|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| LOGO2LIN | | | | | Contractor's Performance Evaluation | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| Report for | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | (year) |
| Contractor No.: | |  |  | Contractor Name: |  | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| Airport: | |  | | |  | | IL Project No.: |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| AIP Project No.: | |  | | |  | | BCM Contract No.: |  | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Approx. Dollar Amt. - Completed (in 1,000’s) (Example: $20,000 = 20) |  | Prime  Sub |
|  | | |
|  | | |

|  |
| --- |
| Rate the Contractor’s performance using the numerical rating guidelines for each category. |

8.0 = **Excellent** 7.0 = **Good** 6.0 = **Satisfactory** 4.0 = **Marginal** 2.0 = **Poor**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality of Work** | | | | **Execution of Work** | | | |
| **Category** (See list on next page) | | **Rating** | | **Category** | | **Rating** | |
|  | | | |  | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | Organization/Prosecution |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | Cooperation |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | Traffic Control/Site Protection |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | EEO/Labor Compliance |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | Erosion Control |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | QC/QA |  |  |
|  | | | | | | | |

A rating of less than six (6.0) must be explained.

|  |
| --- |
| Comments: |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Prepared by Consultant: |  | | |
|  | Resident Engineer | Resident Technician | Date | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Reviewed by Div. of Aeronautics: |  | |
| Airport Construction Engineer | | Date | |

**Work Categories**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 001 | Earthwork | 015A | Cover & Seal Coats (A) | 027D | Pav’t Markings (Polyurea) |
| 002 | PCC Paving | 015B | Cover & Seal Coats (B) | 030 | Inst. Raised Pav’t. Markers |
| 003 | HMA Plant Mix | 016 | Slurry Appl. | 031 | Pav’t. Textur. & Surf. Rem. |
| 005 | HMA Paving | 017 | Concrete Construction | 032 | Cold Mill, Plan. & Rotomill |
| 006 | Clean & Seal Cracks/Joints | 018 | Landscaping | 033 | Erection |
| 007 | Soil Stabilization and Mod. | 019 | Seeding & Sodding | 034 | Demolition |
| 08A | Aggregate Bases & Surf. (A) | 020 | Vegetation Spraying | 035 | Fabrication |
| 08B | Aggregate Bases & Surf. (B) | 021 | Tree Trim. & Sel. Tree Rem. | 036 | Tunnel Excavation |
| 09A | Highway Structures | 022 | Fencing | 037 | Expressway Cleaning |
| 09B | Highway & Railroad Struct. | 023 | Guardrail | 038 | Railroad (Track) Const. |
| 09C | Hwy., R.R. & Waterway Str. | 024 | Grouting | 039 | Marine Construction |
| 010 | Structures Repair | 025 | Painting | 040 | Hydraulic Dredging |
| 011 | Anchors & Tiebacks | 026 | Signing | 041 | Hot (in-place) Recycling |
| 012 | Drainage | 027A | Pav’t. Markings (Paint) | 042 | Cold (in-place) Recycling |
| 013 | Drainage Cleaning | 027B | Pav’t. Markings (Thermo) | 097 | Traffic Control |
| 014 | Electrical | 027C | Pav’t. Markings (Epoxy) |  |  |

**Instructions for Completion of the AER 1777: Contractor’s Performance Evaluation**

1. The performance evaluation is to be prepared by the Resident Engineer or Resident Technician and reviewed by the supervising Division of Aeronautics Airport Construction Engineer.

2. Assign a numerical code for each work category under **Quality of Work** and a numerical code for each aspect of **Execution of Work**. The numerical code is to be to the nearest tenth (0.1).

3. Provide the Contractor with a copy of the report. Offer the Contractor an opportunity to meet and discuss any rating less than six (6.0).

4. A prequalification work rating will not be renewed if an overall weighted rating of less than 4.0 is received or less than six (6.0) is received for two successive years. The rating may be restored upon proof of improvement.

5. A rating of less than six (6.0) may be increased upon demonstration of corrective measures taken by the Contractor.

6. Additional sheets may be used if necessary.

For assistance in completing this form or for questions, please contact the Division of Aeronautics Chief Airport Construction & Materials Engineer at (217) 785-4282.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Numerical Guidelines** | |
|  | |
| **Quality of Work** | |
| **Quality** - Consider the project’s durability and appearance, the knowledge of the supervisory personnel and compliance with contract requirements (i.e. plans, specifications, field inspection, etc.). | |
| 8.0 | Contractor exceeded project requirements in all areas considered. |
| 7.0 | Contractor exceeded project requirements in a majority of areas considered. |
| 6.0 | Contractor met project requirements in all areas considered. |
| 4.0 | Contractor did not meet project requirements in one area considered. |
| 2.0 | Contractor did not meet project requirements in two or more areas considered. |
|  | |
| **Execution of Work** | |
| **Organization/Prosecution** - Consider the Contractor’s ability to diligently prosecute work by planning and scheduling labor materials and the work of subcontractor’s on a project site. | |
| 8.0 | Contractor exceeded project requirements in all areas considered and completed the project well ahead of schedule. |
| 7.0 | Contractor exceeded project requirements in a majority of areas considered and the project was completed slightly ahead of schedule. |
| 6.0 | Contractor met project requirements in all areas considered and the scheduled completion date was met. |
| 4.0 | Contractor did not meet project requirements within its control in one area considered and occasionally did not work when conditions permitted. The scheduled completion date was met. |
| 2.0 | Contractor did not meet project requirements in two or more areas considered. The scheduled completion date was not met. |
|  | |
| **Cooperation** - Consider the Contractor’s willingness to negotiate contract disputes, respond to reasonable requests by the Resident and respond to various Departmental correspondence. | |
| 8.0 | Contractor exceeded project requirements in all areas considered. |
| 7.0 | Contractor exceeded project requirements in a majority of areas considered. |
| 6.0 | Contractor met project requirements in all areas considered. |
| 4.0 | Contractor did not meet project requirements in one area considered. |
| 2.0 | Contractor did not meet project requirements in two or more areas considered. |
|  | |
| **Traffic Control/Site Protection** - Consider the appearance of the traffic control devices, the response to repair deficient devices and the Contractor’s willingness to comply with the Traffic Control Plan (TCP). | |
| 8.0 | Contractor exceeded project requirements in all areas considered. |
| 7.0 | Contractor exceeded project requirements in a majority of areas considered. |
| 6.0 | Contractor met project requirements in all areas considered. |
| 4.0 | Contractor did not meet project requirements in one area considered. |
| 2.0 | Either the Contractor did not meet project requirements in two or more areas considered or the Contractor committed an act or omission which seriously compromised the safety of the public. |
|  | |
| **EEO/Labor Compliance** - Consider the Contractor’s compliance with the Equal Employment Opportunity program and compliance with the labor laws. | |
| 8.0 | Contractor exceeded project requirements. |
| 7.0 | Contractor met project requirements through extraordinary effort and initiative. |
| 6.0 | Contractor met project requirements with minimum effort and initiative. |
| 4.0 | Contractor met project requirements, but had to be motivated by Department personnel. |
| 2.0 | Contractor did not meet project requirements. |
|  | |
| **Erosion Control** - Consider the Contractor’s compliance with the project’s erosion control plan and all pertinent federal and state laws, permits and regulations. | |
| 8.0 | Contractor exceeded project requirements. |
| 7.0 | Contractor exceeded project requirements in a majority of the areas considered. |
| 6.0 | Contractor met project requirements in all areas. |
| 4.0 | Contractor did not meet project requirements in one area considered. |
| 2.0 | Contractor did not meet contract requirements in two or more areas. |
|  | |
| **QC/QA** – The contractor’s ability to meet QC/QA inspection, testing, and documentation requirements; control of product; take corrective action; and communicate production/construction issues with Department personnel are considered. | |
| 8.0 | Contractor exceeded QC/QA requirements. |
| 7.0 | Contractor exceeded QC/QA requirements in a majority of the areas considered. |
| 6.0 | Contractor met QC/QA requirements in all areas. |
| 4.0 | Contractor did not meet QC/QA requirements in one area considered. |
| 2.0 | Contractor did not meet QC/QA requirements in two or more areas considered. |