

Print Close

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY / SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 2.101, 3.104, AND 42.1503

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORT (CPAR)

INCOMPLETE-DRAFTED

Construction

Name/Address of Contractor:

Company Name: [REDACTED]

Division Name:

Street Address: [REDACTED]

City: [REDACTED]

State/Province: [REDACTED]

Country: USA

CAGE Code:

DUNS Number: [REDACTED]

PSC [REDACTED] NAICS Code: [REDACTED]

Evaluation Type: Final

Contract Percent Complete:

Period of Performance Being Assessed: [REDACTED]

Contract Number: [REDACTED] Business Sector & Sub-Sector: Construction

Contracting Office: W074 ENDIST JACKSNVLE Contracting Officer: [REDACTED] Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Location of Work:

[REDACTED]

Award Date: [REDACTED] Effective Date: [REDACTED]

Completion Date: [REDACTED] Estimated/Actual Completion Date: [REDACTED]

Total Dollar Value: [REDACTED] Current Contract Dollar Value: [REDACTED]

Complexity: Medium Termination Type: None

Competition Type: Full and Open Competition after Exclusion of Sources Contract Type: Firm Fixed Price

Key Subcontractors and Effort Performed:

DUNS:

Effort:

DUNS:

Effort:

DUNS:

Effort:

Project Number: [REDACTED]

Project Title:

[REDACTED]

Contract Effort Description:

[REDACTED]

Small Business Subcontracting:

Does this contract include a subcontracting plan? No

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY / SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 2.101, 3.104, AND 42.1503

Date of last Individual Subcontracting Report (ISR) / Summary Subcontracting Report (SSR): N/A

Evaluation Areas	Past Rating	Rating
Quality:	N/A	Very Good
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
(1) ADEQUACY OF SAFETY PLAN:		Satisfactory
(2) IMPLEMENTATION OF SAFETY PLAN:		Satisfactory
(3) CORRECTION OF NOTED DEFICIENCIES:		Very Good

Variance (Contract to Date):

Current Cost Variance (%): Variance at Completion (%):

Current Schedule Variance (%):

Assessing Official Comments:

QUALITY: a. Quality of Workmanship ? Very Good

The Contractor's team constructed the project according to the plans and specifications, and all dredge areas were accepted by the Government with no setbacks. [REDACTED] onsite staff was very proficient with their dredging equipment and was very diligent with collection of quality control soundings to ensure they were digging to grade. Additionally, they had a 3rd party surveyor conduct hydro-surveys prior to Government surveys. Accordingly, there were no quality problems related to the dredging. At the fill site, they had a professional surveyor prepare the layout for the fill template and met the lines and grades required. Following a storm event, [REDACTED] crew at the fill site did not hesitate to re-grade and re-dress the entire fill area that was disturbed by the storm, even though it required considerable effort over several days.

b. Adequacy of the CQC Plan ? Satisfactory

The Contractor's submitted Quality Control Plan met all the requirements of Specification Section 01 45.

c. Implementation of the CQC Plan ? Satisfactory

The Contractor's CQC program was effective at implementation of QCS and the specifications. QC reports were prepared timely. Effective preparatory and initial phase meetings were conducted and testing was conducted as required.

d. Quality of QC Documentation ?Very Good

All quality control documentation was completed in a timely manner. QC reports were submitted daily and on time with virtually no exceptions. Hard copies contained daily environmental logs, dredge logs, and turbidity reports. QC notes, meeting agenda, and minutes contained quantitative information. Southwind was very effective at addressing any comments received by the Government on any of their QC documentation. In particular they developed excellent templates for the mapping required for their turbidity reports, which resolved numerous questions related to boundaries of Outstanding Florida Waters and the sample locations.

e. Adequacy of Submittals ? Satisfactory

All submittals that were applicable were received and the submittal register was completed.

f. Adequacy of Testing ? Satisfactory

The Contractor's performed the required testing as required in Specification Section 01 57 25 and was accepted with the initial review.

g. Identification/Correction of deficiency works in a timely manner- Very Good

Multiple Deficiencies were noted by the QC Manager/SSHO and corrected in timely manner according to the deficiencies log. Deficiencies were corrected within a few days without further instruction from the QAR.

[REDACTED]



FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY / SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 2.101, 3.104, AND 42.1503

c. Correction of Noted Deficiencies : Very Good

The SSO was very detailed in his identification of deficiencies and tracking them until correction. Most deficiencies were corrected within a few days; notice and without instruction from the QAR.

RECOMMENDATION:

Given what I know today about the contractor's ability to perform in accordance with this contract or order's most significant requirements, I would recommend them for similar requirements in the future.

[Redacted signature block]

Contractor Comments:

Name and Title of Contractor Representative:

Name:

Title:

Phone Number: Email Address:

Date:

Review by Reviewing Official:

Name and Title of Reviewing Official:

Name:

Title:

Organization:

Phone Number: Email Address:

Date:

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

