

APPENDIX B - LIST OF SUBCONTRACTORS FORM
98995 E-Discovery Software Solution and Implementation

JEA Solicitation Number #98995 requires certain major Subcontractors be listed on this form, unless the work will be self-performed by the Company.

The undersigned understands that failure to submit the required Subcontractor information on this form will result in bid rejection, and the Company agrees to employ the Subcontractors specified below: (Use additional sheets as necessary)

Note: This list of Subcontractors shall not be modified subsequent to bid opening, without a showing of good cause and the written consent of JEA.

Type of Work	Corporate Name of Subcontractor	Subcontractor Primary Contact Person & Telephone Number	Subcontractor's License Number (if applicable)	Percentage of Work or Dollar Amount

Signed: _____

Company: _____

Address: _____

Date: _____

**#98995 Appendix B - Minimum Qualification Form
E-Discovery Software Solution and Implementation**

GENERAL

THE MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS SHALL BE SUBMITTED ON THIS FORM. IN ORDER TO BE CONSIDERED A QUALIFIED BIDDER BY JEA YOU MUST MEET THE MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS LISTED BELOW, AND BE ABLE TO PROVIDE ALL THE SERVICES LISTED IN THIS SOLICITATION.

THE BIDDER MUST COMPLETE THE BIDDER INFORMATION SECTION BELOW AND PROVIDE ANY OTHER INFORMATION OR REFERENCE REQUESTED. THE BIDDER MUST ALSO PROVIDE ANY ATTACHMENTS REQUESTED WITH THIS MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS FORM.

PLEASE SUBMIT THE ORIGINAL AND THREE COPIES OF THIS FORM AND ANY REQUESTED ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION WITH THE BID SUBMISSION.

BIDDER INFORMATION

COMPANY NAME: _____

BUSINESS ADDRESS: _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP CODE: _____

TELEPHONE: _____

FAX: _____

E-MAIL: _____

PRINT NAME OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: _____

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: _____

NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: _____

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS:

- The Respondent shall provide evidence of successful completion of one (1) similar eDiscovery Software Solution contracts within three (3) years of the Response Due Date. A similar contract is defined as being utilized to satisfy public information requests and containing similar complexity as described in this Solicitation.

#98995 Appendix B - Minimum Qualification Form

E-Discovery Software Solution and Implementation

Similar eDiscovery Software Solution CONTRACT 1

Reference Name _____

Reference Phone Number_____

Reference E-Mail Address _____

Contract Year/Amount _____

Was this Contract utilized to satisfy public information requests?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Project Title _____

Address of Work _____

Description of Project _____

[illegible]

The Grid

FINANCE

Newsfeed

OneDrive

Sites

Woyak, Nathan J. - Procurement Category ...

⚙️

?

JEA

THE GRID

Search this site

Contracts



VENDOR PERFORMANCE SCORECARD

The purpose of the JEA Vendor Performance Program is to ensure JEA vendors are successful in the completion of JEA work, and also ensure that JEA receives quality work. A vendor that scores a 1 on any evaluation criteria, or scores an average of less than 2.8 on all evaluation criteria, is considered by JEA to be a deficient performer and may be in default of its contract.

Once a vendor is determined to be a deficient performer, JEA Procurement will schedule a meeting with the corporate officer from the vendor's company, and will review the deficient scorecard with the vendor. During the meeting a performance plan will be agreed upon, and JEA will then re-evaluate the vendor's performance in a certain number of days.

If the vendor's performance does not improve in the agreed upon number of days, the vendor may be provided with a notice that they are in default of the contract, and they risk having their contract terminated for default. A vendor's contract that is terminated for default by JEA, will not be allowed to bid on a JEA project for two (2) years from the date of the termination of default.

