

For Official Use Only / Source Selection Sensitive Information, See FAR 2.101, 3.104, and
42.1503

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORT (CPAR) CONSTRUCTION

Name/Address of Contractor:

Company Name: INTEGRITAS SYSTEMS, L.L.C.

Division Name:

Street Address: 436 N LAKE ST STE 1R

City, State, Zip Code: AURORA, IL, 60506

Country: USA

DUNS Number: 030780158

PSC: N059 NAICS Code: 238210

Evaluation Type: FINAL

Contract Percent Complete: 100

Period of Performance Being Assessed: 2015-08-08 - 2015-09-09

Contract Number: W912P614C0013

Business Sector & Sub-Sector: CONSTRUCTION,

Contracting Office: CELRC-PM-CT

Contracting Officer: REGINA G. BLAIR Phone Number: 312-846-5371

Location of Work: CHICAGO HARBOR LOCK CHICAGO, IL

Award Date: 2014-07-31

Effective Date: 2014-09-08

Completion Date: 2015-03-07

Actual Completion Date: 2015-06-25

Total Dollar Value: \$303,885.00 Current Contract Dollar Value: \$303,885.00

Complexity: MEDIUM Termination Type: NONE

Competition Type: FULL AND OPEN COMPETITION AFTER EXCLUSION OF SOURCES

Contract Type: FIRM FIXED PRICE

Key Subcontractors and Effort Performed:

Project Number: W912P6-14-C-0013

Project Title: CHICAGO LOCK LIGHTNING PROTECTION

Contract Effort Description: THE SCOPE OF WORK IS FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A LIGHTNING PROTECTION SYSTEM (LPS). THE DESIGN WILL INCLUDE LPS COMPONENTS TO PROVIDE PROTECTION FOR PERSONNEL AND PROPERTY ON THE NORTH AND SOUTH PIERS OF THE LOCK AND ON TOP OF THE LOCK GATES. THE AREA OF THE NORTH PIER TO BE PROTECTED WILL EXTEND FROM THE WEST EDGE OF THE PIER, INCLUDING THE SHOP BUILDING AND NORTHWEST CONTROL HOUSE, TO THE EAST END OF THE PIER ENDING AT LAKE MICHIGAN. THE AREA OF THE SOUTH PIER TO BE PROTECTED WILL EXTEND FROM THE CHAIN LINK FENCE AT THE WEST END OF THE PIER MARKING THE EDGE OF THE PROPERTY FOR THE CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT TO THE CHAIN LINK FENCE ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE EAST LOCK GATE BAY.

Small Business Utilization:

Does this contract include a subcontracting plan? NO

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

A common five level assessment rating system is used to evaluate a contractor's performance. Ratings range from Unsatisfactory to Exceptional. Here's a breakdown of each category:

Rating	Definition
Exceptional	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.
	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The

Very Good	Element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.
Satisfactory	Performance meets contractual requirements. The element being assessed contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.
Marginal	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions.
Unsatisfactory	Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The element being assessed contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.

Evaluation Areas:**Rating**

Quality	EXCEPTIONAL
Schedule	VERY GOOD
Cost Control	N/A
Management	VERY GOOD
Utilization of Small Business	N/A
Regulatory Compliance	VERY GOOD
Other Areas	Rating
(1) SAFETY	VERY GOOD

(2)

(3)

Variance (Contract to Date)

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

Current Schedule Variance (%): Completion Schedule Variance (%):

Assessing Official Comments:

QUALITY: i. Adequacy and implementation of Contractor's Quality Control Plan: Exceptional; Contractor brought up issues and concerns prior to USACE finding them. This led to a positive working relationship and quick problem resolution. ii. Contractor's ability to maintain quality control and accuracy of QC documentation: Very Good; All documentation was in order, only issue was providing proper documentation for the anchorage of the poles. The USACE Structural reviewer asked for documentation that is not standard from the pole manufacturer. This required Contractor to hire an independent Structural Engineer to provide proper documentation. iii. Implementation of the 3-phase inspection process: Very Good iv. Quality of workmanship: Exceptional; The USACE team was very pleased with the installation. v. Work is in accordance with the plans and specifications: Very Good; no deficiencies found.

SCHEDULE: i. Quality and timeliness of the initial schedule submission: Very Good ii. Adherence to the approved schedule: Very Good. The issue with the anchor bolts led to a late approval and arrival of the poles. iii. Communication and submittal of schedule revisions: N/A iv. Corrective action taken by the Contractor when schedule has slipped through fault of Contractor: N/A

COST CONTROL: i. Were the Contractor's billings current, accurate, and complete? : N/A ii. Are the Contractor's budgetary internal controls adequate? : N/A iii. Was innovation used that resulted in cost savings? : N/A

MANAGEMENT: i. Management of resources and key personnel: Exceptional: Contractor's Superintendent was in complete control of their resources and he did a very good job of coordinating activities. ii. Coordination and control of subcontractor(s): Exceptional; Superintendent was exemplary. iii. Review and resolution of subcontractor's issues: Very good, no issues were brought to USACE's attention. iv. Management responsiveness: Very Good.

UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS: i. Compliance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business: N/A ii. Compliance with FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan: N/A iii. Contractor's good faith effort(s) to meet contract goals and requirements: N/A

REGULATORY COMPLIANCE: i. Contractor's enforcement of laws and regulations: Exceptional;

No issues. ii. Correction of deficiencies when out of compliance: Very Good; Contractor made immediate corrections when deficiencies were discovered. iii. Communication of laws and regulations to subcontractor(s): Very Good; A Subcontractor was not abiding by the Chicago Harbor Lock policy for PPE, the Superintendent resolved the issue and made sure Lock personnel were satisfied. iv. Compliance with the Davis-Bacon Act: Very Good, no issues noted. OTHER AREAS: i. Adequacy of Contractor's Safety Plan: Very Good, safety plan was reviewed and approved. Contractor clearly understood the safety requirements of the Chicago Harbor Lock – especially in regard to OSHA requirements for work near water. ii. Implementation of Safety Plan: Very Good; No accidents or injuries. iii. Identification and correction of safety deficiencies: Exceptional; as noted above, the Superintendent corrected the improper safety deficiency and coordinated with the Lock personnel to make sure they were satisfied. iv. Quantitative evaluation of accidents and injuries: No accidents!

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 him for similar requirements in the future.

Name and Title of Assessing Official:

Name: PHILIP STAVRIDES

Title: CIVIL ENGINEER/COR

Organization: USACE LCR-TS-C-C

Phone Number: 312-846-5490 Email Address: PHILIP.A.STAVRIDES@USACE.ARMY.MIL

Date: 2016-01-19

Contractor Comments:

ADDITIONAL/OTHER: The evaluation was delivered/received by the contractor on 01/19/2016. The contractor neither signed nor offered comment in response to this evaluation.

Name and Title of Contractor Representative:

Name:

Title:

Phone Number: Email Address:

Date: 2016-03-21

Review by Reviewing Official:

Review by Reviewing Official not required.

Name and Title of Reviewing Official:

Name:

Title:

Organization:

Phone Number: Email Address:

Date:

For Official Use Only