy, adequacy, and timeliness of contract-required activity/progress reports, notifications, technical reports and other required documents.**

- a. Were the contractor's proposal and reports submitted in the required format (electronic and hard copy)? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, No = 0)

- b. Were the contractor's proposal, technical reports and deliverables well written, accurate and complete? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Minor errors or missing items = 2, Several errors or missing items, including data tables or maps = 1, Significant errors or missing items, or data interpretation was not correct = 0)

- c. Did the contractor provide the necessary professional review and certification when required? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, No = 0)

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

**INTERIM CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

- d. Was the contractor responsive to suggestions, comments or modifications regarding work plans, reports or projects? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)
- e. Did the contractor submit reports within the approved timeframes? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Within 2 weeks = 2, Within 1 month = 1, Within >1 month = 0)
- f. Did the contractor submit required time extension requests with justification prior to missing report due dates? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, No = 0)
- g. Did the contractor provide legible and detailed field notes documenting work performed and on-site personnel? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, Not provided or not consistent with the report = 0)
- h. How would you characterize site owner/RP comments pertaining to contractor performance in this category? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Positive = 3, Neutral = 2, Slightly Negative = 1, Strongly Negative = 0)

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

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

**5. Communication: Contractor's accessibility, responsiveness, and cooperativeness with respect to any contract-related concerns communicated by the Contract Manager or Site Manager; plus contractor's demonstrated relationship with and direction of subcontractors.**

- a. Was the contractor cooperative and readily accessible? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)
- b. Did the contractor consistently and clearly communicate project status and issues to the DEP and subcontractors? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)
- c. Did the contractor respond to questions or concerns raised by the project manager in a concise and efficient manner? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)
- d. Did the contractor provide field event notifications within the required time frame? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)
- e. How would you characterize site owner/RP comments pertaining to contractor performance in this category? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Positive = 3, Neutral = 2, Slightly Negative = 1, Strongly Negative = 0)

INTERIM CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

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

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

6. **Cost Control: Contractor's demonstrated performance of cost control effectiveness and budget management.**

- a. Was the original scope of the project completed within the agreed upon price or cost with no loss of quality? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Within 5% = 2, >5% to 10% above = 1, >10% above = 0)
- b. Was the scope of work well defined prior to conducting field activities? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Minor modification required = 2, Modification required = 1, Significant modification required = 0)
- c. Were the technical details, including permitting, size of excavation, location of equipment compound, sufficient number of wells and/or depth of wells, etc. correctly estimated prior to submitting the proposal? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Minor modification required = 2, Modification required = 1, significant modification required = 0)
- d. Did the contractor submit verbal change orders (VCOs) during the implementation for additional scope that should have been anticipated and included in the original proposal? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(No = 3, Once = 2, Twice = 1, >2 Times = 0)
- e. How would you characterize site owner/RP comments pertaining to contractor performance in this category? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Positive = 3, Neutral = 2, Slightly Negative = 1, Strongly Negative = 0)

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

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

7. **Technical Competence and Expertise: Contractor's demonstrated technical competence and expertise (including competence and expertise of subcontractors); plus contractor's innovativeness and willingness to apply, within the limitations of the contract, new techniques or technologies.**

- a. Did the contractor designate optimal key and perimeter wells and/or sampling parameters and frequency? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)
- b. Was the contractor familiar with the latest innovative techniques and solutions? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)
- c. Did the contractor consider and select the most appropriate technology(s) to bring the site to closure based on the No Further Action (NFA) options with or without controls specified in Chapter 62-780 and guidance? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)
- d. Did the average monthly remediation system run times meet at least 80% of the approved design run time for each major treatment process? 0 1 2 3  
n/a

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

**INTERIM CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

(Yes = 3, <80-70% runtime = 2, <70-50% runtime = 1, <50% runtime or runtime data not provided = 0)