JEA Project Manager:

Today's Date:

Project Description*:

Contract Number:

Vendor*:

Solicitation Number:

JEA Procurement Category Manager*:

IT Software

IT SOFTWARE

Cost

Performance Criteria	Rating	Scale				
		1	2	3	4	5
<u>PRICE COMPETITIVENESS</u> Degree to which vendor provides competitive pricing and cost structure relative to other vendors	<input type="text" value="Choose..."/>	Least competitive	Below average competitiveness	Average competitiveness	Above average competitiveness	Most competitive
<u>COST MANAGEMENT</u>	<input type="text" value="Choose..."/>	Far below expectations (less				

Degree to which projects and services are delivered within budget estimates		than 90% of the time)	Below expectations (90% to 94% of the time)	Meets expectations (95% to 97% of the time)	Exceeds expectations (98% to 99% of the time)	Far exceeds expectations (100% of the time)
<u>COST TRANSPARENCY</u>	Choose... ▼					
Degree to which vendor shares cost breakdowns and explains variations on products/services provided		Never shares cost information requested	Occasionally shares cost information requested	Regularly shares cost information requested	Always shares cost information requested	Proactive, Leading edge open book approach to sharing information
<u>IDENTIFICATION OF SAVINGS OPPORTUNITIES</u>	Choose... ▼					
Degree to which vendor adds value by proactively identifying savings opportunities and other lower-cost service alternatives		0 viable opportunities in evaluation period	1 viable opportunity in evaluation period	2 viable opportunities in evaluation period	3 viable opportunities in evaluation period	>3 viable opportunities in evaluation period
<u>SOFT-DOLLAR BENEFITS</u>	Choose... ▼					
Degree to which vendor is willing to provide extra features/services at no additional charge		Never	Sometimes	Usually	Almost always	Every time
COST SCORE: <input type="text"/>	INSERT COMMENT:					
<div></div>						

Delivery and Support

Performance Criteria	Rating	Scale				
		1	2	3	4	5
<u>RESPONSIVENESS</u>	Choose... ▼					
Degree to which vendor responds to our requests in a timely fashion		Far below expectations (less than 75% of the time)	Below expectations (75% to 89% of the time)	Meets expectations (90% to 95% of the time)	Exceeds expectations (96% to 99% of the time)	Far exceeds expectations (100% of the time)
<u>PROBLEM RESOLUTION OWNERSHIP</u>	Choose... ▼					
Degree to which vendor is willing to take ownership of day-to-day issues and problems		Never takes ownership of problem resolution	Sometimes takes ownership of problem resolution	Regularly takes ownership of problem resolution and suggests solutions	Always takes ownership of problem resolution and practices problem avoidance	Always takes ownership; assists in resolving other contractors' problems
<u>APPLICATION SUPPORT</u>	Choose... ▼					
Degree to which vendor resources including helpdesk and/or supporting documentation successfully troubleshoots software issues		Far below expectations (less than 75% of the time)	Below expectations (75% to 89% of the time)	Meets expectations (90% to 95% of the time)	Exceeds expectations (96% to 99% of the time)	Far exceeds expectations (100% of the time)
<u>TIMELY COMMUNICATION</u>	Choose... ▼					
Degree to which vendor provides timely notification of software releases, upgrades, and patches		Far below expectations	Below expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations	Far exceeds expectations
DELIVERY AND SUPPORT SCORE: <input type="text"/>	INSERT COMMENT:					
<div></div>						

Flexibility and Ease of Doing Business

Performance Criteria	Rating	Scale				
		1	2	3	4	5
<u>ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT</u>	Choose... ▼					
Degree to which vendor's account team has established a productive and healthy working relationship		Far below expectations	Below expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations	Far exceeds expectations
<u>INVOICE TIMELINESS</u>	Choose... ▼					
Degree to which vendor provides invoices in a timely manner		Far below expectations (less than 90% of the time)	Below expectations (90% to 94% of the time)	Meets expectations (95% to 97% of the time)	Exceeds expectations (98% to 99% of the time)	Far exceeds expectations (100% of the time)

USEFULNESS OF REPORTING Degree to which reports provided by the vendor contain clear, concise, and actionable information	Choose... ▼	Far below expectations (less than 75% of the time)	Below expectations (75% to 89% of the time)	Meets expectations (90% to 95% of the time)	Exceeds expectations (96% to 99% of the time)	Far exceeds expectations (100% of the time)
RESPONSIVENESS TO CHANGE AND/OR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS Degree to which vendor is able to accommodate software change and/or enhancement requests in a timely manner	Choose... ▼	Far below expectations	Below expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations	Far exceeds expectations
FLEXIBILITY AND EASE SCORE: <input type="text"/>	INSERT COMMENT:					

