

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (CONSTRUCTION)		1. CONTRACT NUMBER N6247311D0617 0002			
		2. CEC NUMBER 028965684			
MODIFIED EVALUATION					
IMPORTANT: Be sure to complete Part III - Evaluation of Performance Elements on reverse.					
PART I - GENERAL CONTRACT DATA					
3. TYPE OF EVALUATION (<i>X one</i>)		4. TERMINATED FOR DEFAULT			
<input type="checkbox"/> INTERIM (<i>List percentage _____ %</i>)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FINAL			
<input type="checkbox"/> AMENDED		<input type="checkbox"/>			
5. CONTRACTOR (<i>Name, Address, and ZIP Code</i>) MARTIN BROTHERS CONSTRUCTION 20 LIGHT SKY CT SACRAMENTO CA 95828 US NAICS Code: 237990		6.a. PROCUREMENT METHOD (<i>X one</i>)			
		<input type="checkbox"/> SEALED BID		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEGOTIATED	
		b. TYPE OF CONTRACT (<i>X one</i>)			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FIRM FIXED PRICE		<input type="checkbox"/> COST REIMBURSEMENT	
<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (<i>Specify</i>)					
7. DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION OF WORK Construct a six lane All-Weather Track at Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton 11-area.					
8. TYPE AND PERCENT OF SUBCONTRACTING N/A contractor is a small business					
9. FISCAL DATA	a. AMOUNT OF BASIC CONTRACT \$782,652	b. TOTAL AMOUNT OF MODIFICATIONS \$25,100	c. LIQUIDATED DAMAGES ASSESSED		
d. NET AMOUNT PAID CONTRACTOR \$807,752					
10. SIGNIFICANT DATES	a. DATE OF AWARD 09/28/2011	b. ORIGINAL CONTRACT COMPLETION DATE 03/31/2012	c. REVISED CONTRACT COMPLETION DATE 04/05/2012		
d. DATE WORK ACCEPTED 04/05/2012					
PART II - PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF CONTRACTOR					
11. OVERALL RATING (<i>X appropriate block</i>)					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OUTSTANDING	<input type="checkbox"/> ABOVE AVERAGE	<input type="checkbox"/> SATISFACTORY	<input type="checkbox"/> MARGINAL		
<input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY (<i>Explain in Item 20 on reverse</i>)					
12. EVALUATED BY					
a. ORGANIZATION (<i>Name and Address (Include ZIP Code)</i>) ROICC CAMP PENDLETON		b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (<i>Include Area Code</i>) 7607258199			
c. NAME AND TITLE LISA TRONCATTI SUPERVISORY CIVIL ENGINEER		d. SIGNATURE //Electronically Signed//			
		e. DATE 08/14/2012			
13. EVALUATION REVIEWED BY					
a. ORGANIZATION (<i>Name and Address (Include ZIP Code)</i>) ROICC, CAMP PENDLETON		b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (<i>Include Area Code</i>) 7607258692			
c. NAME AND TITLE LEILANI MURRAY CONTRACTING OFFICER		d. SIGNATURE //Electronically Signed//			
		e. DATE 08/24/2012			
14. AGENCY USE (<i>Distribution, etc.</i>)					

PART III - EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS

N/A = NOT APPLICABLE O = OUTSTANDING A = ABOVE AVERAGE S = SATISFACTORY M = MARGINAL U = UNSATISFACTORY

15. QUALITY CONTROL							16. EFFECTIVENESS OF MANAGEMENT						
N/A	O	A	S	M	U	N/A	O	A	S	M	U		
	X						X						
		X					X						
	X						X						
		X							X				
	X						X						
	X							X					
	X							X					
		X							X				
	X						X						
	X							X					
	X								X				
	X						X						
17. TIMELY PERFORMANCE							18. COMPLIANCE WITH LABOR STANDARDS						
			X						X				
	X								X				
	X								X				
		X							X				
	X						19. COMPLIANCE WITH SAFETY STANDARDS						
	X						X						
								X					
X							X						

20. REMARKS (Explanation of unsatisfactory evaluation is required. Other comments are optional. Provide facts concerning specific events or actions to justify the evaluation. These data must be in sufficient detail to assist contracting officers in determining the contractor's responsibility. Continue on separate sheet(s), if needed.)

Small Business Utilization

Does this contract include a subcontracting plan? No

Date of last Individual Subcontracting Report (ISR) / Summary Subcontracting Report (SSR): N/A

EVALUATOR REMARKS: 15. Quality of Work:

a. The track built by Martin Brothers (MB) is of high quality. b.c.d. MB quality control plan was adequate the first time submitted. The revisions were minor in nature and did not require substantial Government re-review. MB was proactive in executing their QC plan. In this design bid build contract, Martin Brothers provided a designer of record (DOR) who along with upper management and all key personnel identified in the QC plan were consistently present at QC meetings and very involved. The submittal register was kept up to date and reviewed at each weekly QC meeting. MB implemented controls and testing procedures to include independent third party inspections and verification of product quality and rigorously followed them.

e. All construction materials were stored in an appropriate manner to prevent deterioration or damage. The storage area was kept neat and clean. f. Whenever materials provided offered variations in meeting the specifications, contractor always elected to go with the higher quality product exceeding the contract requirements. g-h. MB maintained and submitted accurate test results promptly upon completion of tests. The DOR was actively involved in the inspection process ensuring the quality of work. The independent testing lab produced non-biased testing controls, accurate results and made timely recommendations to ensure the quality of the project. QC testing was conducted by qualified personnel in a manner that would identify all deficiencies, if any. i. As-built drawings were being kept up to date and updated in detail at every QC meeting. As-built drawings were turned over promptly at the end of the job and accurately reflect all

(continued...)

