

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION			
BOA Number 70Z08420GM0004400	UNIT Sector Jacksonville	FPN/CPN Number M20010	Date of Report 17MAR20
Name and Address of Contractor Moran Environmental Recovery 75D York Avenue, Randolph, MA 02368	Date of Order: 03DEC2019	Final \$ Amount of Order: \$89,317.41	
	Date Work Completed: 31JAN2020		
Question 1-8 shall be completed by FOSCR assigned to case. FOSCR shall provide detailed/complete sentence responses, and shall rate each question with a numerical rating, 1=Unsat, 2=Sat, 3=Outstanding. Comments required for ALL ratings.			RATE
SCHEDULE			1/2/3
1. Did the contractor respond to the incident within the timeframe discussed with them when issuing an ATP in accordance to paragraphs F.2 Response time of their BOA? MER responded on scene very quickly since they are located only minutes away from the incident location.			3
2. Did the contractor perform the work in a diligent and timely manner IAW F.2 of BOA? All work was conducted diligently and efficiently. The contractor immediately engaged the FOSCR to conduct safety briefs and discuss the work to be done for the day.			3
QUALITY			
3. Was the quality of the contractor's work satisfactory (both Labor and Supervision)? Labor and Supervision were exemplary throughout the incident. All personnel were extremely professional and easy to work with.			3
4. Did the contractor have the necessary equipment to respond to the incident? Was their equipment in good working order? All equipment was in proper working order. If any additional items were needed that were not on site already (lights), or equipment needed for debris removal, MER fulfilled the requests in a timely manner.			3
COST CONTROL			
5. Did the contractor submit Complete and Accurate Daily Reports each day to the FOSCR during the incident IAW H.5 of their BOA? Dailies were behind by a couple of days throughout the incident. However, they were produced immediately when requested, and did not impact the response in any way. If there were any issues on the dailies they were immediately corrected.			2
6. Did the contractor invoice within 60 days from completion of work, and submit a "proper" invoice and provide documentation, including disposal manifest IAW G.1(e) and G.5 of their BOA? All invoices and documentation were provided in a timely manner.			3
7. Did the contractor provide proper notifications when they reach 85% of their ceiling IAW H.4(a) of their BOA. Did they exceed the ATP Ceiling without proper notifications? MER always had close communication with the FOSCR in regards to the ATP ceiling. If they were approaching 85% of the ceiling, the FOSCR was notified well ahead of time.			3
REGULATORY COMPLIANCE			
8. Was the contractor compliant with environmental laws and regulations IAW H.10, H.11 and H.15 of their BOA? All laws and regulations were followed in accordance to their BOA.			3
MANAGEMENT (Questions 1-4 shall be completed by Contract Specialist)			
1. Did the contractor work within the terms and conditions of the BOA? Yes, all BOA procedures were properly followed. Invoices were submitted weekly, sometimes in batches, and Moran agreed to rate adjustments when daily rates were lower than hourly rates.			3
2. If subcontractor items were applicable, did the contractor follow the proper approval procedures IAW H.2 of their BOA? Yes, all subcontract requests were received in advance of costs and were timely adjusted when the work extended beyond initial expectations.			3
3. Did the contractor submit a release with final invoice IAW G.1(e)(12) of their BOA? Yes, once all invoices were reviewed and a mutually agreed final total was determined.			2
4. Did the contractor submit required disposal documentation and disposal manifest with invoice IAW G.1(f)(i) of their BOA? Yes, all as required by the terms and conditions of the BOA.			2
Overall Evaluation: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outstanding <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory			
Unit Evaluation Obtained From Name and Title: MST1 Tonya Mulhern	Evaluation Prepared By: Name and Title Mr. Thomas Auler	Evaluation Approved By: Name and Title Mr. Gerard E. Hendricks	

RESET FORM

Please put your comments on page 1 in the spaces provided. In the event that there is not enough space for your comments, continue on page two.

Ratings of **(3) Outstanding**: the comments shall provide sufficient detail regarding specific events that demonstrate outstanding, exceptional, extraordinary quality work and reliability.

Rating of **(2) Satisfactory**: the comments shall indicate acceptable, adequate, average, competent quality of work and reliability.

Rating of **(1) Unsatisfactory**: the comments shall provide sufficient details/facts regarding specific events or actions to justify inadequate, substandard, deficient, poor or unacceptable work. (e.g., extent of Government inspection required, rework required, subcontracting, cooperation of contractor, quality of workmen and adequacy of equipment).

Moran Environmental Recovery continued to provide the USCG Sector Jacksonville with a timely and effective response. When called upon, the contractor brought all equipment and personnel necessary to complete the task, and continued to provide superior technical skills and capabilities throughout the two month long response at Safe Harbor.

Although contractor dailies were behind by several days, the constant communication in regards to ceilings and daily expenditures ensured that the FOSCR always had the most accurate and up to date costs and information on a daily basis.

MER continues to be exceptional and highly professional in every response, and this one was no different.

Evaluation Areas. Evaluate each area based on the following criteria (in alignment with CPARS):

Schedule. Assess the timeliness of the contractor against the completion of the contract, task orders, milestones, delivery schedules, and administrative requirements (e.g., efforts that contribute to or affect the schedule variance). This evaluation of the contractor's adherence to the required delivery schedule should include the contractor's efforts during the evaluation period that contribute to or affect the schedule variance. Also, address significance of scheduled events (e.g., design reviews), discuss causes, and assess the effectiveness of contractor corrective actions.

Quality. Assess the contractor's conformance to contract/order requirements, specifications and standards of good workmanship (e.g., commonly accepted technical, professional, environmental, or safety and health standards).

Cost Control. Assess the contractor's effectiveness in forecasting, managing, and controlling contract/order cost. If the contractor is experiencing cost growth or under-run, discuss the causes and contractor-proposed solutions for the cost overruns or underruns. For contracts/orders where task or contract sizing is based upon contractor-provided person hour estimates, the relationship of these estimates to ultimate task cost should be assessed. In addition, the extent to which the contractor demonstrates a sense of cost responsibility, through the efficient use of resources, in each work effort should be assessed.

Regulatory Compliance. Assess compliance with all terms and conditions in the contract/order relating to applicable regulations and codes. Consider aspects of performance such as compliance with financial, environmental (example: Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act), safety, and labor regulations as well as any other reporting requirements in the contract.

Management. Assess the integration and coordination of all activity needed to execute the contract/order, specifically the timeliness, completeness and quality of problem identification, corrective action plans, proposal submittals, the contractor's history of reasonable and cooperative behavior (to include timely identification of issues in controversy), customer satisfaction, timely award and management of subcontracts.
