

PAST PERFORMANCE SURVEY

SECTION A: Contractor Information (to be completed by the contractor for who past performance information is being collected, prior to forwarding to respondent)

1. Prospective Government Contractor's Name and Address: Renewable Resources
265 Dean Road
Barnesville, Georgia 30204
2. Contractor Point of Contact: David Ellis or Jill Ellis
3. Phone number (with area code): 770/584-2248 (David); 770/584-2247 (Jill)
4. Contract number for the service that was provided: DACW23-02-C-0011
5. Description of Services performed under contract referenced in item 4: The contract performed Wetland Restoration that was Mitigation for the construction of levees in Gary, Indiana. We cleaned, cleared and restored approximately 60 acres of former agricultural fields and 35 acres of condemned neighborhoods into high quality wetlands and savannas. The project included removal of exotic and invasive vegetation from the properties and the removal of 982 tons of garbage, tires and concrete. Intensive applications of herbicides for five years were required to reclaim the site.

The restoration of the field required the total removal of an extensive drain field tile system. The site contours were changed to allow a natural spring to flow through the site instead of into a ditch. Herbicide applications were used to remove the agriculture based exotics and Cottonwoods that attempted to takeover the site. Installation of two runs of 48 inch RPC and one run of 36 inch RPC controlled the flow of local drainage ditches around the site to meet the goals of flood control included in the project. Installation of the site customized native seed mix has successfully converted the site into a field of waving grasses and flowers filled with birds attracted by the abundant vegetation.

6. Contract award date: 22 September 2002 Contract award amount: \$921,102.68; Final Contract: \$1,405,845.297
7. Period of performance: 5 May 2003 to 7 July 2008
8. Authorization is hereby granted to provide the information requested in this survey to USFWS, Contracting and Grant Services Division, Atlanta, Georgia




(Signature)

Jill Ellis, Vice President
(Name and Title of Authorizing Official)

19 August 2009
(Date)

SECTION B: Respondent Information (to be completed by respondent)


Greg Moore
Plant Ecologist

(Signature)

24 August 2009
(Date)

Gregory Moore
(Typed or Printed Name)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
(Organization Name)

Plant Ecologist, Technical Representative
(Title)

312/846-5586
(Phone Number)

111 North Canal Street, Chicago, IL 60606
(Organization Address)

Note: The identity of individual(s) providing past performance information shall not be disclosed. Respondent should complete survey and submit NLT 28 August 2009, 4:00 p.m. local time to: fax 404-679-4059, E-mail Christina_hacker@fws.gov or mail to the following address:

Contracting and Grant Services Division
Attn: Christina Hacker
1875 Century Boulevard, Suite 310
Atlanta, Georgia 30345
Tel: 404-679-4059
E-mail: Christina_hacker@fws.gov

The following Rating Scale provides the definitions for the Past Performance ratings to be assessed:

E EXCEPTIONAL

Based on the Offeror's performance record, essentially no doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Past performance has met contractual requirements and has exceeded some to the respondent's benefit. Contractual performance was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective action(s) taken by the contractor were highly effective.

V VERY GOOD

Based on the Offeror's performance record, little doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Past performance has met contractual requirements and has exceeded some to the respondent's benefit. Contractual performance was accomplished with some minor problem(s) for which corrective action(s) taken by the contractor were effective.

S SATISFACTORY

Based on the Offeror's performance record, some doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Past performance has met contractual requirements. Contractual performance contains some minor problem(s) for which corrective action(s) taken by the contractor appear or where satisfactory.

M MARGINAL

Based on Offeror's performance record, substantial doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Past performance has not met some contractual requirements. Contractual performance reflects a serious problem for which either the contractor has not yet identified correction action(s), or the proposed corrective action(s) appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.

U UNSATISFACTORY

Based on Offeror's performance record, extreme doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Past performance has not met most contractual requirements, and recovery did not occur or was not in a timely manner. Contractual performance contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective action(s) appear or were ineffective.

N NEUTRAL

No performance record identifiable; unknown performance.

The questions on the survey shall be rated in accordance with the definitions provided in the Rating Scale. Any unsatisfactory or marginal rating shall be supplemented with an explanation in the space provided.

QUALITY OF SERVICE

1. Rate the contractor's compliance with contractual requirements.

E V S M U N

2. Contractor exhibited the ability to identify and correct non-compliance issues.

E V S M U N

3. Contractor exhibited the ability to improve business processes resulting in increased quality.

E V S M U N

5. Contractor completed mechanical site preparation work including removing trees on 89 or more acres of land. **E V S M U N**
6. Contractor showed ability to mobilize specified equipment, operators and support equipment to treat large acreage. **E V S M U N**
7. Contractor provided appropriate equipment needed to complete requirements such as labor, materials, maintenance and repair, fuel, insurance and tools etc. **E V S M U N**
8. Contractor's equipment was in good repair and operating conditions at all times and was in compliance with all federal, state and local vehicle regulations, safety standards, and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations. **E V S M U N**
8. Contractor was qualified to operate transport and maintain the equipment required to complete the work. **E V S M U N**
9. Contractor repaired, replaced and restored all damaged property generated by operation. **E V S M U N**
10. Upon completion of the work the contractor removed all trash and rubbish generated by the operations and such trash was disposed of in an appropriate location. **E V S M U N**
11. Overall rating of contractor quality of service. **E V S M U N**

COMMENTS:

SCHEDULE

1. Delivery of service was within required time period specified by contract requirements. **E V S M U N**
2. Rate the contractor's ability to respond in a timely manner to expanded requirements. **E V S M U N**
3. Rate the contractor's ability to adjust manning and equipment to respond to expanded requirements without falling behind regular schedule. **E V S M U N**
4. Overall rating of contractor conformance to schedule. **E V S M U N**

COMMENTS: The Ellises replaced a collapsed corrugated metal culvert at the end of a ditch that directs stormwater runoff away from one of the contract wetland restoration sites with two 48-inch reinforced concrete culverts. The excavation for and installation of these pipes occurred under the NIPSCO utility company's right-of-way, inches from a 36-inch gas line. In fact, the culverts did not fit under the gas line as designed. The Ellises discovered the error and, through a "seat-of-the-pants" field re-design, safely and effectively installed the pipes.

Another unanticipated incident involved the removal of approximately 3,000 linear feet of additional plastic field drainage tile from the former agricultural field portion of the restoration. The Ellises brought in the necessary equipment to excavate the tile, kept topsoil and subsoil separate during excavation and backfilled the trenches keeping soil layers intact. They also abided by the original cost proposal even though there were several hundred more feet of tile than originally estimated. The Ellises properly hauled this additional material to an approved landfill.

BUSINESS RELATIONS

- 1. Rate the working relationship between contractor's management, your company and your designated representatives (to include inspection personnel). E V S M U N
- 2. Rate the contractor's ability to submit reports and/or invoices. Are they complete and accurate? E V S M U N
- 3. Rate the contractor's ability to submit required reports and/or invoices in a timely manner. E V S M U N
- 4. Rate the contractors responsiveness to customer complaint resolution. E V S M U N
- 5. Overall rating of contractor's business relations. E V S M U N

COMMENTS:

MANAGEMENT OF KEY PERSONNEL

- 1. Rate the contractor's ability to select, retain, support and replace key personnel (Project Manager, Alternate, Supervisors). E V S M U N
- 2. Rate the working relationship between contractor's key personnel, your company and your designated representatives (to include inspection personnel). E V S M U N

COMMENTS: There was no turnover of key personnel during the contract period, therefore the rating of 'N' for that criterion.

The Ellises took great pride in the quality of their work and communicated cheerfully and readily with this office to keep the lines of communication open so that there were no misunderstandings that could allow lapses in quality to occur. The Ellises paid constant attention to the satisfaction of this office in terms of the quality of their work.

Unforeseen situations often arise during large, complicated projects, and this one was no exception. The Ellises handled the two that occurred during the course of this project cheerfully, quickly and efficiently. We have had several Contracting Officer's Representatives (CORs) attached to this project due to retirements and deployments to Iraq, and each of them was happy to work with Renewable Resources because of their attention to detail and the quality of their work.

Even though Renewable Resources is located in Georgia, some distance away from the project site, it did not take long for them to find, develop relationships with and employ some of the most reputable suppliers in the area for both their civil works and native plant materials. In no way did they try to get by on the cheap.

4. How would you feel about awarding another contract to this contractor?

 X Wouldn't hesitate to award another contract to this contractor.

 Would most likely award another contract to this contractor.

 Would think twice about awarding another contract to this contractor, but would do so if no better alternative existed.

 Do not wish to award another contract to this contractor.

 Would not award another contract to this contractor.

COMMENTS: I would not hesitate to award another contract to Renewable Resources. In fact we have a quite large mitigation project coming up soon, which I hope they are able to bid on and fit into their work schedule.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS: If Renewable Resources is as conscientious for you as they have been with us, I have no doubt that you will be satisfied with their work.