Partnership and Innovation

Performance Criteria	Rating	1	2	3	4	5
PROVISION OF INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS Degree to which vendor proactively provides valuable, innovative, and on-target solutions	Choose... ▼	Far below expectations	Below expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations	Far exceeds expectations
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT FOCUS vendor's level of commitment and follow-through of vendor relationship management program (e.g. commitment to vendor review meeting, strategy development, and continuous improvement planning)	Choose... ▼	Far below expectations	Below expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations	Far exceeds expectations
BEST PRACTICE TRANSFER Degree to which vendor shares industry best practices and proactively transfers knowledge to our staff	Choose... ▼	Far below expectations	Below expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations	Far exceeds expectations
UNDERSTANDING OF THE BUSINESS Degree to which vendor understands and accurately communicates the nature of our industry and business, leading to relevant business enhancements	Choose... ▼	Far below expectations	Below expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations	Far exceeds expectations
PARTNERSHIP AND INNOVATION SCORE: <input type="text"/>	INSERT COMMENT:					

Quality

Performance Criteria	Rating	1	2	3	4	5
INSTALLATION ACCURACY Degree to which vendor installs software releases, upgrades, and patches in an error-free fashion	Choose... ▼	Far below expectations (less than 75% of the time)	Below expectations (75% to 89% of the time)	Meets expectations (90% to 95% of the time)	Exceeds expectations (96% to 99% of the time)	Far exceeds expectations (100% of the time)
APPLICATION DEFECTS Degree to which incidents/defects/bugs in production environment negatively impact workflow	Choose... ▼	Very high (more than 2 critical incidents or more than 10 non-critical incidents) in evaluation period	High (1 critical or 5-10 non-critical incidents) in evaluation period	Medium (zero critical and less than 5 non-critical incidents) in evaluation period	Low (zero critical and less than 3 non-critical incidents) in evaluation period	Very Low in evaluation period
USER SATISFACTION	Choose... ▼	Below expectations Meets expectations				

Degree to which end users are satisfied with service performance		Far below expectations			Exceeds expectations	Far exceeds expectations
<u>INTEGRATION</u> Degree to which vendor effectively integrates software with existing platforms, when necessary	Choose... ▼	Far below expectations	Below expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations	Far exceeds expectations
<u>TECHNICAL EXPERTISE</u> Degree to which vendor displays leading-edge technical expertise and robust understanding of its own solution offerings	Choose... ▼	Far below expectations	Below expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations	Far exceeds expectations
QUALITY SCORE: <input type="text"/>		INSERT COMMENT: <input type="text"/>				

Risk and Contract Compliance

Performance Criteria	Rating	1	2	Scale	3	4	5
<u>CORPORATE INFORMATION SECURITY AND PRIVACY STANDARDS</u> Degree to which vendor personnel are aware of and comply with corporate information security and privacy standards	Choose... ▼	Never complies	Sometimes complies	Regularly complies	Always complies	Always complies and acts as advocate	
<u>vendor FINANCIAL VIABILITY</u> Degree to which vendor is financially viable	Choose... ▼	Significant Risk	High Risk	Medium Risk	Low Risk	No Risk- Stable	
RISK AND COMPLIANCE SCORE: <input type="text"/>		INSERT COMMENT: <input type="text"/>					

Environmental Stewardship

Performance Criteria	Rating	1	2	Scale	3	4	5
<u>COMPLIANCE WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS AND PERMIT REQUIREMENTS</u> Measure of how contractor complies with environmental issues related to the job sites with regards, to wetlands, stormwater compliance, dewatering, etc.	Choose... ▼	Never complies	Sometimes complies	Regularly complies	Always complies	Always complies and acts as advocate	
ENVIRONMENTAL SCORE: <input type="text"/>		INSERT COMMENT: <input type="text"/>					

JSEB Compliance

Performance Criteria	Rating	1	2	Scale	3	4	5
<u>JSEB COMPLIANCE</u>	Choose... ▼	Far Below Expectations - Less	Below Expectations -70% - 99%	Meets Expectations -	Exceeds Expectations -	Far Exceeds Expectations -	

