

Attachment D

PAST PERFORMANCE (QUESTIONNAIRE) FOR MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL OF 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:	<i>Lobar, Inc.</i>
Project Title and Location:	<i>Shaul Elementary School</i>

Evaluator:

Owner's Name:	<i>Cumberland Valley School District</i>		
Name:	<i>Jose E. Medina</i>	Date:	<i>10/29/09</i>
Phone No:	<i>717-506-3324</i>	Fax No.	<i>717-506-3360</i>
Address:	<i>6746 Carlisle Pike, Mechanicsburg, PA 17050</i>		
Position held of function in relation to project:	<i>Facility Director</i>		
Signature of Evaluator:	<i>Jose E Medina</i>		

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: <input checked="" type="radio"/> E, VG __, S __, M __, U __, N/A __</p> <p>Comments: <i>The project team was always very cooperative and reasonable in any negotiations. Always reached a reasonable agreement. Excellent integrity.</i></p>
<p>2. The relationship between the contractor and the owner's teams.</p> <p>Rating: <input checked="" type="radio"/> E, VG __, S __, M __, U __, N/A __</p> <p>Comments: <i>Lobar's project team communicated that they were interested in performing the work with the best interest of the customer in mind.</i></p>
<p>3. The contractor's on-site management and coordination of subcontractors.</p> <p>Rating: <input checked="" type="radio"/> E, VG __, S __, M __, U __, N/A __</p> <p>Comments: <i>The project progressed smoothly and work arounds were planned and executed to address schedule challenges.</i></p>
<p>4. The contractor's quality control (CQC) system.</p> <p>Rating: E __, VG <input checked="" type="radio"/> S, M __, U __, N/A __</p> <p>Comments: <i>QC was performed by Lobar's project team, including the VP. Field Ops, Project Manager, and full-time Superintendent.</i></p>

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

G.C. - General Contractor

Rating: E VG, S __, M __, U __, N/A __

Comments: Lobar scope as a G.C. was extensive, approx \$11 mil. Most of the work was very good. We have some problems, such as leaks and cracked concrete. Lobar is making efforts to correct these problems under warranty.

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

Rating: E, VG __, S __, M __, U __, N/A __

As G.C., Lobar had schedule responsibilities. Managed several challenges from their subs and other prime contractors. Lobar team contributed to identifying and implementing solutions.

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

Rating: E, VG __, S __, M __, U __, N/A __

Comments: Identified options, implemented schedule revisions and work arounds to keep the project moving forward, assisted owner and architect.

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

Rating: E __, VG __, S, M __, U __, N/A __

Comments: The contractor submitted quite a few change orders that were approved by the architect and owner. The % increase was less than similar, other projects.

9. The contractor's compliance with labor standards.

Rating: E __, VG S, M __, U __, N/A __

Comments: Lobar submitted all required reports and met labor standards. My observations indicated that they have motivated employees.

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

Rating: E, VG __, S __, M __, U __, N/A __

Comments: The project took approx. 1 1/2 yrs involving steel erection, significant road work, and other work related to construction of a new 80,000 sq. ft. building. To the best of my recollection Lobar did not have a reportable accident.

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.

Very good overall. There are some problems that need resolution as stated in #5 above.

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

There are no negative performance ratings - hobar is making efforts to correct leaks and cracked concrete.

15. OVERALL RATING:

Rating: E (VG) S M U N/A Comments:

see comments above.

Additional Comments: