

**CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM**

X  **TA/PO Completion Performance Evaluation** or   **Interim Performance Evaluation**

Contractor Name: Groundwater And Environmental Services, Inc. Contractor ID No: 01070  
 Contract No.: GC761 TA/PO No.: GC761-016D; PO# B5BDD9 TA/PO Task No(s). (if interim eval. ):    
 Evaluation Period: 8/16/2019 to: 10/16/2020 DEP Facility No.: 298508957  
 Facility/Project Name & Address: Circle K #2709778, 1901 W Brandon Blvd Brandon  
 Description of Work Performed: RA - NAM  
 Evaluator Name: Rachel Kasson Team/LP: PCLP29 Position Title: Site Manager  
 Evaluator's Signature: Electronically signed by KASSON\_R Evaluation Date: 11/6/2020

**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>Ranking</u>
1. Project Timeliness	2.00	10%	0.20	<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. Invoicing	2.00	15%	0.30	
3. Reports	1.00	15%	0.15	
4. Communication	2.00	10%	0.20	
5. Cost Control	2.00	15%	0.30	
6. Quality and Technical Competence	1.67	25%	0.42	
7. Owner/RP Input	NA	10%	NA	
<b>Overall Weighted Performance Rating:</b> (sum of weighted ratings for all categories)			<b>1.74</b>	
<b>Performance Ranking:</b>				<input type="checkbox"/> Poor <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.  2     1     0  
 n/a  
 (Always = 2, < 3 weeks late = 1, ≥ 3 weeks late = 0)

**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** = 6  
**Section Score** (Section Total / No. of Relevant Items) = 2

**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** = 4  
**Section Score** (Section Total / No. of Relevant Items) = 2

**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** = 3  
**Section Score** (Section Total / No. of Relevant Items) = 1

**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.  
*(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 =** 4

**Section Score** (Section Total / No. of Relevant Items) = 2

**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 =** 2

**Section Score** (Section Total / No. of Relevant Items) = 2

**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

**CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM**

- e. The contractor implemented remedial action in accordance with the approved remedial action plan, rules and applicable program guidance.  2  1  0  
 n/a  
*(Consistently = 2, Limited implementation concerns, all resolved = 1, Implementation not in accordance with RAP = 0)*
- f. The contractor proposed site closure when the closure criteria in rules and applicable program guidance were met.  2  1  0  
 n/a  
*(Yes = 2, Only after prompting by Department = 1, Site closure was not proposed even though warranted or appropriate = 0)*

**Section Total =** 5

**Section Score** (Section Total / No. of Relevant Items) = 1.67

**List Name/Date of Supporting Documentation Used for Ratings:**

1. Project Timeliness:  
 1a= met requirements for score--1b=fieldwork notice always provided in advance per requirements---1c= responses to department comments always recieved within required timeframes. all documentation in Oculus  


---
2. Invoicing:  
 2a,b= met requirements for score, no invoicing errors, all invoices submitted within timeframes  


---
3. Reports:  
 3a=minor clerical errors fixed on request, see T2 letter 12-20-19---3b=T3 letter 9-04-2020 missing pay item documentation, provided quickly upon request---3c= 2-11-2020 letter,GW ADaPT not uploaded correctly, ATC fixed on req  


---
4. Communication:  
 4a,b = met requirements for score, good communication and response times, all documentation in oculus  


---
5. Cost Control:  
 5a= N/A --- 5b= RFCs only submitted as necessary for appropriate costs  


---
6. Quality and Technical Competence:  
 6a=met req for score----6c=T2 initial rec missed opportunity for changes, ATC revised to rec that moved site towards closure see 12-10-19 report, 12-20-19 & 1-24-20 letters---6f=T3 Report rec NFA when appropriate---6b,d,e=N/A  


---
7. Contractor Performance Evaluation Survey:  
 No CPE Owner Survey response recieved.  


---