

Attachment 3 – Past Performance Questionnaire

NAVFAC/USACE PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE (Form PPQ-0)	
CONTRACT INFORMATION (Contractor to complete Blocks 1-4)	
1. Contractor Information Firm Name: Drax, Inc. Address: 1213 N Sherman Ave #361, Madison, WI 53704 Phone Number: 608-268-3468 Email Address: andrewlangum@draxco.com Point of Contact: Andrew Langum	CAGE Code: 1KD24 DUNs Number: 052764771 Contact Phone Number: 608-268-3468
2. Work Performed as: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prime Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> Sub Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> Joint Venture <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain) Percent of project work performed: 75% If subcontractor, who was the prime (Name/Phone #):	
3. Contract Information Contract Number: Delivery/Task Order Number (if applicable): Contract Type: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Firm Fixed Price <input type="checkbox"/> Cost Reimbursement <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify): Contract Title: Eucha Dam Tainter gate repairs, hoist and electrical upgrades Contract Location: Eucha Dam, Delaware County, Oklahoma Award Date (mm/dd/yy): August 2018 Contract Completion Date (mm/dd/yy): May 2020 (base) Actual Completion Date (mm/dd/yy): November 2020 Explain Differences: Two new hoist gearboxes were added onto the contract. Due to long lead time, there was a time extension. Original Contract Price (Award Amount): \$4,891,270.00 Final Contract Price (to include all modifications, if applicable): \$6,200,000.00 Explain Differences: Additional steel repairs were discovered and additional hoist work was added.	
4. Project Description: Complexity of Work <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> Routine How is this project relevant to project of submission? (Please provide details such as similar equipment, requirements, conditions, etc.) Eucha Dam is a tainter gate dam. The project included steel repairs on the (5) gates, seal replacement, blast cleaning/coating on (5) gates, new hoist installation on (3) gates and hoist upgrades on (2) gates.	
CLIENT INFORMATION (Client to complete Blocks 5-8)	
5. Client Information Name: <i>Steve Rogger</i> <i>[REPRESENTING THE TULSA METROPOLITAN UTILITY AUTHORITY (TMUA)]</i> Title: <i>CONSTRUCTION MANAGER</i> Phone Number: <i>(918) 724-0922</i> Email Address: <i>sroger@cityoftulsa.org</i>	
6. Describe the client's role in the project: <i>CONSTRUCTION MANAGER, REPRESENTING THE PROJECT OWNER, TMUA.</i>	
7. Date Questionnaire was completed (mm/dd/yy): <i>09/02/20</i>	
8. Client's Signature: <i>Steve Rogger</i>	

NOTE: NAVFAC REQUESTS THAT THE CLIENT COMPLETES THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AND SUBMITS DIRECTLY BACK TO THE OFFEROR. THE OFFEROR WILL SUBMIT THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE TO NAVFAC WITH THEIR PROPOSAL, AND MAY DUPLICATE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FUTURE SUBMISSION ON NAVFAC SOLICITATIONS. CLIENTS ARE HIGHLY ENCOURAGED TO SUBMIT QUESTIONNAIRES DIRECTLY TO THE OFFEROR. HOWEVER, QUESTIONNAIRES MAY BE SUBMITTED DIRECTLY TO NAVFAC. PLEASE CONTACT THE OFFEROR FOR NAVFAC POC INFORMATION. THE GOVERNMENT RESERVES THE RIGHT TO VERIFY ANY AND ALL INFORMATION ON THIS FORM.

*ADJECTIVE RATINGS AND DEFINITIONS TO BE USED TO BEST REFLECT
YOUR EVALUATION OF THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE*

RATING	DEFINITION	NOTE
(E) Exceptional	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government/Owner's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor was highly effective.	An Exceptional rating is appropriate when the Contractor successfully performed multiple significant events that were of benefit to the Government/Owner. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also, there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.
(VG) Very Good	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's/Owner's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.	A Very Good rating is appropriate when the Contractor successfully performed a significant event that was a benefit to the Government/Owner. There should have been no significant weaknesses identified.
(S) Satisfactory	Performance meets minimum contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.	A Satisfactory rating is appropriate when there were only minor problems, or major problems that the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract. There should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. Per DOD policy, a fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that contractors will not be assessed a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract.
(M) Marginal	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.	A Marginal is appropriate when a significant event occurred that the contractor had trouble overcoming which impacted the Government/Owner.
(U) Unsatisfactory	Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.	An Unsatisfactory rating is appropriate when multiple significant events occurred that the contractor had trouble overcoming and which impacted the Government/Owner. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating.
(N) Not Applicable	No information or did not apply to your contract	Rating will be neither positive nor negative.

Contractor Information (Firm Name): DRAX, INC.