- e. Was the average monthly remediation system performance within  $\pm 20\%$  of the approved design capacity or the optimum capacity observed during startup, whichever is less, for each of the major treatment processes at the point of recovery or treatment, including flow rates, vacuum pressures, injection pressures, etc.? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Within >20% to 30% = 2, Within >30% to 50% = 1, Within >50% = 0)
- f. Did the Contractor conform to the manufacturer's recommended maintenance requirements for the remediation equipment? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)
- g. Did the Contractor respond to system shutdowns or malfunctions within three business days of discovery or notification by the FDEP/LP, including evaluation of the problem, minor repairs and re-starts if possible? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Within 1 week = 2, Within 2 weeks = 1, Within >2 weeks = 0)
- h. Did the Contractor achieve contaminant reductions at or below the established cleanup milestone goals within the time frames approved in the RAP? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Up to 25% longer = 2, >25% to 50% longer = 1, >50% longer = 0)
- i. Did the Contractor achieve contaminant reductions at or below the established cleanup milestone goals approved in the RAP? \* 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Reached 75% of goal = 2, Reached <75% to 50% of goal = 1, Reached <50% of goal = 0)
- j. Did the contractor submit a detailed PBC proposal which included a comprehensive breakdown of cleanup cost, reasonable milestone payment schedule, and a rational proposed cost for obtaining the cleanup endpoint? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Only 2 of the 3 required components included = 2, Only 1 of the 3 required components included = 1, None of the required components included or provided insufficient detail = 0)
- k. Did the contractor achieve all PBC milestones agreed upon? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Reached 75% of the milestones = 2, Reached <75% to 50% of the milestones = 1, Reached <50% of the milestones = 0)
- l. Did the contractor require direction concerning appropriate technology and solutions? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(No = 3, Minimal direction = 2, Some direction = 1, Significant direction = 0)
- m. Did the contractor have knowledge and experience to make on-site adjustments and improvements that would directly result in cost-effective and successful cleanup? 0 1 2 3  
n/a  
(Yes = 3, Mostly = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0)

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

**INTERIM CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

- n. Was the contractor able to locate all of the site wells to abandon when tasked? 0 1 2 3  
 (Yes = 3, 90% = 2, <90% to 60% = 1, <60% = 0) n/a
- o. How would you characterize site owner/RP comments pertaining to contractor performance in this category? 0 1 2 3  
 (Positive = 3, Neutral = 2, Slightly Negative = 1, Strongly Negative = 0) n/a

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

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

**\*Milestone Calculation:**

$$\text{Average \% Reduction (KW}_n\text{)} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \left[ 1 - \frac{(C_{mli} - C_{tl})}{(C_{bli} - C_{tl})} \right] * 100 \right) \right\} / n$$

Where: **KW<sub>n</sub>** = key well number n; **n** = number of key wells; **i** = 1, 2, ...n; **C<sub>mli</sub>** = milestone measurement concentration of contaminant group in key well n; **C<sub>tl</sub>** = target level concentration for contaminant group (*this value is calculated by summing the individual Cleanup Target Levels for each contaminant in the group. For example, if the Target Levels are GCTLs, then for the BTEX + MTBE group this value is 111 µg/l, and for the Naphthalene group this value is 70 µg/l*); and **C<sub>bli</sub>** = baseline concentration of contaminant group in key well i.



#### IV. Contractor Performance Evaluation Category Descriptions

<b>PERFORMANCE CATEGORY</b>	<b>EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</b> Score = 3	<b>SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE</b> Score = 2	<b>MARGINAL PERFORMANCE</b> Score = 1	<b>UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE</b> Score = 0
<b>1. Quality and Accuracy:</b> Quality, sufficiency, and accuracy of contract-required work, including work or tasks performed by subcontractors	Work product always, with rare exceptions, of excellent quality. No revisions required.	Work product of satisfactory quality with only minor errors, which are timely corrected upon request.	Work product is acceptable, but: many errors require correction. Corrections require several iterations or are unreasonably delayed.	Very low quality or unacceptable work product with many errors. Not all errors corrected. Requires unreasonable amount of time to review and correct.
<b>2. Project Timeliness:</b> Timeliness with respect to completing contract-required task assignments and work, including work performed by subcontractors	All tasks and contract deliverables on time or ahead of schedule. Quality of work does not suffer as a result of the time line.	Some intermediate task delays, not expected to cause major deadlines to be missed or to require contract extension. Does provide advance notification for delay and offers alternate deadline.	Some major work performance delays caused (or expected to cause) delivery schedules to be missed. Does not always provide advance notification for delay and offer alternate deadline.	Work not completed on time due to factors within contractor's control. Frequent failure to provide advance notification for delay and offer alternate deadline.
<b>3. Invoicing:</b> Accuracy, adequacy, and timeliness of invoices, pay requests, financial reports, subcontractor payments, and other related documents	Invoices are typically accurate, free of errors, and timely. Very responsive to related questions and concerns. Always pays subcontractors on time.	Invoices and reports are satisfactory with only minor errors, which are timely corrected upon request. Typically pays subcontractors on time	Many errors require correction. Invoices/reports not timely. Some issues with paying subcontractors on time.	Numerous errors require correction. Invoices/reports and/or corrections are not timely. Requires unreasonable amount of time to review and correct. Fails to pay subcontractors on time resulting in complaints.
<b>4. Reports:</b> Accuracy, adequacy, and timeliness of contract-required activity/ progress reports, notifications, technical reports, and other required documents	All reports accurate and complete, and on time. No rewrites or additional information required.	Reports satisfactory with respect to both quality and timeliness. Contractor responds quickly and appropriately to questions or comments raised. Only minor addendums required.	Many errors require correction. Reports were submitted late, but within 5 working days of deadline. Did not always provide advance notification of delay and offer alternate deadline.	Consistently poor quality reports are inadequate for interpretation or analysis. Reports submitted more than 5 days late. Frequent failure to provide advance notification of delay and offer alternate deadline.
<b>5. Communication:</b> Contractor's accessibility, responsiveness, and cooperativeness with respect to any contract-related concerns communicated by the Contract Manager or Site Manager; plus contractor's demonstrated relationship with and direction of subcontractors	Works as a team member and is flexible and responsive to changes in circumstances or scope of work. Consistently and clearly communicates project status and issues to DEP and subcontractors.	Contractor is usually flexible and responsive to changes in circumstances or scope of work. Generally maintains good communication of project status with DEP/subcontractors and provides clear direction.	Marginal team player. Contractor is only intermittently responsive to changes in contract scope or other circumstances. Is not always up to date on project status. Communication with DEP and/or direction to subcontractors is not always clear and/or consistent.	Not cooperative or accessible. Not flexible to changes in scope or other circumstances. Fails to keep up with project status. Communication with DEP and/or direction to subcontractors is poor and/or inconsistent.

6. <u>Cost Control</u> : Contractor's demonstrated performance of cost control effectiveness and budget management	Contract performed at or below allowed cost, with no loss of quality.	Contract performed at less than 5% above allowed cost with adequate quality.	Contract performed at 5 - 10% above allowed cost. Several and/or costly change orders that could have been anticipated.	Contract performed at >10% above allowed cost. Frequent and/or costly change orders that could have been anticipated.
7. <u>Technical Competence</u> : Contractor's demonstrated technical competence and expertise (including competence and expertise of subcontractors); plus contractor's innovativeness and willingness to apply, within the limitations of the contract, new techniques or technologies	Successfully applies most of the current proven technologies based on site-specific data. On site adjustments based on process knowledge and experience directly resulted in cost-effective and successful cleanups. Has used several of the latest innovative techniques and solutions.	Applies current proven technologies based on based on site-specific data. On site adjustments based on process knowledge and experience improved effectiveness of equipment. Experience with some of the latest innovative techniques and solutions.	Applies a few of the current proven technologies. On site equipment needs more attention and evaluation. Aware of, but with little or no experience in, the use of some of the latest innovative techniques and solutions.	Only applies one or two of the current proven technologies. . On site equipment is rarely evaluated to improve overall effectiveness. Requires direction concerning appropriate technology and solutions. Not familiar with the latest innovative techniques and solutions.

Notes:

1. The omission of required or necessary information is considered an error.
2. For the performance category scores 0 – 2, having at least one of the qualities can result in that score.