

PAST PERFORMANCE REFERENCE CHECK
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (VA)
Honolulu, Hawaii
VA-101-16-R-0027

Instructions for Offeror Requesting Reference: Offeror shall fill out the Parts I and II of this form and forward to the reference to complete and submit directly back to VA. Any form that is identified by the name of Offering Entity for this Procurement shall not be considered. In order to be considered, the reference must be received by the recipients listed below by: June 9, 2017.

Instruction for Reference: This reference form is provided as a PDF file with text boxes for ease of completion. Please complete Part III on behalf of the Offeror for the Project identified below in Parts I and II, sign and submit reference via email to the following email recipients list: Anntwinette.Dupree-Hart@va.gov; Samuel.Perminter@va.gov; Jrayfield@savills-studley.com; Tmazzucca@savills-studley.com.

Please be certain to include the following in the email subject line with this completed form attached. **"Honolulu, HI VA-101-16-R-0027 REFERENCE for "(insert name of Offeror)"**

In order to be considered, this reference must be received by the recipients above by: June 9, 2017.

If you have any questions, please contact VA's broker representative on this procurement:

Julie Rayfield
Tim Mazzucca
Savills Studley, Inc.
Jrayfield@savills-studley.com
and
Tmazzucca@savills-studley.com

PART I REFERENCE FOR

1. Name of Offering Entity:
2. Project Name:
3. Project Address (Street, City, State):
4. Project Size (square footage):
5. Type of Construction:
 - New construction:
 - New build-to-suit construction:
 - Renovation:
6. Intended Use of the Facility
 - Medical outpatient:
 - Other (For example: office, industrial, retail. Please specify):
7. Type of Occupancy

Government:
Private Sector:

8. Project Duration (number of years):
9. Project Completion Timeframe (occupancy by month and year):
10. List of quality awards this project received:

PART II REFERENCE PROVIDED BY

1. Reference Name:
2. Reference Title:
3. Reference Company or Government Agency:
4. Role on Referenced Project:
5. Reference Contact Information
Telephone:
Email:

PART III REFERENCE QUESTIONS

Does the information in Part II above accurately describe your project, and if not, please describe discrepancies.

Please describe the of services the Offeror provided:

Timeliness of Performance:

1. Please identify which of the following best describes the project as it relates to schedule:

Ahead of schedule
On schedule
Behind schedule
2. If schedule was not met, please identify what, in your opinion, were the causes and were they related to circumstances within the Offer's control?
3. Did the Offeror take steps to ensure the schedule was met or that delays were minimized?

Yes
No

4. Were the Offeror's services and deliverables timely?

- 9-10 Significantly Exceeded Expectations
- 7 -8 Met and to Some Extent Exceeded Expectations
- 5-6 Met Expectations
- 3-4 Did Not Fully Meet Expectations
- 0-2 Failed to Meet Expectations

5. Please rate Offeror overall related to Timeliness of Performance?

- 9-10 Significantly Exceeded Expectations
- 7 -8 Met and to Some Extent Exceeded Expectations
- 5-6 Met Expectations
- 3-4 Did Not Fully Meet Expectations
- 0-2 Failed to Meet Expectations

Cost Control:

1. Please identify which of the following best describes the project as it relates to cost control:

- Below budget
- On budget
- Over budget

2. If the budget was not met, please identify what, in your opinion, were the causes and were they related to circumstances within the Offer's control?

3. Did the Offeror take steps to ensure the project was delivered on budget?

- Yes
- No

4. What was your level of satisfaction with the management of overall project cost and of change orders?

- 9-10 Significantly Exceeded Expectations
- 7 -8 Met and to Some Extent Exceeded Expectations
- 5-6 Met Expectations
- 3-4 Did Not Fully Meet Expectations
- 0-2 Failed to Meet Expectations

5. Please rate Offeror overall related to Cost Control:

- 9-10 Significantly Exceeded Expectations
- 7 -8 Met and to Some Extent Exceeded Expectations
- 5-6 Met Expectations

- 3-4 Did Not Fully Meet Expectations
- 0-2 Failed to Meet Expectations

Effective Management:

1. How would you rate the Offeror's ability to management this project effectively?

- 9-10 Significantly Exceeded Expectations
- 7 -8 Met and to Some Extent Exceeded Expectations
- 5-6 Met Expectations
- 3-4 Did Not Fully Meet Expectations
- 0-2 Failed to Meet Expectations

2. Please rate the Offeror's responsiveness to questions, comments and direction?

- 9-10 Significantly Exceeded Expectations
- 7 -8 Met and to Some Extent Exceeded Expectations
- 5-6 Met Expectations
- 3-4 Did Not Fully Meet Expectations
- 0-2 Failed to Meet Expectations

3. How would you rate the Offeror's ability to control quality on this project?

- 9-10 Significantly Exceeded Expectations
- 7 -8 Met and to Some Extent Exceeded Expectations
- 5-6 Met Expectations
- 3-4 Did Not Fully Meet Expectations
- 0-2 Failed to Meet Expectations

4. How would you rate the Offeror's ability to effectively manage its team members including the general contractor?

- 9-10 Significantly Exceeded Expectations
- 7 -8 Met and to Some Extent Exceeded Expectations
- 5-6 Met Expectations
- 3-4 Did Not Fully Meet Expectations
- 0-2 Failed to Meet Expectations

5. Please provide information to support your numerical evaluation above.

Customer Satisfaction/Business Relations:

1. Please rate your overall level of satisfaction with this Offeror on this project:

- 9-10 Significantly Exceeded Expectations
- 7 -8 Met and to Some Extent Exceeded Expectations
- 5-6 Met Expectations
- 3-4 Did Not Fully Meet Expectations
- 0-2 Failed to Meet Expectations

2. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the outcome of the project:

- 9-10 Significantly Exceeded Expectations
- 7 -8 Met and to Some Extent Exceeded Expectations
- 5-6 Met Expectations
- 3-4 Did Not Fully Meet Expectations
- 0-2 Failed to Meet Expectations

3. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the Offeror's level of service and responsiveness:

- 9-10 Significantly Exceeded Expectations
- 7 -8 Met and to Some Extent Exceeded Expectations
- 5-6 Met Expectations
- 3-4 Did Not Fully Meet Expectations
- 0-2 Failed to Meet Expectations

Technical Success of the Project:

A. Building

1. For the building, would you rate the workmanship, quality of materials used and overall appearance?

- 9-10 Significantly Exceeded Expectations
- 7 -8 Met and to Some Extent Exceeded Expectations
- 5-6 Met Expectations
- 3-4 Did Not Fully Meet Expectations
- 0-2 Failed to Meet Expectations

2. Please provide information to support your numerical evaluation above.

3. For the interior spaces, would you rate the efficiency of the space, how effectively it supports your programmatic needs and how flexible it is in accommodating change?

- 9-10 Significantly Exceeded Expectations
- 7 -8 Met and to Some Extent Exceeded Expectations
- 5-6 Met Expectations
- 3-4 Did Not Fully Meet Expectations
- 0-2 Failed to Meet Expectations

4. Please provide information to support your numerical evaluation above.

Small Business Subcontracting:

1. Was a Small Business Subcontracting Plan required under this contract?

Yes

No

2. If so, did the firm meet the goals of the plan?

Yes

No

3. If the goals were not met, did the Offeror make a good faith effort to attain them?

4. If this was a government project, did the firm file the required eSRS reports?

Yes

No

Other:

1. Were any claims or mechanics liens filed in connection with this project?

Yes

No

2. Would you contract with this Offeror again?

Reference Signature

Date