

**ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA  
OFFICE OF THE PURCHASING AGENT**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS NO. 23-DMF-RFP-455**

**ADDENDUM NO. 1**

Arlington County's Request for Proposals No. 23-DMF-RFP-455 for External Financial Audit Services is amended as follows:

**1. VI. Contract Terms and Conditions is hereby changed as follows:**

- a. **1. Contract Documents: ADD:**  
Exhibit C – Contractor Performance Evaluation Form
- b. Contractor Performance Evaluation is hereby incorporated into the Contract Terms and Conditions as follows:

**55. CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

Arlington County will perform written evaluations of the Contractor's performance at various intervals throughout the term of this Contract. The evaluations will address, at a minimum, the Contractor's work/performance, quality, cost controls, schedule, timeliness and sub-contractor management. The Project Officer shall be responsible for completing the evaluations and providing a copy to the Contractor and County Procurement Officer.

- c. **Exhibit C – Contractor Performance Evaluation Form** attached and hereby added to the Contract Terms and Conditions.

The balance of the solicitation remains unchanged.

Arlington County, Virginia  
Tomeka D. Price, VCO, VCA  
Procurement Officer  
[tprice@arlingtonva.us](mailto:tprice@arlingtonva.us)

**RETURN THIS PAGE, FULLY COMPLETED AND SIGNED, WITH YOUR PROPOSAL:  
OFFEROR ACKNOWLEDGES RECEIPT OF ADDENDUM NUMBER 1.**

**FIRM NAME:** \_\_\_\_\_

**AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE:** \_\_\_\_\_ **DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**EXHIBIT C**  
**CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM**

**ARLINGTON COUNTY GOVERNMENT**

Contractor Performance Evaluation Form

Contractor Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Contract No.: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Project/Contract Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Interim Evaluation \_\_\_\_ Final Evaluation \_\_\_\_

Scope of Work/Services Provided:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Contract Start Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ Contract End Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ Actual Completion Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Please rate the effectiveness of the Contractor's performance on the Contract/Project across the following dimensions:

Evaluation Criteria: Unacceptable Poor Satisfactory Excellent

Written comments to explain assigned ratings are required for any performance ratings below "satisfactory" or an "excellent" in any category.

Evaluation Questions

1. Quality of Workmanship

Rate the quality of the Contractor's workmanship. Were there quality-related or workmanship problems on the Contract? Was the Contractor responsive to remedial work required?

\_\_\_\_ Unacceptable      \_\_\_\_ Poor      \_\_\_\_ Satisfactory      \_\_\_\_ Excellent      \_\_\_\_ N/A

2. Problem Solving and Decision Making

Rate the Contractor's ability to provide effective and creative problem solving, coordination and fair decision making on Contract/Project.

\_\_\_\_ Unacceptable      \_\_\_\_ Poor      \_\_\_\_ Satisfactory      \_\_\_\_ Excellent      \_\_\_\_ N/A

3. Project Schedule

Rate the Contractor's performance with regard to adhering to contract schedules. Did the Contractor meet the contract schedule, or the schedule as revised by approved change orders? If not was the delay attributable to the Contractor?

Unacceptable       Poor       Satisfactory       Excellent       N/A

4. Subcontractor Management

Rate the Contractor's ability, effort and success in managing and coordinating subcontractors (if no subcontractors rate the Contractor's overall project management). Was the Contractor able to effectively resolve problems?

Unacceptable       Poor       Satisfactory       Excellent       N/A

5. Safety

Rate the Contractor's safety procedures on this Contract/Project? Were there any OSHA violations or serious safety accidents?

Unacceptable       Poor       Satisfactory       Excellent       N/A

6. Environmental Compliance

Did the Contractor comply with local, state, and federal environmental standards in the performance of the Contract? Did the Contractor comply in good faith with local erosion and sedimentation control requirements and/or any Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan?

Unacceptable       Poor       Satisfactory       Excellent       N/A

7. Change Orders

Did the Contractor unreasonably claim change orders or extras? Were the Contractor's prices on change orders and extra work reasonable?

Unacceptable       Poor       Satisfactory       Excellent       N/A

8. Paperwork Processing

Rate this Contractor's performance in completing and submitting required project paperwork (i.e., change orders, submittal, drawings, invoices, workforce reports, etc.) Did the Contractor submit the required paperwork promptly and in proper form?

Unacceptable       Poor       Satisfactory       Excellent       N/A

9. Supervisory Personnel

Rate the general performance of this Contractor's supervisory personnel. Did they have the knowledge, management skills and experience to run a project of this size and scope?

\_\_\_ Unacceptable      \_\_\_ Poor      \_\_\_ Satisfactory      \_\_\_ Excellent      \_\_\_ N/A

10. Expertise, Knowledge and Experience

Rate this Contractor's personnel. Were they dedicated, experienced and qualified for the duration of project.

\_\_\_ Unacceptable      \_\_\_ Poor      \_\_\_ Satisfactory      \_\_\_ Excellent      \_\_\_ N/A

11. Project/Contract Closeout

Rate the Contractor's performance on timeliness and quality of closeout deliverables such as As-Built Drawings, Operation and Maintenance Manuals, and training. Did the Contractor complete the tasks or Project on schedule; was the punch list completed within the allotted time?

\_\_\_ Unacceptable      \_\_\_ Poor      \_\_\_ Satisfactory      \_\_\_ Excellent      \_\_\_ N/A

12. Level of Overall Performance

\_\_\_ Unacceptable      \_\_\_ Poor      \_\_\_ Satisfactory      \_\_\_ Excellent      \_\_\_ N/A

Based on these comments, would you recommend this Contractor for comparable work in the future?

Yes       No

Please provide any comments regarding the Contractor's performance or the quality of its work. The Contractor can also provide any comments or clarification on the evaluation in the box below.

(Project Officer or Contractor, use additional sheets, if Necessary):

Signatures and Certifications:

1. The information contained in this evaluation form represents, to the best of my knowledge, a true and accurate analysis of the Contractor’s performance record on this Contract; and,
2. The contents on the evaluation form and the ratings were not negotiated with the Contractor or its representative for any reason.

Evaluator’s Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator’s (PjO) Printed Name \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator’s Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Contractor’s signature below acknowledges receipt and the opportunity to respond:

Contractor Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Contractor Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATION RATINGS DEFINITIONS

Rating	Definition	Notes
Excellent	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the County’s benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.	To justify an Exceptional rating, identify multiple significant events and state how they were of benefit to the County. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also, there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.
Satisfactory	Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.	To justify a Satisfactory rating, there should have been only minor problems, or major problems the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract/order. There should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. A fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that contractors will not be evaluated with a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract/order.
Poor	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor’s proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.	To justify poor performance, identify a significant event in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the County. A poor rating should be supported by referencing the management tool that notified the contractor of the contractual deficiency (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental deficiency report or letter).

Unacceptable	Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-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 County. 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, or environmental deficiency reports, or letters).
Not Applicable (N/A)	N/A (not applicable) should be used if the ratings are not going to be applied to a particular area for evaluation.	