

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:** 08/01/2014 - 08/31/2015**Contract Number:** W912EQ12C0014 **Business Sector & Sub-Sector:** Construction**Contracting Office:** W07V ENDIST MEMPHIS **Contracting Officer:** PRISCILLA G SWEENEY **Phone Number:** 901-544-3117**Location of Work:**

St. Francis River Levee, Clay & Green Counties, AR

Award Date: 07/31/2012 **Effective Date:****Completion Date:** 09/19/2015 **Estimated/Actual Completion Date:** 08/31/2015**Total Dollar Value:** \$3,115,935 **Current Contract Dollar Value:** \$3,115,935**Complexity:** Low **Termination Type:** None**Competition Type:** Not Available for Competition **Contract Type:** Firm Fixed Price**Key Subcontractors and Effort Performed:****DUNS:****Effort:**

Tri-County Sand and Gravel, Inc., Aggregate Surfacing - \$321,200

DUNS:**Effort:**

Riverside Landscaping, Turfing - \$116,000

DUNS:**Effort:****Project Number:** W912EQ-12-C-0014**Project Title:**

St. Francis River Levee - Right Bank, Slope Restoration and Planting Berm Construction, Clay and Greene Counties, AR, St. Francis Levee District of Clay & Green Counties, AR, St. Francis River Basin - Maintenance.

Contract Effort Description:

The work consists of slope flattening on the riverside of the levee, construction of a planting berm at the riverside toe of levee, gravel placement on the levee crown/ramps, and excavation from a borrow pit. It will require excavation/placement of approximately 128,000 CY for flattening of the levee slope/berm and 8,800 CCY of gravel surfacing.

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

Variance (Contract to Date):

Current Cost Variance (%): Variance at Completion (%): -0.4%

Current Schedule Variance (%): 51%

Assessing Official Comments:

QUALITY: i. Adequacy and implementation of Contractor's Quality Control Plan (EXCELLANT) – The contractors plan is quite impressive (professionally prepared document) considering the scope of work was of low to moderate complexity (borrow pit excavation, hauling to levee for slope restoration and berm construction, placement of riprap along toe of berm, and gravel surfacing of the levee roadway). The plan was specific to the work, not generic language. Considerable time, thought, and effort in crafting the plan were evident. Implementation of the plan is considered excellent as well based on final outcome of the project.

ii. Contractor's ability to maintain quality control and accuracy of QC documentation (EXCELLANT) – Quality of the work never suffered. Contractor's QC narratives were some of the best I've read and painted a good picture of the daily work progress, 3-phase inspections performed, adverse weather and high river stages condition impacting work, daily safety findings and corrective actions taken, as well as any issues that affected progress of the work. QC surveys on slopes and berm, and thickness testing of aggregate surfacing, ensured contractor was meeting or exceeding quality required.

iii. Implementation of the 3-phase inspection process (EXCELLANT) – Contractor performed and documented preparatory phase, initial phase, and follow-up inspections for all definable features of work.

iv. Quality of workmanship (EXCELLANT) – The contractor's equipment operators did a nice job constructing the levee slopes and berm; slopes and berms were flat and smooth with no humps or depressions and will be easy for the Levee District to maintain. The levee crown and gravel surfacing are consistent in width and free of potholes and safe for traffic. The levee looks really good.

v. Work was in accordance with the plans and specifications (EXCELLANT) - The lines and grade of the newly constructed levee slope and berm were in accordance with the plans and specifications as verified by the final construction surveys. The newly constructed aggregate levee roadway was consistent in width, thickness, and compaction with no notable dips, depressions, or pot holes. A local landscaping company provided turf establishment and the outcome was very good grass growth on the levee slopes, berm, and to the construction limits. The borrow pit was finish dressed appropriately. Haul roads and other disturbed areas were returned to pre-construction conditions.

SCHEDULE: i. Quality and timeliness of the initial schedule submission (EXCELLANT) – Given the nature of the work, the activity schedule was not complex, however, the schedule did take into account the two construction seasons and utilized the full period of performance provided in the contract. The schedule accurately reflected the work that needed to be accomplished within the windows of opportunity during the two construction seasons.

ii. Adherence to the approved schedule (EXCELLANT) – Due to the nature of the work with both the borrow pit and levee berm being located on the riverside of the levee, high river stages drastically affected the schedule at no fault of the contractor. The two constructions seasons turned into a 1,123 calendar day period of performance. The contractor always had management staff, labor, and equipment available during the short 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 (EXCELLENT) – The contractor was on or ahead of schedule for the duration of the contract.

*Contractor completed the project 19 calendar days ahead of the revised contract required completion date.

COST CONTROL: 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: i. Management of resources and key personnel (EXCELLANT) – 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 (N/A)

iii. Review and resolution of subcontractor issues (N/A)

iv. Management responsiveness (EXCELLENT) – 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: 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 Arkansas 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 (N/A)

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

OTHER AREAS: i. Adequacy of the Contractor's Safety Plan (EXCELLANT) – Similar to the contractor's QC Plan, the Safety Plan was well done and site specific...not generic. Considerable time, thought, and effort in crafting the plan were evident. Administrative plan and AHA's were good.

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

iii. Identification and correction of safety deficiencies (EXCELLANT) – 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 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.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

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

Name and Title of Assessing Official:

Name: JACK RATLIFF

Title: Administrative Contracting Officer

Organization: Caruthersville Area Office

Phone Number: 573.333.1043 Email Address: jack.d.ratliff@usace.army.mil

Date: 01/11/2016

Contractor Comments:

QUALITY: 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.

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: 01/11/2016

Review by Reviewing Official:

I concur with this evaluation as written.

Contractor's QC program yields high-quality projects. Well done ! 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