GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE REPORT

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 75
BASF-

RATING FACTORS	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT
A. QUALITY OF WORK				
1. Workmanship & Methods of Construction	Numerous instances of unacceptable work which had to be redone. Had to continually inspect all aspects of work to insure acceptable standards. Work crews demonstrated low level of skill.	Several instances of unacceptable work which had to be redone. Regular inspection program had to be maintained. Acceptable level of skill demonstrated by work crews.	All work performed satisfactorily with little or none having to be redone. Spot inspections all that was required to insure satisfactory standards. Work crews demonstrated good level of skill.	All work performed with high degrees of skill & in workmanlike manner. Inspections revealed no instances of less than satisfactory work.
2. Compliance with specifications	Contractor violated specifications every chance he had. Continual battle to obtain compliance.	The contractor adequately complied with the specifications but required close supervision by the inspectors.	The contractor accepted the specification requirement as a binding obligation and substantially complied. No particular problem.	The contractor took pride in his work and performed all phases of construction in accordance with the intent of the specifications.
3. Appearance of completed work	Barely acceptable after extensive corrective measures.	Appearance fair, but does not exhibit pride in finish work.	Appearance good, but lacks the excellence of that little extra attention.	All lines neat and true and finished surfaces pleasing to the eye.
B. JOB CONTROL				
1. Planning and progress	Failed to meet completion dates due to contractor's own lack of planning. Did not respond to orders or requests to expedite work.	Met completion dates including any approved extensions of time. Could have arranged work a little better. Several good days did not work full force.	Met completion dates including any approved extensions of time. Work carried on in logical sequence fairly close to proposed work schedules. Worked most days conditions permitted.	Completed work ahead of schedule. All phases of work planned and discussed with resident engineer well in advance of actual construction. Worked every day conditions permitted.
2. Job appearance during construction	The contractor had complete disregard for the appearance of the jobs during construction	The contractor periodically checked areas for appearance. No reasonable complaints received.	The contractor consistently kept construction areas in a satisfactory condition. Reasonably neat and free of debris.	The contractor was conscious of the job appearances at all times and made an extra effort to keep the contract areas neat and free of unsightly debris and storage areas.

RATING FACTORS	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT
C. ORGANIZATION				
1. Experience and ability of supervisory personnel	Supervisory personnel lack experience and ability to satisfactorily supervise the work.	Most supervisory personnel qualified to perform their jobs. Jobs need close State supervision and a little technical help here and there but overall the supervisory personnel are satisfactory.	All supervisory personnel well qualified for their jobs. Could use a little more foresight and judgment in some instances but overall, very capable.	All supervisory personnel have excellent training and experience for the work they supervise. Know all the construction techniques and foresee all the problems and solutions well in advance. Proper supervision on the jobs all of the time.
2. Cooperative attitude	Continual disagreement with contractor. Several instances were referred to higher authority for decision.	With a little pressure now and then and a few arguments, agreement and cooperation were satisfactory.	Contractor was generally cooperative. No real arguments but a few differences of opinion had to be ironed out. Once understanding was reached things were fairly smooth.	Contractor was most cooperative with the resident engineer in regard to specification requirements and all reasonable requests as well as with other contractors in the area - no problems.
3. Submission of administrative data and reports	Very slow on submitting administrative data. Disregarded letters requesting same. Data not accurate when received.	Contractor had to be reminded often that reports were overdue. Slow getting all releases and final papers in.	Administrative data and reports were submitted without any undue delay and were satisfactorily prepared.	Administrative data and reports were submitted on time and were prepared thoroughly and correctly.
D. SAFETY				
1. Safety attitude or supervisory personnel	No forethought about safety. Refused to implement any safety steps that might cost either time or money.	Supervisors think about safety - but frequently lose sight of it when involved in actual work.	Each supervisor was on his own to watch for and correct safety hazards. Some supervisors were fairly safety minded - others were somewhat lax.	It was obvious that the contractor wanted a good safety record. Supervisors were alert to obvious safety hazards and took steps on their own for correction.

RATING FACTORS	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT
D. SAFETY				
2. Job accident record	Several serious accidents resulting in extensive lost time, permanent disability or fatalities.	One or more serious accidents resulting in extensive lost time, permanent disability or fatality.	No fatal or permanently disabling accidents. Possibly a few minor lost time injuries.	No accidents causing "lost time" injuries involving either contractor's employees or traveling public.
3. Adequacy of signs and barricades	Provided signs and barricades when demanded. Barricades and lights poorly maintained. Continually attempting to operate without adequate protection.	All signs and barricades furnished in accordance with specification requirements. A little lax on protection for some portions of the job. Barricades and lights not always well maintained as work progresses.	All signs and barricades were provided in accordance with specification requirements. Made an honest effort to provide adequate protection for workmen. Some warning devices left in place when no longer needed.	All signs and barricades were kept in first class condition, properly placed, clean, well lighted and attended.
4. Compliance with BWC Safety Regulations	Daily infractions with no attempt to correct and enforce requires constant supervision. No contractor representative present. Had to stop work.	Complied only when BWC Safety/Constr. man present or when BWC Insurance Rep. at site. Infractions corrected after letters and meetings.	Most men wearing safety equipment. Infractions corrected next day. OSHA regs. observed to a good degree. Few warnings required.	Safety representative on job. Safety meetings with workers. Few or no infractions-corrected immediately with excellent cooperation with BWC. Neat and clean jobsite. Good compliance with OSHA regulations.
E. EQUIPMENT				
1. Condition and quantity of equipment	Insufficient equipment to do the work in time limit. Equipment in poor state of repair.	Barely enough equipment to do the job. Several cases of shutdown due to machine failure. No standby equipment.	Sufficient equipment to do the job. A few breakdowns. Equipment mostly dependable and met specifications.	Ample equipment in first class working condition, standby equipment on the job to fill in in case of emergency or breakdown. Equipment easily met specifications.
2. Proper use of equipment	Numerous instances of makeshift use of equipment resulting in poor quality of work and poor progress.	Several incidents of makeshift use of equipment. Proper adjustment and operation of equipment would have helped considerably.	Always had the right equipment for the job, usually in fair adjustment. Operators were better than average.	Always had the right equipment for the job and the personnel knew how to adjust, adapt, and operate the equipment for best performance.