Measure of vendor's compliance with JSEB program commitment, its intent and achievement goals	than 70% compliance with established JSEB goal and minimal to no JSEB spend reports were submitted to JEA's JSEB Manager	compliance with established JSEB goal, with some JSEB spend reports submitted to JEA's JSEB Manager	100% of JSEB goal met, with supporting JSEB spend reports submitted to JEA's JSEB Manager	Greater than 100% of JSEB goal met, with supporting JSEB spend reports submitted to JEA's JSEB Manager	Greater than 100% of JSEB goal met and JSEB spend reports were submitted timely to JEA's JSEB Manager
JSEB COMPLIANCE SCORE: <input type="text"/>		INSERT COMMENT:			
<div></div>					

Safety

Performance Criteria	Rating	Scale				
		1	2	3	4	5
<u>TIMELINESS</u> Measure of how well the vendor adheres to schedule and meets due dates	Choose... <input type="button" value="v"/>	Rarely on Schedule Few or no due dates met; little or no sense of urgency; little or no use of a scheduling process; more than 20% behind schedule and delay is attributable to vendor performance	Inconsistently on Schedule 10% to 20% behind schedule and delay is attributed to vendor performance; some sense of urgency, but little effective action; some use of a scheduling process	Usually on Schedule Demonstrated sense of urgency and commitment to a schedule; less than 10% over/under schedule, adjusting for change orders; no portion of delay is attributed to vendor performance; regularly utilized a schedule system and communicates progress	Consistently on Schedule Proactive in identifying schedule-related issues; scheduling/planning processes formalized; where being ahead of schedule is beneficial to JEA, work was more than 10% but less than 20% ahead of schedule, adjusting for change orders	Always on Schedule Met all due dates, including interim steps; proactive in identifying and resolving schedule-related issues; scheduling/planning processes formalized and integrated into aspects of the work; where being ahead of schedule is beneficial to JEA, work was more than 20% ahead of schedule, adjusting for change orders
<u>RESPONSIVENESS</u> Measure of how well the vendor responds to on-call requests as specified in the contract	Choose... <input type="button" value="v"/>	Poor Responsiveness Did not respond according to specifications; little or no use of a call-tracking system; no sense of urgency	Fair Responsiveness Only sometimes responded according to specifications; some semblance of a call-tracking system with some follow-up; some sense of urgency, but little effective action	Good Responsiveness Demonstrated sense of urgency and commitment to providing good service; regularly utilizes call-tracking system to monitor service; usually responded according to specifications	Very Good Responsiveness Consistently responded according to specifications; proactively identified response-related issues	Excellent Responsiveness Always responded according to specifications; call-tracking and work-management processes documented and used to manage all portions of work; proactively identified and resolved response-related issues
<u>CUSTOMER SERVICE</u> Measure of customer service orientation of vendor to JEA and other agencies involved in the work as demonstrated through courtesy and cooperation, credibility and adequacy of communications, reliability of stated actions and flexibility	Choose... <input type="button" value="v"/>	Poor Customer Service Demonstrated little or no courtesy or cooperation with others; inflexible to changing conditions; little or no regard for serving JEA; little or no useful communication; unreliable in meeting commitments	Customer Service Needs Improvement Some effective communication, but could be improved; some issues relating to cooperation with others; some issues that could have been more easily resolved had vendor been more flexible; sometimes did not follow through to ensure commitments made were met	Good Customer Service Cooperative and courteous; demonstrated intent to be flexible to JEA needs; met commitments made; timely and useful communication	Very Good Customer Service Consistently cooperative and courteous; met all commitments made to JEA and other agencies; very flexible in handling day-to-day issues; very good communication and coordination	Exceptional Customer Service Always a can-do approach to business and extremely flexible to JEA needs; always courteous and cooperative; formal processes for providing updates and other useful communication; excellent verbal/written communications; proactively seeks ways to better serve JEA
INSERT COMMENT:						

SAFETY SCORE:

PLEASE INCLUDE SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION (IF AVAILABLE):

[Click here to attach a file](#)

EMAIL ADDRESS OF VENDOR RECIPIENT TO RECEIVE COPY:

MINIMUM SCORE:

AVERAGE SCORE:

****NOTE: Will not submit unless all scores are filled out (or marked NA).**



Personnel Risk Assessment Review Process Contractors – CIP, FACTA & HIPAA

ORIGINATION DATE:
November 25, 2015

REVISION DATE: February 23, 2017

Purpose:

The purpose of this document is to detail the process used to ensure Contract personnel who require access to information and resources covered by NERC CIP (CIP-004 R3), FACTA (Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act), and HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act) regulations meet JEA and regulatory standards.

Review Process:

The Review Process applies to Contractors who require access to information or resources covered by NERC CIP, FACTA, or HIPAA. These individuals can be categorized as:

- New Contract personnel being placed in impacted positions,
- Contract personnel transferring to impacted positions,
- Contract personnel requesting new access, and
- Contract personnel with NERC CIP access (NERC CIP requires these positions to have a background check every 7 years (CIP 004 R3)).

The Evaluation Criteria detailed in the chart below is used to evaluate each individual. It was established to set guidelines to evaluate Personnel Risk Assessments (PRA) (aka background checks), ensures the minimum criteria for access is met, and is required by CIP 004 R3.3. The evaluation is split into three sections:

1. Section A – Identity Verification (CIP 004 R3.1)
2. Section B – Criminal History Records Check (CIP 004 R3.2)
3. Section C – Criminal Flags

The PRA Contractor Evaluation Form is provided to the Contractor by the Hiring Manager for completion. The Contractor provides the following to Talent Acquisition Services:

- Completed PRA Contractor Evaluation Form
- Substantive Evidence (i.e. Redacted PRA or PRA Receipt)¹

¹ Proper methods of data redaction ensure the redacted data and/or metadata and elements are removed and non-recoverable. Information remaining on background check and background check receipt must be sufficient enough that the background check can be verified belonging to the individual



Personnel Risk Assessment Review Process Contractors – CIP, FACTA & HIPAA

ORIGINATION DATE:
November 25, 2015

REVISION DATE: February 23, 2017

- If criminal flags are identified a redacted PRA must be provided.

In cases where the contractor is unable to process a background check, Talent Acquisition Services provides a third party contact who can process the check for them or sends a link to the Contractor in order to process the background check directly. Once the information is received the PRA Contractor Evaluation Form is completed.

The PRA Contractor Evaluation Form is used to document the results of the review. If criminal flags are discovered or a full 7 year background check cannot be performed, a determination will be made by Talent Acquisition Services or the Chief of the hiring department which action should be taken. All issues and decisions should be documented on the PRA Contractor Evaluation Form in order to clearly record the results and decisions made.

- The Evaluation Form will be signed by all reviewers, which may include the Final Reviewer, and Chief of the hiring department.
- A Chief's signature is required if a criminal flag was noted and it is determine the contractor will still be engaged.

The PRA and forms will be stored and destroyed securely, in accordance with JEA's Document Retention Schedule and applicable laws.

Adverse Action

In order to comply with the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), prior to an adverse action being taken by JEA a notice will be provided to the Contractor. For Contract personnel the contractor is responsible for the adverse action requirements.

Review Criteria:

SECTION	POSITION REQUIRING	CRITERIA
A – Identity Verification	C-Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) OR F-Fair and Accurate Credit Transaction Act (FACTA)	The identity of the individual will be verified using available means, which may include USCIS I-9 List of Acceptable Documents (one selection from List A, or a combination of one selection from List B and one selection from List C). (CIP 004 R3.1)

and the date the background check was conducted. If any criminal flags are identified a redacted background check must be provided.



Personnel Risk Assessment Review Process Contractors – CIP, FACTA & HIPAA

ORIGINATION DATE:
November 25, 2015

REVISION DATE: February 23, 2017

	OR H-Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)	
B – Criminal History Records Check	C-Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP)	<p>Check must include a Federal, State, and County criminal records search for a minimum of 7 years. If it is not possible to perform a full seven year criminal history records check, conduct as much of the 7 year criminal records check as possible and document the reason the full seven year criminal history records check could not be performed in the notes section of the PRA Evaluation Form (CIP 004 R3.2). The Check must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Residence, regardless of duration. (CIP 004 R3.2.1) • Other locations where, during the seven years immediately prior to the date of the criminal history records check, the subject has resided for six consecutive months or more. (CIP 004 R3.2.2)
C – Criminal Flags for CIP or FACTA Access	C-Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) OR F-Fair and Accurate Credit Transaction Act (FACTA) OR H-Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arson and Criminal Mischief ≥ \$1000 (C, F & H) • Blackmail (C, F & H) • Bribery (C, F & H) • Criminal Impersonation (C, F & H) • Cyber Crimes (FL Statue 815) (C, F & H) • Data Fraud (C, F & H) • Extortion (C, F & H) • Florida Communications Fraud Act (FL Statute 817.034) (C, F & H) • Forgery (C, F & H) • Sabotage (C, F & H) • US Watch List (FBI TSC List, OFAC, etc.) (C, F & H) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bad Checks (F & H) • Counterfeiting (F & H) • Credit Card Fraud (F & H) • Criminal Use of Personal Identifying Information (FL Statute 817.568) (F & H) • Embezzlement (F & H)



