

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 Renewable Resources
Name and Address: 265 Dean Road
Barnesville, GA 30204
- 2. Contractor Point of Contact: David Ellis or Jill Ellis
- 3. Phone number (with area code): (David) 770-584-2248 (Jill Ellis) 770-584-2247
- 4. Contract number for the service that was provided: AG-4310-P-07-0015
- 5. Description of Services performed under contract referenced in item 4: The Roundabout Swamp is located in southeast GA in Atkinson County just west of the town of Pierson. The Cypress Swamp had been clear-cut 30 years ago but had not regenerated a new Cypress Forest. The drought of 2006 was severe in south Georgia and in the spring of 2007 this 3,000 acre eco-system was tinder dry and caught fire, burning the swamp down to a pile of ash. In fact, the ash was more than a foot deep. We were contracted to repair the access roads and replant 2,000 acres of the swamp with 608,000 seedlings in order to restore the Carolina Bay to its historic cypress habitat.
- 6. Contract award date: 8-22-07 Awarded Amount: \$352,491.33 Final Contract: \$387,516.33
- 7. Period of performance: 12-12-07 to 5-1-08
- 8. Authorization is hereby granted to provide the information requested in this survey to USFWS, Contracting and Grant Services Division, Atlanta, Georgia

Jill Ellis
(Signature)

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

8/19/09
(Date)

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

Louis P. Hendricks
(Signature)

8/31/2009
(Date)

Louis P. Hendricks
State Admin. Officer
(Typed or Printed Name)

USDA - NRCS - Missouri
(Organization Name)

(Title)

(573) 876-9368
(Phone Number)

601 Business Loop 70 West
Columbia, Missouri 65203
(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 Blvd,
Suite 310

Atlanta, Georgia 30345
Tel: 404-679-4059

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. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> E V S M U N |
| 2. Contractor exhibited the ability to identify and correct non-compliance issues. | E V S M U N N/A |
| 3. Contractor exhibited the ability to improve business processes resulting in increased quality. | E <input checked="" type="radio"/> V S M U N |
| 5. Contractor completed mechanical site preparation work including removing trees on 1,000 or more acres of land. | E V S M U N N/A |
| 6. Contractor showed ability to mobilize specified equipment, operators, and support equipment to treat large acreage. | E <input checked="" type="radio"/> V S M U N |
| 7. Contractor provided appropriate equipment needed to complete requirements such as labor, materials, | E <input checked="" type="radio"/> V S M U N |

maintenance and repair, fuel, insurance, and tools etc.

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 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:

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: *I was very pleased with this contractor's flexibility and willingness to work with us, We encountered several delays due to standing water, preventing the planting of trees, but Renewable Resources still finished on time. They keep their word.*

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

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:

ADDITIONAL REMARKS: