

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY / SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 2.101, 3.104, AND 42.1503

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORT (CPAR)**Construction****Name/Address of Contractor:**

Company Name: C & M CONTRACTORS, INC.

Division Name:

Street Address: HC 6 BOX 286

City: DONIPHAN

State/Province: MO Zip Code: 639359011

Country: USA

CAGE Code:

DUNS Number: 945067569

PSC: Y1QA NAICS Code: 237990

Evaluation Type: Final**Contract Percent Complete:** 100**Period of Performance Being Assessed:** 08/21/2014 - 08/27/2015**Contract Number:** W912EQ13C0019 **Business Sector & Sub-Sector:** Construction**Contracting Office:** W07V ENDIST MEMPHIS **Contracting Officer:** PRISCILLA G SWEENEY **Phone Number:** 901-544-3117**Location of Work:**

Pemiscot and Dunklin Counties, MO

Award Date: 08/21/2013 **Effective Date:****Completion Date:** 09/12/2015 **Estimated/Actual Completion Date:** 08/27/2015**Total Dollar Value:** \$2,527,082 **Current Contract Dollar Value:** \$2,527,082**Complexity:** Low **Termination Type:** None**Competition Type:** Not Available for Competition **Contract Type:** Firm Fixed Price**Key Subcontractors and Effort Performed:****DUNS:****Effort:**

Kinder Brothers, Earthwork/Excavation - \$1,641,990

DUNS:**Effort:**

Riverside, Landscaping/Irrigation - \$365,750

DUNS:**Effort:**

Shultz, Surveying

Project Number: W912EQ-13-C-0019**Project Title:**

Elk Chute Ditch, Channel Cleanout and Clearing, Pemiscot and Dunklin Counties, MO, Elk Chute Drainage District, St. Francis River Basin - Maintenance

Contract Effort Description:

The work consists of furnishing all plant, labor and materials for channel cleanout of the lower 1.2 miles of Elk Chute Ditch and clearing and snagging along with smoothing of existing spoil piles for the remaining 14.6 miles Elk Chute Ditch for a total of 15.8 miles. The work will include channel excavation, clearing, snagging and disposal of debris/material along with seeding and mulching; and environmental protection.

Small Business Utilization:

Does this contract include a subcontracting plan? No

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

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY / SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 2.101, 3.104, AND 42.1503

Evaluation Areas	Past Rating	Rating
Quality:	Satisfactory	Very Good
Schedule:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Cost Control:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Management:	Satisfactory	Very Good
Utilization of Small Business:	N/A	N/A
Regulatory Compliance:	Satisfactory	Very Good
Other Areas:		
(1) SAFETY:		Very Good
(2):		N/A
(3):		N/A

Variance (Contract to Date):

Current Cost Variance (%): Variance at Completion (%):

Current Schedule Variance (%):

Assessing Official Comments:

QUALITY: (VERY GOOD)

- i. Adequacy and implementation of Contractor's Quality Control Plan (VERY GOOD) – The contractor's plan is a professionally prepared document and is more than adequate considering the scope of work was of low complexity (channel excavation, berm flattening, and clearing).
- ii. Contractor's ability to maintain quality control and accuracy of QC documentation (SATISFACTORY) – The satisfactory rating is based on the low complex nature of the work and not the contractor's performance. The majority of the construction was performed by subcontractors. Quality of the work was very good and acceptable to the government without continuous QA surveillance. Contractor's QC narratives were good, 3-phase inspections performed, adverse weather and high river stages condition impacting work documented, daily safety findings and corrective actions taken, as well as any issues that affected progress of the work. Before construction surveys were sufficient for quantity computations.
- iii. Implementation of the 3-phase inspection process (SATISFACTORY) – Contractor performed and documented preparatory phase, initial phase, and follow-up inspections. The satisfactory rating is based on having only a couple 3-phase inspections to do.
- iv. Quality of workmanship (VERY GOOD) – The contractor's equipment operators did a nice job. As-built surveys indicate the channel was excavated within the prescribed tolerances for grade and section and the berm was flattened and sloped toward the channel per design. Nice job.
- v. Work was in accordance with the plans and specifications (VERY GOOD) - As-built surveys indicate the channel was excavated within the prescribed tolerances for grade and section, the berm was flattened and sloped toward the channel per design, and the tree stumps were cut to the prescribed tolerances above natural ground. A local landscaping company provided turf establishment and the outcome was very good grass growth on the areas disturbed by construction.