Personnel Risk Assessment Review Process Contractors – CIP, FACTA & HIPAA

ORIGINATION DATE:
November 25, 2015

REVISION DATE: February 23, 2017

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fraud (FL Statute 817) (F & H) • Identity Theft (F & H) • Wire Fraud (F & H)
--	--	--

Retention

Contractors must retain evidence demonstrating the completion of the background check for a period of 10 years from the date of completion. JEA must follow Florida record retention requirements refer to Section 7.4 of Screening Personnel Risk Assessments procedure.

Revision #	Date	Description	Revised By	Approval
0	11/25/2015	New version creation for compliance with CIP V5 and other regulatory requirements.	KLE	PM
1	9/22/2016	Revision, minor corrections, emails, title.	KMD	DM
2	10/20/2016	Annual Review	KLE	DM
3	2/23/2017	Minor updates	KLE	SL

PRA Contractor Evaluation Form
Contractor Background Check Attestation

JEA Contact Name: _____
JEA Contact Phone No: _____
JEA Contact E-mail: _____

In order to ensure the security of JEA's systems and facilities a background check must be conducted for contractors prior to access being granted to sensitive systems and applications. An updated background check is required every 7 years for contractors with access to these systems. **Please complete the below form and send the completed copy with substantive evidence (i.e. redacted background check or background check receipt)¹ to recsel@jea.com. The evidence of background check must be retained for 10 years by Contractors². Any questions can be addressed to your JEA contact.**

Date of Evaluation:	_____	Date Background Check:	_____
Position:	_____	Contractor Full Name:	_____
Begin on JEA Acct:	_____	End Date or Ongoing:	_____
Contract Manager:	_____	Contract Manager Phone:	_____

Section A – Identity Verification

The identity of the individual must be confirmed. The USCIS I-9 List of Acceptable Documents may be used (one selection from List A, or a combination of one selection from List B and one selection from List C may be used). Means used to verify identify must be listed below.

Identity Verified: Yes or No (circle one)

Method used to verify person's identity? _____

Section B – Criminal History Records Check

The criminal history records check (aka background check) must include a Federal, State, and County criminal records search for a minimum of 7 years , including: current residence regardless of duration, and locations where the individual has resided for at least 6 months. If it is not possible to perform a full seven year criminal history records check, conduct as much of the 7 year criminal records check as possible and document the reason the full seven year criminal history records check could not be performed in the notes section. (CIP 004 R3.2)

Full 7 year criminal records check available (Federal and State): Yes or No (circle one)

Criminal Records check performed, including Current Residence: Yes or No (circle one)

Criminal Records check performed, including Other Locations of residence in past 7 years: Yes or No (circle one)

Method used & List States Checked : _____

Notes: (Please explain) _____

¹ Proper methods of data redaction ensure the redacted data and/or metadata and elements are removed and non-recoverable. Information remaining on background check and background check receipt must be sufficient enough that the background check can be verified belonging to the individual and the date the background check was conducted. If any criminal flags are identified a redacted background check must be provided.

² JEA must follow Florida General Records Schedule. Refer to Screening Personnel Risk Assessments Procedure Section 7.4 for requirement.

Section C – Criminal Flags

Note any convictions identified on background check. Also you must verify the contractor is not on the US Government Watch List.

Convictions Identified: Yes or No (circle one)

On US Government Watch List (OFAC, FBI Terrorist Watch List): Yes or No (circle one)

List All Convictions identified:

Notes: (Please explain)

Attesting Party's Signature:

By signing below I attest the information above is accurate.

Name, Title, & Contact No.:

Company Name:

Signature:

Date Completed:

_(Area below to be completed by JEA)

Reviewers' Signatures:

Chief of Department: (required if exception was made)

Name:

Signature:

Date Reviewed:

Reason for exception:

Final Reviewer: (always required)

Name & Title:

Signature:

Date Reviewed: