

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: N62467-04-C-2737
5. Description of Services performed under contract referenced in item 4: Removal of 35 acres of Mangrove Trees and associated trees from the area adjacent to the main Airfield Runway. The right-of-way surrounding the airfield had not been maintained in a mowed condition and had regenerated in Mangroves. This condition endangered the planes using the runway. The site conditions included habitat of the endangered Lower Keys Marsh Rabbit, Bald Eagles.
6. Contract award date: 9-24-09 Contract award amount: \$236,759.00 Final Contract: \$269,947.18
7. Period of performance: 2-28-05 to 8-25-05
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)

8/19/09
(Date)

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



(Signature)



(Date)

Sharon Keenan, Contracting Officer
305.293.568
Sharon.keenan@jjatfs.southcom.mil
US Army, Joint Interagency Task Force South
Naval Air Station, Key West, FL

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

pk

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.

pk

E V S M U N

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

pk

E V S M U N

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

pk

E V S M U N

5. Contractor completed mechanical site preparation work including removing trees on 1,000 or more acres of land.

pk

E V S M U N

6. Contractor showed ability to mobilize specified equipment, operators, and support equipment to treat large acreage.

pk

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.

pk

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,

pk

E V S M U N

state, and local vehicle regulations, safety standards, and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations.

8. Contractor was qualified to operate transport, and maintain the equipment required to complete the work. *ph* E V S M U N

9. Contractor repaired, replaced, and restored all damaged property generated by operation. Not applicable. *ph* E V S M U N
Renewable Resources did not damage any Government property. If they did, from my experience with this company they would have immediately Repair, replace etc. *ph*

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. *ph* E V S M U N

11. Overall rating of contractor quality of service. *ph* E V S M U N

Excellent company to do business with.

COMMENTS:

Renewable Resources is an excellent company and works extremely well with the Federal Government. The contract that the Navy had with Renewable Resources was an extremely difficult project which entailed removing Mangroves and non native vegetation that was severely overgrown and was causing extreme safety issues relating to the Ability for the Navy jet pilots to see the runway. *ph*

Renewable Resources worked during the hottest months of the season clearing vegetation and completed the project on time.

Renewable Resources was very conscious of badging requirement and security issues. There was also constant communication between Renewable Resources, the contracting officer and the engineering tech.

SCHEDULE

1. Delivery of service was within required time period specified by contract requirements. *ph* E V S M U N

2. Rate the contractor's ability to respond in a timely manner to expanded requirements. *ph* 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. *ph* E V S M U N

4. Overall rating of contractor conformance to schedule. *ph* 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). *ph* 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:

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:

Excellent contractor