Client Information (Name): STEVE ROPER (REPRESENTING TULSA METROPOLITAN UTILITY AUTHORITY, TMUA)

TO BE COMPLETED BY CLIENT

PLEASE CIRCLE THE ADJECTIVE RATING WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR EVALUATION OF THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE.

1. QUALITY:	
a) Quality of technical data/report preparation efforts	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
b) Ability to meet quality standards specified for technical performance	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
c) Timeliness/effectiveness of contract problem resolution without extensive customer guidance	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
d) Adequacy/effectiveness of quality control program and adherence to contract quality assurance requirements (without adverse effect on performance)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
2. SCHEDULE/TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE:	
a) Compliance with contract delivery/completion schedules including any significant intermediate milestones. (If liquidated damages were assessed or the schedule was not met, please address below)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
b) Rate the contractor's use of available resources to accomplish tasks identified in the contract	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
3. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:	
a) To what extent were the end users satisfied with the project?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
b) Contractor was reasonable and cooperative in dealing with your staff (including the ability to successfully resolve disagreements/disputes; responsiveness to administrative reports, businesslike and communication)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
c) To what extent was the contractor cooperative, businesslike, and concerned with the interests of the customer?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
d) Overall customer satisfaction	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
4. MANAGEMENT/ PERSONNEL/LABOR	
a) Effectiveness of on-site management, including management of subcontractors, suppliers, materials, and/or labor force?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
b) Ability to hire, apply, and retain a qualified workforce to this effort	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
c) Government Property Control	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
d) Knowledge/expertise demonstrated by contractor personnel	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
e) Utilization of Small Business concerns	E VG S M U <input checked="" type="radio"/> N
f) Ability to simultaneously manage multiple projects with multiple disciplines	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
g) Ability to assimilate and incorporate changes in requirements and/or priority, including planning, execution and response to Government changes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
h) Effectiveness of overall management (including ability to effectively lead, manage and control the program)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N
5. COST/FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	
a) Ability to meet the terms and conditions within the contractually agreed price(s)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E VG S M U N

Contractor Information (Firm Name): DRAX, INC.

Client Information (Name): STEVE ROGER OF TULSA METROPOLITAN UTILITY AUTHORITY

b) Contractor proposed innovative alternative methods/processes that reduced cost, improved maintainability or other factors that benefited the client	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) If this is/was a Government cost type contract, please rate the Contractor's timeliness and accuracy in submitting monthly invoices with appropriate back-up documentation, monthly status reports/budget variance reports, compliance with established budgets and avoidance of significant and/or unexplained variances (under runs or overruns)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E	VG	S	M	U	N
d) Is the Contractor's accounting system adequate for management and tracking of costs? <i>If no, please explain in Remarks section.</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes				No	
e) If this is/was a Government contract, has/was this contract been partially or completely terminated for default or convenience or are there any pending terminations? <i>Indicate if show cause or cure notices were issued, or any default action in comment section below.</i>	Yes				<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	
f) Have there been any indications that the contractor has had any financial problems? <i>If yes, please explain below.</i>	Yes				<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	
6. SAFETY/SECURITY						
a) To what extent was the contractor able to maintain an environment of safety, adhere to its approved safety plan, and respond to safety issues? (Includes: following the users rules, regulations, and requirements regarding housekeeping, safety, correction of noted deficiencies, etc.)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Contractor complied with all security requirements for the project and personnel security requirements.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E	VG	S	M	U	N
7. GENERAL						
a) Ability to successfully respond to emergency and/or surge situations (including notifying COR, PM or Contracting Officer in a timely manner regarding urgent contractual issues).	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Compliance with contractual terms/provisions <i>(explain if specific issues)</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) Would you hire or work with this firm again? <i>(If no, please explain below)</i>			<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes		No	
d) In summary, provide an overall rating for the work performed by this contractor.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> E	VG	S	M	U	N

Please provide responses to the questions above (if applicable) and/or additional remarks. Furthermore, please provide a brief narrative addressing specific strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, or other comments which may assist our office in evaluating performance risk (please attach additional

DRAX WAS AN OUTSTANDING PARTNER ON PROJECT TMUA-W 14-06 GLENA DAM TAINTER GATE REPAIRS, HOIST, AND ELECTRICAL UPGRADES. WHILE THIS PROJECT WAS UNIQUE FOR THE TMUA, AND THIS WAS OUR FIRST PARTNERSHIP WITH DRAX, THEY QUICKLY ADAPTED TO OUR PROJECT MANAGEMENT METHODS AND PARTICIPATED WITH THE TMUA AS IF WE HAD LONG STANDING RELATIONSHIPS. I LOOK FORWARD TO THE OPPORTUNITY TO WORK WITH THEM AGAIN. STEVEN D ROGER