20. REMARKS (...continued)

as-built conditions. j. All materials required by contract were installed. k. QC personnel performed reviews of shop drawings and materials quickly identifying and correcting deficient work if any without Government involvement. All Requests for information were always accompanied with at least two or more Alternative solutions leaving the government in a better position to choose an option as opposed to committing considerable resources to providing technical solutions to problems encountered in the field.

16. Effectiveness of Management:

a.c.e.g. Upper management was very involved and willing to make critical decisions promptly in order to keep the work on track. Management made an on-the-spot decision during the pre-final walk through of the project by electing to patch the deteriorated pavement at the existing vehicle access ramp and add a trench drain to prevent water from getting onto the field. Additionally, MB installed 570 LF of drainage pipe and 7 drainage inlets on the northwest and southwest corners of the field at no additional cost to the government, to account for offsite water flowing onto the project. These items were not contractual requirements but it made the project a much better deliverable to the government. b. MB adequately planned, scheduled, resourced, organized and otherwise managed the work in order to keep on schedule.

d. For the majority of the contract MB maintained a clean site, however after final site clean up a piece of equipment was left on site for over a week. f. MB complied with all contract requirements. h. Although there were some known subcontractor issues, like going out of business and being new to Government regulations, MB was very proactive in ensuring compliance to the contract requirements with little Government intervention.

17. Timely Performance:

a.f. The initial baseline schedule was combined with task order 0003 and had to be rejected. It took some effort on the part of the government to assist MB in providing a schedule that met the contract requirements. Once understood, the schedule and all updates were timely, complete and logical. b.c. MB completed the construction activities in a timely manner and adequately scheduled the work to allow for timely completion. When and if the schedule slipped through their own fault or negligence, the MB took appropriate corrective action of his own volition. d. Issues were brought to the Governments attention as soon as they were known so they could be resolved timely and not impact timely completion. Most submittals were timely with the exception of a couple of proposals that by contract must be provided utilizing RS Means. However, on one proposal, their actual costs were lower than the RS Means and MB honored their actual costs. e. The contractor dealt with punch list items in real time for timely completion of the project. All pre-punch list items were taken care of within a day or two once they were identified. MB was proactive in doing their own independent inspections and fixing items before the inspection with the Government was held. This system of early diagnosis of potential punch list items resulted in a final inspection with no punch list items. The DOR was actively involved in the pre-inspections producing a very detailed list of discrepancies and recommended solutions before each scheduled inspection with the government. This saved the government from having to commit considerable resources to inspections and re-inspections if needed.

18. Compliance with Labor Standards:

a.b. Payroll records were submitted in a complete and timely manner. The payrolls submitted were in accordance with the contract and the Davis-Bacon Wage Decision. c. MB complied with all required labor laws. The Government was not notified of any issues from any subcontractor or supplier on this project.

19. Compliance with Safety Standards:

a.b.c. MB implemented a highly effective safety program that mitigated the risk of potential accidents. MB employed the same early diagnosis principle by identifying

(continued...)

20. REMARKS (...continued)

potential risks early prior to performing each major definable feature of work. Sub contractors responsible for the definable feature of work were immediately notified and no active construction work was started on the activity until all activity hazard analysis were updated to reflect the changes and the foreman had communicated the newly identified hazard to his crew by conducting a safety meeting. MB maintained a binder containing all Government-accepted Activity Hazard Analyses along with documented training rosters at the jobsite as required. MB was very knowledgeable in the requirements of the EM-385 and implemented their safety plan on a daily basis. Once a safety deficiency was identified, the contractor acted immediately to rectify the situation. MB had no safety related incidents resulting in lost days on the job. Of the two safety incidents reported to the Government, one was a bee sting and another was an employee refusing to wear the proper foot protection on the jobsite. In both incidents MB followed their safety plan.

MODIFIED RATINGS:

15a Quality of Workmanship: Concur with MBC's comments; rating upgraded.

15i Adequacy of as-builts: Concur with MBC's comments; rating upgraded.

16a & g Cooperation and responsiveness & professional conduct: Concur with MBC's comments; ratings upgraded.

17c Resolution of delays: Concur with MBC's comments; rating upgraded.

We believe MBC's overall rating of above average be upgraded to an outstanding for the following reasons:

MBC was very cooperative and professional when dealing with the government. On several occasions, MBC was willing to go above and beyond the contractual requirements. All evaluation factors not rated above average or outstanding were mostly due to KTRs learning curve being new to government contracting. MBC was also proactive in seeking out the governments help on issues they were not familiar with. Also, given the initial circumstances of this project, we believe MBC did an outstanding job of partnering with the government even when the government was giving conflicting information to MBC like treating the contract as DB vs. DBB. For this reason and others, the conclusion is that they deserved an overall rating of outstanding.

CONTRACTOR REMARKS: This record has been modified, please see the original record to view the contractor remarks.

REVIEWER REMARKS: I concur with this evaluation.