| | Loxahatchee River Environmental Control District | CONTRACT NO. | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|----|--|--|--|
| ADDRESS | 2500 Jupiter Park Drive | CONTRACTOR | | | | | |
| CITY / STATE/ ZIP | Jupiter, FL 33458 | PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE | FROM | ТО | | | |
| CONTRACT PROJECT MANAGER | | LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE | | | | | |
| INSTRUCTIONS: This form can be completed on the computer or printed and completed by hand. Use the mouse to navigate. To check or uncheck a box, 'double click' the box. If further direction is required on how to complete this evaluation or where to submit it, please contact your Contracting Officer. Comment boxes are formatted to automatically wrap the entered text. Check the box that best describes the level in which the Contractor supported the area described. Comments are essential and must substantiate your rating selection. N/A = not applicable. If additional space is required, use page 2 of the form or attach additional page(s). SEE PAGE 3 FOR EVALUATION RATINGS DEFINITIONS 1. Quality. Contractor conformed to contract requirements. Was capable, efficient and effective in supporting the programs of this contract. Provided well maintained equipment and highly qualified personnel. Finished product meets the quality requirements set | | | | | | | |
| forth in the contract. | | | | | | | |
| COMMENTS: | Satisfactory Unsatisfactory | | | | | | |
| 2. Schedule. Contractor was prepared and available to begin work on contract start date and provided daily coverage during the contract period with little to no disruption or unavailability. Contractor completed the work within the dates specified in the contract and any approved extensions of time. □ N/A □ Satisfactory □ Unsatisfactory COMMENTS: | | | | | | | |
| negotiations for time | ontractor conformed to contract requirements, p and costs. Contractor did not engage with frivo the contract for identification and quantification | olous our unsuppo | rted change order reques | | | | |
| □ N/A □ | Satisfactory Unsatisfactory | | | | | | |
| COMMENTS: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| 4. Management. Contractor and on-site representatives were professional, well qualified, and committed to customer satisfaction and safety of operations. Contractor provided necessary support for key personnel and if applicable, took necessary action to correct or replace any personnel. Contractor was timely and complete with shop drawings, pay applications, releases, schedules and other required submittals. | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| □ N/A | ☐ Satisfactory | ☐ Unsatisfactory | | | | |
| COMMENTS: | D | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 6. Regulatory Con others. | npliance. How well does | the contractor comply with governing regulat | ions such as the FDEP, FDOH, SFWMD or | | | |
| □ N/A | ☐ Satisfactory | ☐ Unsatisfactory | | | | |
| COMMENTS: | D | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 7. Safety. Contract operations? | ctor and on-site represen | atives attitude and efforts, as well as actual a | pplication and general safety of | | | |
| □ N/A | ☐ Satisfactory | ☐ Unsatisfactory | | | | |
| COMMENTS: | D | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 9. Other Areas: □ N/A | ☐ Satisfactory | ☐ Unsatisfactory | | | | |
| 10. Other Areas: □ N/A | ☐ Satisfactory | ☐ Unsatisfactory | | | | |
| 11. Other Areas: ☐ N/A | • | ☐ Unsatisfactory | | | | |
| | ☐ Satisfactory | | | | | |

| 12. Ove | erall Contrac | ctor Rating: | | | | | |
|---------|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| □ N/A | | ☐ Satisfactory | ☐ Unsatisfactory | | | | |
| Additio | Additional comments to support your response to any item above or other items. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Name | Title of Ind | ividual Completing th | is Form (include agency in | hone and electronic address) | | | |
| rianio, | THE OF ITE | ividual Completing th | is form (molade agency, p | none and electronic address y | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Signat | ure | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| R | ATING | DEFINITIO | N | NOTE | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Sa | atisfactory | | s contractual requirements. erformance of the element | To justify a Satisfactory rating, there should have been only minor problems, or major problems the contractor | | | |
| | | being assessed r | nay contain some minor | recovered from without impact to the contract. There | | | |
| | | problems for which the Contractor were | corrective actions taken by satisfactory. | should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. | | | |

Unsatisfactory

Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.

To justify an Unsatisfactory rating, identify multiple significant events in each category that the Contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the Government. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating. An Unsatisfactory rating should be supported by referencing the management tools used to notify the contractor of the contractual deficiencies (e.g. management, quality, safety, etc.)