

ATTACHMENT J-0200000-07

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

MEMORANDUM FOR PAST PERFORMANCE REFERENCES

FROM: Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Mid-Atlantic Division
Facilities Support Contracts
9742 Maryland Avenue
Norfolk, Virginia 23511-3095

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION FOR SOLICITATION
N40085-06-R-1193, REGIONAL CONTRACT FOR LEAD, ASBESTOS, TCLP, AND PCB SAMPLING
AND TESTING, HAMPTON ROADS, VA

1. This Command is in the process of selecting Contractors for an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity type procurement for the services identified above. In our proposal instructions to Offerors in Section L, we requested the Offeror forward this letter and past performance questionnaire to points of contact for projects they submitted on the Past Performance/Corporate Experience Form. One of our award criteria includes the evaluation of the offeror's past performance on prior or current contracts. It is for that purpose that your comments are solicited on the attached Questionnaire.
2. Please have the questionnaire completed by the person(s) most familiar with the Offeror's performance on subject contract. This should be a joint endeavor between the Contracting Officer and customers in the process. Your candid response to the questions is important to our evaluation effort and may affect the award outcome. Please note a neutral rating for questions not applicable to work performed on your contracting action.
3. Your personal attention to this matter would be greatly appreciated. Please submit the Past Performance Questionnaire directly to Lynn M. Tanno at email: lynn.tanno@navy.mil or fax to 757-322-4611 no later than the due date of the solicitation. The Offeror will provide the exact date questionnaires are due in their cover letter to you. Do not send the Past Performance Questionnaire to the Offeror. This questionnaire relates to an ongoing source selection and it will be considered Source Selection Sensitive Information in accordance with FAR 3.104. No information will be released outside of the Source Selection Evaluation Organization.
4. Please do not hesitate to call our office if you have any questions regarding the questionnaire. If additional information is required, please contact Lynn M. Tanno at 757-322-8290. Responses may be submitted to this office as indicated on the Offeror's cover for this questionnaire. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

DAWN CAIL
Contracting Officer

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR SOLICITATION N40085-06-R-1193

CONTRACT INFORMATION: (Offeror completes this section only)

- A. Offeror: GeoEnvironmental Resources, Inc.
- B. Contract Number: N62470-04-B-4042
Status: Active Completed:
- C. Project Title: FY'06 MCON Projects P-985 & P-986 V-22 Gearbox Repair and Test Facilities Location: NAD Cherry Point, NC
- D. Original Award Amount: Subcontractor \$23,000 Final Amount: \$23,000
- E. Award Date: May 2005 CCD (Original): CCD (Final):
- F. Project Description: Performed hazardous materials (asbestos, paint: lead, cadmium, & chromium, TCLP and PCB) investigation, sampling and testing for expected demolition of Building 421, 4057 and F-402. Work was performed in accordance with NAVFAC guidelines. Prepared a detailed report of our findings and cost estimates for removal. Bid documents included technical specifications and contract drawing preparation.

RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION (NOT TO BE RELEASED OUTSIDE GOVERNMENT)

- A. Name: Mr. Richard Corner
- B. Title: Project Manager
- C. Phone Number: 490-9048
- D. Email: RichardC@hbaonline.com
- E. Date questionnaire was completed: April 2, 2007

Questionnaire may be sent by the following methods (email is the preferred method):

Email: lynn.tanno@navy.mil
Fax: 757-322-4611

OFFEROR RATING

1. In this section of the questionnaire you are asked to rate the Offeror. Please indicate the rating that best applies. If you wish to elaborate on any of your answers, please provide comments at the end of this section. If more space is needed, continue your comments on a separate sheet of paper and attach it to this questionnaire prior to submitting it to Lynn M. Tanno at email: lynn.tanno@navy.mil or FAX 757-322-4611.
2. You are urged to supplement your own knowledge of the Contractor's performance with the judgment of others in your organization. Any marginal ratings should be supplemented with an explanatory narrative in the remarks block of this survey.
3. ONCE COMPLETED, THIS SURVEY WILL BE CONSIDERED SOURCE SELECTION SENSITIVE IN ACCORDANCE WITH FAR PART 3.104.
4. The following definitions are applicable rating levels for the Contractor's performance:

(E) Excellent/High Confidence	Based on the offeror's performance record, essentially no doubt exists that the offeror has/will successfully perform the required effort.
(G) Good/Significant Confidence	Based on the offeror's performance record, little doubt exists that the offeror has/will successfully perform the required effort.
(S) Satisfactory/Confidence	Based on the offeror's performance record, some doubt exists that the offeror has/will successfully perform the required effort.
(N) Neutral/Unknown Confidence	No performance record identifiable.
(M) Marginal/Little Confidence	Based on the offeror's performance record, substantial doubt exists that the offeror has/will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve the contract requirements.
(P) Poor/No Confidence	Based on the offeror's performance record, extreme doubt exists that the offeror has/will successfully perform the required effort.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
N40085-06-R-1193
COMPANY REFERENCES

1. Rate the Offeror's ability to effectively manage and control multiple projects E G S N M P
2. How effective was on-site management? E G S N M P
3. Was the Offeror timely in submission of schedules, reports, and other submittals? E G S N M P
4. Rate the Offeror's overall responsiveness in terms of quality & workmanship E G S N M P
5. How successful was the completion of the project? E G S N M P
6. How would you rate the Offeror's responsiveness towards safety issues? E G S N M P
7. How would you rate the Offeror's ability to effectively deal with the customer and other Government personnel?: E G S N M P
8. Was the offeror cooperative in solving problems & negotiating changes? YES NO
9. Did the Offeror stay on schedule & meet the completion date? YES NO
10. Did the Offeror encounter any financial difficulties on your contract, i.e., payment of subcontractors, labor disputes, bonding? YES NO
(if yes, please explain)
11. Rate the Offeror's overall performance for your project E G S N M P

Comments: G.E.R. has worked with HBA over the past 5 years on DOD projects and has consistently out-performed any other Geotechnical/ HAZMAT investigation consultant currently or formerly retained by our office. HBA would not consider using another consultant for its DOD workload. Our DOD clients and structural engineering consultants appreciate G.E.R.'s service and professionalism. G.E.R. constantly remains aware of changes in the regulatory environment that influences spec preparation. G.E.R. also observes demolition, construction and abatement in the field, and has developed keen experience for solutions, constructability, and cost estimating. Key individuals employed by G.E.R. have long tenure and close relationships with our staff and customers. G.E.R. has encountered and dealt with unusual and sometimes challenging field conditions, and, in every case, has gone above and beyond the call of duty to deliver complete and accurate information and analysis. I wish we could obtain this level of service from all of our other consulting engineers!