

**Attachment B**

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CONTRACTOR'S EXPERIENCE IN RELEVANT PROJECTS  
SOLICITATION NUMBER W912DR-09-R-0121

The contractor identified below has made an offer for the award of a contract by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, in response to the referenced solicitation. This is a request for information about the past performance of the offeror, which the offeror has identified as being relevant to the referenced solicitation. The information provided below will be used in the evaluation of the offeror's past performance. The information, once submitted by the offeror, will be treated confidentially and will not be released. It will be used only to evaluate this offeror for the referenced solicitation. If the project described below was a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or U.S. Navy project, please submit the SF-1420 evaluation form in lieu of this form.

Information may be typed or legibly handwritten in ink.

Please evaluate the project performance for which the contractor was solely responsible. Do not allow factors beyond the control of the contractor, which resulted in performance delays or other problems, to affect the evaluation of the contractor's performance.

Past Project Information:

Contractor: <u>LOBAR, INC.</u>
Project Title and Location: <u>GUIDED MISSILE FACILITY</u>

Evaluator: WILLIAM WERNTOES

Owner's Name: <u>LETTICKENNY ARMY DEPOT</u>
Name: _____ Date: <u>28 OCT 09</u>
Phone No: <u>717-770-7512</u> Fax No. <u>717-770-7660</u>
Address: <u>284 'J' AVE, NEW CUMBERLAND, PA 17070</u>
Position held of function in relation to project: <u>PROJECT ENGINEER</u>
Signature of Evaluator: <u>William H. Werntoes</u>

The following is a definition of the rating system used:

Exceptional: Performance met contractual requirements and exceeded many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.

Very Good: Performance met contractual requirements and exceeded some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.

Satisfactory: Performance met contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contained some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were satisfactory.

Marginal: Performance did not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflected a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet

identified correction actions. The contractor's proposed actions were only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.

Unsatisfactory: Performance did not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contained serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions were not effective.

Ratings: In completing this questionnaire, please circle a letter corresponding to your rating, or N/A if you are unable to provide an evaluation:

E=Exceptional, VG=Very Good, S=Satisfactory, M=Marginal, U=Unsatisfactory

Please provide clear and concise narrative explanations (both positive and negative) for your answers. This is especially important for any rating above or below satisfactory.

Please rate and provide any supporting information for the following: (Use additional sheets as needed.).

<p>1. The contractor's overall corporate management, integrity, reasonableness, and cooperative conduct.</p> <p>Rating: E <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>, VG ____, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A __</p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>2. The relationship between the contractor and the owner's teams.</p> <p>Rating: E <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>, VG ____, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A __</p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>3. The contractor's on-site management and coordination of subcontractors.</p> <p>Rating: E <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>, VG ____, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A __</p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>4. The contractor's quality control (CQC) system.</p> <p>Rating: E ____, VG <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>, S ____, M ____, U ____, N/A __</p> <p>Comments:</p>

5. The contractor's performance on delivery of quality work.

Rating: E , VG \_\_, S \_\_, M \_\_, U \_\_, N/A \_\_

Comments:

6. The contractor's ability to meet the performance schedule.

Rating: E \_\_, VG , S \_\_, M \_\_, U \_\_, N/A \_\_

Comments:

7. What did the contractor do to improve schedule problems.

Rating: E \_\_, VG \_\_, S , M \_\_, U \_\_, N/A \_\_

Comments:

8. The contractor's ability to provide the required work at a reasonable total price.

Rating: E , VG \_\_, S \_\_, M \_\_, U \_\_, N/A \_\_

Comments:

9. The contractor's compliance with labor standards.

Rating: E , VG \_\_, S \_\_, M \_\_, U \_\_, N/A \_\_

Comments:

10. The contractor's compliance with safety standards and/or number of incidents.

Rating: E , VG \_\_, S \_\_, M \_\_, U \_\_, N/A \_\_

Comments:

11. Did the contractor receive any of the following: Cure Notices; Show Cause; Letters of Reprimand; Suspension of Payments; or Termination? If Yes, please explain.

No

12. Would you award another contract to this contractor? In no, please explain.

YES

13. Customer satisfaction with end product.

EXTREMELY SATISFIED

14. Was the contractor been provided with an opportunity to discuss any negative performance ratings? If so, what were the results?

N/A

15. OVERALL RATING:

Rating: E , VG \_\_, S \_\_, M \_\_, U \_\_, N/A \_\_ Comments:

Additional Comments:

FAIR, REASONABLE, RESPONSIVE, RESPONSIBLE, CO-OPERATIVE