

EXHIBIT "B"
PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE (PPQ) - OFFEROR

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest in San Diego, CA is considering the Offeror listed below. Your comments would be appreciated regarding this firm's past performance. The intent of this form is to evaluate commercial projects. If the reference project is a government project, you may forward a copy of the official performance evaluation. Although your comments are considered Source Selection Sensitive; therefore, you are advised that the Federal Acquisition Regulation (15.506) prohibits the release of the names of individuals providing reference information about an Offeror's past performance. However, the solicitation requires the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) be sent back to the contractor to be submitted in their proposal. So, to avoid having to fill out Past Performance Questionnaires for the same contractor/project numerous times, you may forward the questionnaire back to the contractor to be kept on file for any subsequent proposal submissions. If you do not want the contractor to have a copy of the completed PPQ, you may return it to this office by facsimile at (619) 532-4789. In order to maintain the integrity of the source selection process, it is respectfully requested that you do not divulge the name of the Offeror, nor discuss your comments on this questionnaire with any other individuals.

Past Performance Information:

Name and Address of Offeror being evaluated:
 Souza Construction, 501 North Church Street, Visalia, Ca 93291

Contract Number/Delivery or Task Order Number, Title, & Location:
 C8158051020 – N8158051020, Bunker Road Repair, Fort Baker, National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Evaluator: (The following information will assist in the analysis of the data. Information will be kept confidential)

Name of Evaluator: Barbara Judy

Address: Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Fort Mason, Building 201, San Francisco CA 94123

Phone Number: 415-561-4812

Position held or function in relation to project: Historical Architect, Contracting Officer's Representative

Rating: Please evaluate the past performance using only the following ratings without variation. ***DO NOT RATE ON A "+" OR "-" SCALE.*** If a "+" or "-" is used, the rating without the "+" or "-" will be applied. If the rating is **Marginal** or **Unacceptable**, please provide additional information in the appropriate block or in the remarks section of this form.

"O"	Outstanding	Performance greatly exceeded the contract requirements.
"A"	Above Average	Performance exceeded the contract requirements.
"S"	Satisfactory	Performance met the contract requirements.
"M"	Marginal	Performance met the minimum contract requirements but some material aspects of the contractor's performance were less than satisfactory.
"U"	Unacceptable	Performance was poor and/or did not satisfy contract requirements.

Please rate and provide any supporting information/comments for the following:	
1. The relationship between the Offeror and client's/customer's contract team?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> O A S M U
2. The Offeror's management and coordination of subcontractors.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> O A S M U
3. Overall corporate management, integrity, reasonableness and cooperative conduct:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> O A S M U
4. Quality of work:	O <input checked="" type="radio"/> A S M U
5. Quality control:	O <input checked="" type="radio"/> A S M U
6. Ability to meet the performance schedule:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> O A S M U
7. Ability/actions to improve schedule problems, if applicable:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> O A S M U
8. Ability to control costs and provide the required work at a reasonable total price:	O <input checked="" type="radio"/> A S M U
9. Compliance with labor standards, as applicable:	O <input checked="" type="radio"/> A S M U
10. Compliance with safety standards and/or number of safety related incidents, code compliance, as applicable:	O <input checked="" type="radio"/> A S M U
11. Have any cure notices, show cause letters, letter of reprimand, suspension of payment, or termination been issued? If yes, please explain:	Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No

12. Would you award another contact to the party being evaluated? If no, please explain.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes No
13. Was the customer satisfied with the end product? If no, please explain.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes No
14. Has the firm being evaluated been provided an opportunity to discuss or respond to any negative comments or performance ratings? If so, what were the results?	Yes No (Not applicable)
15. Additional Remarks: The GGNRA project with Souza Construction that is the basis of this past performance review consisted of a road rehabilitation project at a national park site in Marin County, California. The project construction cost was \$260,000 and the construction work itself was straightforward reconstruction of concrete drainage features, and repair and resurfacing of an asphalt concrete roadway. The challenging aspect of the project involved management of the project schedule to minimize the duration of the project so that the road was back in service as quickly as possible. Souza Construction really excelled in managing all aspects of the project schedule, by anticipating and solving potential problems with supplies, by selecting similarly cooperative subcontractors, and by generally staying on top of all aspects of the construction effort. Their efforts resulted in the road being re-opened two days ahead of the planned three week shutdown, an outcome that was very much appreciated by our agency. I look forward to working with them again in the future and I recommend their services to other federal agencies.	
16. Overall rating for this firm:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> O A S M U
<i>Barbara A. Judy</i> _____ Signature of Evaluator	4-26-06 _____ Date

PLEASE NOTE: Contractors may be advised of adverse remarks and given the opportunity to respond in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation requirements.