SCHEDULE: (SATISFACTORY)

- i. Quality and timeliness of the initial schedule submission (SATISFACTORY) – Given the nature of the work, the activity schedule was not complex. The schedule accurately reflected the work that needed to be accomplished and utilized the full period of performance of the contract.
- ii. Adherence to the approved schedule (SATISFACTORY) – Due to the nature of the work high channel stages drastically affected the schedule at no fault of the contractor. The 451 calendar day contract turned into a 738 calendar day period of performance. The contractor always had management staff, labor, and equipment available during the windows of opportunity to progress the work.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY / SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 2.101, 3.104, AND 42.1503

iii. Communication and submittal of schedule revisions (N/A) – Revised schedules were not required.

iv. Corrective action taken by the Contractor when the schedule has slipped through fault of the Contractor (Satisfactory) – The contractor was on or ahead of schedule for the duration of the contract.

*Contractor completed the project 16 calendar days ahead of the revised contract required completion date.

COST CONTROL: (SATISFACTORY)

i. Contractor's billings current, accurate, and complete (VERY GOOD) – Contractor's invoices accurately reflected the progress of work and were submitted timely.

ii. Contractor's budgetary internal controls adequate (SATISFACTORY) – No complaints for non-payment of services or suppliers are known to exist as of this writing.

iii. Innovation used that resulted in cost savings (N/A)

MANAGEMENT: (VERY GOOD)

i. Management of resources and key personnel (VERY GOOD) – Contractor's managers, QC staff, safety officer, project superintendent, and equipment operators all did quality work. As noted above, fluctuating river stages drastically affected the progress of the work. The contractor always had management staff, labor, and equipment available during the short windows of opportunity to progress the work.

ii. Coordination and control of subcontractors (VERY GOOD) – The majority of the construction was done by subcontract. As noted above, the work met the intent of the contract.

iii. Review and resolution of subcontractor issues (VERY GOOD) – No issues were presented to the government.

iv. Management responsiveness (VERY GOOD) – Managers were very engaged with this contract. The management staff ensured that all resources required to progress the work were available when needed.

REGULATORY COMPLIANCE: (VERY GOOD)

i. Contractor's enforcement of laws and regulations (VERY GOOD) – Environmental protection measures, to include erosion control and storm water runoff, were effective and satisfactorily to pass State of Missouri site inspections.

ii. Correction of deficiencies when out of compliance (VERY GOOD) – Contractor continually performed maintenance on the structural measures for erosion control.

iii. Communication of laws and regulations to subcontractors (SATISFACTORY) – Subcontractors are well versed in regulatory compliance issues.

iv. Compliance with Davis-Bacon Act (SATISFACTORY) – Labor rates posted as required, labor interviews conducted, and no labor complaints have been presented.

OTHER AREAS: SAFETY (VERY GOOD)

i. Adequacy of the Contractor's Safety Plan (VERY GOOD) – Similar to the contractor's QC Plan, the Safety Plan was well done and site specific. Administrative plan and AHA's were good.

ii. Implementation of the Safety Plan (VERY GOOD) – Weekly tool box safety meetings and daily safety checks were performed and documented on the QC reports.

iii. Identification and correction of safety deficiencies (VERY GOOD) – Deficiencies (such as non-working back-up alarms, broken glass, undercharged fire extinguishers) were documented, repaired or replaced, and corrective actions taken documented.

iv. Quantitative evaluation of accidents or injuries on this project: There were no accidents or injuries on this project.

ADDITIONAL/OTHER: I have worked with this contractor on numerous projects over several years. They have always been a

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY / SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 2.101, 3.104, AND 42.1503

good partner with the Corps and are willing to go the extra mile to provide a quality product that we are pleased to turn over to our local sponsors.

RECOMMENDATION:

Given what I know today about the contractor's ability to perform in accordance with this contract or order's most significant requirements, I would recommend them for similar requirements in the future.

Name and Title of Assessing Official:

Name: Jack D. Ratliff

Title: Civil Engineer, ACO

Organization: USACE Memphis Dist., Caruthersville Area Office

Phone Number: (901) 579-4706 Email Address: jack.d.ratliff@usace.army.mil

Date: 01/09/2016

Contractor Comments:

ADDITIONAL/OTHER: All employees of the Caruthersville office was very helpful and timely with any questions that we encountered. They worked in partnership with our firm to achieve success on this project.

CONCURRENCE: I concur with this evaluation.

Name and Title of Contractor Representative:

Name: Melinda Vaughn

Title: President

Phone Number: 573-996-3113 Email Address: melinda@candmcontractors.com

Date: 12/28/2015

Review by Reviewing Official:

I concur with evaluation as written.

Another solid performance from a well-respected Contractor. JW

Name and Title of Reviewing Official:

Name: JAMES R. WOLFF

Title: Chief of Construction

Organization: Army Corps of Engineers, MVM

Phone Number: 901-544-3113 Email Address: james.r.wolff3@usace.army.mil

Date: 01/13/2016

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY