CONSULTANT AND CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (CIP)
PERFORMANCE REVIEW
AND
EVALUATION PROCEDURE

All consultants and CIP contractors under contract with the County will be evaluated and the Purchasing Department will maintain the corresponding grades. These evaluations will assist the County in determining the consultant’s suitability for future selections and/or pre-qualification status. The requesting or managing department is responsible for assigning the consultant’s performance grade for each project.

The departmental project manager shall forward the completed evaluation to the Purchasing Department. The Purchasing Department will send the evaluation to the consultant/contractor. If the consultant/contractor disagrees with the summary, they shall have seven (7) work days from the mailing date of the evaluation(s) to rebut the evaluation. A letter must be sent to the Purchasing Department outlining the points of disagreement. The Purchasing Department will review the evaluation with the requisitioning Department Director and a finding will be sent to the consultant/contractor either upholding or revising the evaluation(s). If the consultant/contractor does not dispute the evaluation(s) within the seven (7) day period, the evaluation(s) will be deemed acknowledged and grades therein used accordingly. The results of the completed evaluation(s) will be maintained by the Purchasing Department and may be used to determine the firm’s responsibility on future projects or pre-qualification status.

The evaluation form for Construction is below.
PINELLS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ANNUAL BID EVALUATION FOR CONSTRUCTION AND CIP SERVICES

Department/Division:  

Date:  

Project Name:  
Bid No.  
PID No.  

Evaluation Period:  

FIRST EXTENSION  
(If Term Contract)  

SECOND EXTENSION  
(If Term Contract)  

INTERIM EVALUATION  

FINAL CLOSEOUT  

Company:  

Company Project Manager:  

Company Address:  

Annual Approved Bid Amount:  

Bid Type:  

Scope of Work:  

PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>BASIS</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTSTANDING</td>
<td>Superior performance with no exceptions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>Distinguished performance with limited/no exceptions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETS EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>Satisfactory performance with few or minor exceptions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELOW EXPECTATIONS</td>
<td>Marginal performance in many areas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSATISFACTORY</td>
<td>Overall poor performance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EVALUATION CATEGORIES

A. Pursuit of Work  
B. Maintenance of Traffic  
C. Documentation/Submittals  
D. Timely Project Completion  
E. Coordination/Cooperation  
F. Coordination of Sub-contractors  
G. Contract Conformance  

Overall Score  

Evaluations are scored for each category based on the PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE. OVERALL SCORE is the average score of applicable EVALUATION CATEGORIES.

BOCC Project Mgr. Signature:  

Department Director Signature:  

Purchasing Department Signature:  

Date Mailed to Company:  

REBUTTAL PROCEDURE: Any disagreement with score must be submitted in a formal letter to the Purchasing Department) within seven (7) working days of receipt of evaluation.
## A. PURSUIT OF WORK
Contractor diligently and systematically pursued the work with sufficient labor, materials, and equipment at all times. The Contractor mobilized on site in accordance with the time period/schedule defined in the bid documents. The Contractor remained on the jobsite until the work was complete and accepted.

### RATING KEY
- **5**: Contractor adequately pursued the work 90% of the work days or better.
- **4**: Contractor adequately pursued the work between 80% and 90% of the work days.
- **3**: Contractor adequately pursued the work between 70% and 80% of the work days.
- **2**: Contractor adequately pursued the work between 60% and 70% of the work days.
- **1**: Contractor adequately pursued the work between 50% and 60% of the work days.
- **0**: Contractor pursued the work less than 50% of the work days.

### SCORE
For unacceptable ratings daily logs from inspector in charge are attached.

**Comments:**

## B. MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC
Provided maintenance of traffic (MOT) in accordance with all applicable standards. Coordinated construction operations that directly affected the traveling public so as to minimize impact to the public. Effectively used the worksite Traffic Supervisor to monitor and correct deficiencies. The Contractor took the initiative to identify and correct MOT concerns in a timely manner. Work zone safety was in accordance with bid documents and all applicable standards.

### RATING KEY
- **5**: Contractor met all project requirements in all areas considered. The Contractor corrected deficiencies promptly (maximum of 24 hours). Contractor took immediate action, as appropriate, to minimize impact to the public and businesses, including adjusting operations as necessary. No deficiency letter was sent to the Contractor.
- **4**: Contractor was sent no more than one (1) deficiency letter.
- **3**: Contractor was sent no more than two (2) deficiency letters.
- **2**: Contractor was sent no more than three (3) deficiency letters.
- **1**: Contractor was sent no more than four (4) deficiency letters.
- **0**: Contractor was sent more than four (4) deficiency letters.

### SCORE

**Comments:**

## C. DOCUMENTS / SUBMITTALS
Contractor submitted all required documents with all information and detail in a timely and accurate manner. Documents include but are not limited to proposals, responses to correspondence, time extension requests, project schedules and updates, payment applications, claims for delay or extra work, MOT plans, Erosion Control Plans, etc.

### RATING KEY
- **5**: Contractor submitted documents in a complete, accurate and timely manner that did not delay the project.
- **4**: Contractor was sent no more than one (1) deficiency letter.
- **3**: Contractor was sent no more than two (2) deficiency letters.
- **2**: Contractor was sent no more than three (3) deficiency letters.
- **1**: Contractor was sent no more than four (4) deficiency letters.
- **0**: Contractor was sent more than four (4) deficiency letters.

### SCORE

**Comments:**

## D. TIMELY PROJECT COMPLETION
Contractor completed the project in a timely manner including site clean up.

### RATING KEY
- **5**: Contractor always finished assignments within agreed upon schedule, including final walk-through and punch list (including rain days).
- **3**: Contractor frequently finished assignments within agreed upon schedule, including final walk-through and punch list (including rain days).
- **0**: Contractor rarely finished assignments within agreed upon schedule, including final walk through and punch list (including rain days).

### SCORE

**Comments:**
**CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE RATING CONTINUED**

### E. COORDINATION / COOPERATION
Contractor coordinated/cooperated with the inspector in charge responsible for administration of the bid requirements and inspection of work. The Contractor coordinated/cooperated well with county staff, consulting engineer, property owners, utilities companies and adjacent projects throughout the term of the bid.

**RATING KEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Contractor was cooperative and communicated well with the inspector in charge, utilities and property owners with very little direction from the Project Manager. The Contractor always gave advanced notices to the inspector and utilities (when work was in the vicinity of a utility) of work activities that required inspection. Contractor worked with the property owners to eliminate access problems for businesses and private property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Contractor was sent no more than one (1) deficiency letter by Project Manager documenting failure to coordinate/cooperate with County staff, inspector in charge, consulting engineering, property owners and utilities companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contractor was sent no more than two (2) deficiency letters by Project Manager documenting failure to coordinate/cooperate with County staff, inspector in charge, consulting engineering, property owners and utilities companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Contractor was sent no more than three (3) deficiency letters by Project Manager documenting failure to coordinate/cooperate with County staff, inspector in charge, consulting engineering, property owners and utilities companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contractor was sent no more than four (4) deficiency letters by Project Manager documenting failure to coordinate/cooperate with County staff, inspector in charge, consulting engineering, property owners and utilities companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Contractor was sent more than four (4) deficiency letters by Project Manager documenting failure to coordinate/cooperate with County staff, inspector in charge, consulting engineering, property owners and utilities companies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE**

**Comments:**

### F. COORDINATION OF SUB-CONTRACTORS
Contractor coordinated the work effort with all the sub-contractors, maintaining the schedule and quality of the work.

**RATING KEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Contractor coordinated with all sub-contractors to provide quality work within project time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Contractor was sent no more than one (1) deficiency letter by Project Manager documenting failure to coordinate the work effort with all the sub-contractors, maintaining the schedule and quality of the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contractor was sent no more than two (2) deficiency letters by Project Manager documenting failure to coordinate the work effort with all the sub-contractors, maintaining the schedule and quality of the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Contractor was sent no more than three (3) deficiency letters by Project Manager documenting failure to coordinate the work effort with all the sub-contractors, maintaining the schedule and quality of the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Contractor was sent no more than four (4) deficiency letters by Project Manager documenting failure to coordinate the work effort with all the sub-contractors, maintaining the schedule and quality of the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Contractor was sent more than four (4) deficiency letters by Project Manager documenting failure to coordinate the work effort with all the sub-contractors, maintaining the schedule and quality of the work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE**

**Comments:**

### G. CONTRACT CONFORMANCE
Contractor ensured conformance to all annual bid requirements including specified materials and workmanship of temporary as well as final products and services. Contractor provided required supervision, management and oversight to ensure quality control at all times. Efforts by the Contractor are such that the efforts of the County’s Inspector in charge were not essential to ensure quality.

**RATING KEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Contractor worked diligently throughout the life of the project to provide quality products and services in accordance with the bid documents. Contractor personnel performed all quality controls, management and oversight necessary to ensure quality. Inspector in charge had no documented quality control or contract concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inspector in charge had documented quality control or contract concerns on the greater of either five (5) days or five percent (5%) of the project duration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Inspector in charge had documented quality control or contract concerns more than five (5) days or five percent (5%) of the project duration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE**

*For scoring, Project Manager will document significant quality control or contract concerns in the daily report.*

**Comments:**