CITY OF LEAGUE CITY VENDOR REPORT CARD: GENERAL SERVICES Vendor Name: UNIFIRST Contract/PO # 3230088 Form completed by: Ramiro Ochoa Date: 9/25/2025 **Scoring Guide** 1 Does not meet criteria 2 Generally does not meet criteria 3 Meets criteria 4 Exceeds some criteria 5 Exceptional criteria ear 1 Score ear 6 Score ear 5 Scor **Evaluation Criteria** Renewal Period (annotate with an X in box) **VENDOR RESPONSIVENESS** Vendor is knowledgeable and competent about service 4 Service level agreements are met 4 Communication is relevant and timely 3 Communication is professional 4 Vendor provides timely response to questions 3 Total Vendor Responsiveness Score 18 0 0 0 0 **QUALITY AND DELIVERY** Services on-time and schedule is upheld 4 Satisfies scope of services 4 Service is reliable 4 Quality of deliverables 4 Product or service provides significant added value 3 Quality of personnel assigned 4 Depth of vendor's team 3 Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 **FINANCIAL** Value of products/services is high 4 Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely 3 Budget is upheld 4 Pricing is competitive 4 Invoice pricing matches contract pricing 3 Total Vendor Financial Score 18 0 0 0 0 0 0 REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data 3 Organizational stability and resiliency 3 Industry reputation is in good standing **Total Vendor Reputational Score** 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Total Vendor Score 72 0 0 0 0 0 0 Would you hire them again? Yes ■ No Overall Worked with Unifirst in the past, using them again have noticed changes but can still work with them. **Comments:** Grade: 86-100 = A, 76-85 = B, 66-75 = C, below 66 = F If a contract is not being renewed and/or is being broken due to performance issues, please send a copy of the report card to the vendor.

CITY OF LEAGUE CITY VENDOR REPORT CARD: GENERAL SERVICES

Vendor Name: Unifirst Holding Incorporate Contract/PO # 3230088

Form completed

Date: 9/16/2025 by: Robert Taylor Fiscal Years: 2023-2026

Scoring Guide

- 1 Does not meet criteria
- 2 Generally does not meet criteria
- 3 Meets criteria
- 4 Exceeds some criteria
- 5 Exceptional criteria

	Year 1 Score	ar 2 Score	ar 3 Score	Year 4 Score	Year 5 Score	Year 6 Score	Year 7 Score	ar 8 Score
Evaluation Criteria	Yes	Year	Year	Yes	Yea	≺ea	Yea	Year 8
Renewal Period (annotate with an X in box)								
VENDOR RESPONSIVENESS								
Vendor is knowledgeable and competent about service	4	5	5					
Service level agreements are met	3	5	5				STEE	
Communication is relevant and timely	3	5	5					
Communication is professional	4	5	5					
Vendor provides timely response to questions	3	5	5					
Total Vendor Responsiveness Score	17	25	25	0	0	0	0	0
QUALITY AND DELIVERY								
Services on-time and schedule is upheld	4	5	5					
Satisfies scope of services	3	4	5					
Service is reliable	4	5	5					
Quality of deliverables	3	4	4					
Product or service provides significant added value	4	4	4					
Quality of personnel assigned	5	5	5					
Depth of vendor's team	5	5	5				1	
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score	28	32	33	0	0	0	0	0
FINANCIAL								
Value of products/services is high	4	4	4					
Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely	3	3	4					
Budget is upheld	4	4	4					
Pricing is competitive	4	4	4				1	
Invoice pricing matches contract pricing	3	3	4					
Total Vendor Financial Score	18	18	20	0	0	0	0	0
REPUTATIONAL								
Confidentiality and security of documents and data	4	4	4		130			
Organizational stability and resiliency	4	4	4			E 55		1000
Industry reputation is in good standing	4	4	4				354	
Total Vendor Reputational Score	12	12	12	0	0	0	0	0
Total Vendor Score	75	87	90	0	0	0	0	0

Would you hire them again? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Overall Comments:

The start of the contract was a little shaky while we worked all of the bugs out. Monica has been fantastic and very responsive to our needs. We still have multiple invoice corrections that are needed throughout the year that Salina assists us with. Overall the service has been satisfactory.

Grade: 86-100 = A, 76-85 = B, 66-75 = C, below 66 = F

If a contract is not being renewed and/or is being broken due to performance issues, please send a copy of the report card to the vendor.

Date: 9/11/2025 Form completed by: Tommy Arredon: Fiscal Years		FY202	5					
Scoring Guide								
1 Does not meet criteria								
2 Generally does not meet criteria								
3 Meets criteria								
4 Exceeds some criteria								
5 Exceptional criteria								
	ore	2 Score	ore	ore	ore	ore	ore	970
	L Sc	2 Sc	3 Sc	1 Sc	SS	5 Sc	Sc.	ear 8 Score
Evaluation Criteria	Year 1 Score	ear.	Year 3 Score	fear 4 Score	Year 5 Score	rear 6 Score	Year 7 Score	1
arativation official	7	-Xe	۶	7	×	28	7	>
Renewal Period (annotate with an X in box)								
/ENDOR RESPONSIVENESS								
/endor is knowledgeable and competent about service	5					TE		
Service level agreements are met	5							
Communication is relevant and timely	5							
Communication is professional /endor provides timely response to questions	5							
Total Vendor Responsiveness Score		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
QUALITY AND DELIVERY	24	U	U	0		U	U	
Services on-time and schedule is upheld	5							
Satisfies scope of services	4							
Service is reliable	4							
Quality of deliverables	5							
Product or service provides significant added value	4							
Quality of personnel assigned Depth of vendor's team	5							
	4	0	0	0	0	0		
	24				U	0	0	0
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score	31	U	U					
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score	1	U						
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score INANCIAL /alue of products/services is high	4 4	U						
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score	4	U						
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score FINANCIAL Value of products/services is high Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely Budget is upheld Pricing is competitive	4	U						
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score FINANCIAL Value of products/services is high Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely Budget is upheld Pricing is competitive Invoice pricing matches contract pricing	4 4 4							
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score FINANCIAL /alue of products/services is high Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely Budget is upheld Pricing is competitive Invoice pricing matches contract pricing Total Vendor Financial Score	4 4 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score FINANCIAL Value of products/services is high Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely Budget is upheld Pricing is competitive Invoice pricing matches contract pricing Total Vendor Financial Score	4 4 4 4				0	0	0	0
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score FINANCIAL Value of products/services is high Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely Budget is upheld Pricing is competitive Invoice pricing matches contract pricing Total Vendor Financial Score REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data	4 4 4 4 20				0	0	0	0
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score FINANCIAL Value of products/services is high Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely Budget is upheld Pricing is competitive Invoice pricing matches contract pricing Total Vendor Financial Score REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data Drganizational stability and resiliency	4 4 4 4 20				0	0	0	0
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score FINANCIAL Value of products/services is high Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely Budget is upheld Pricing is competitive Invoice pricing matches contract pricing Total Vendor Financial Score REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data Organizational stability and resiliency Industry reputation is in good standing	4 4 4 4 20 4 4 5	0	0	0				
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score FINANCIAL Value of products/services is high Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely Budget is upheld Pricing is competitive Invoice pricing matches contract pricing Total Vendor Financial Score REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data Diganizational stability and resiliency Industry reputation is in good standing Total Vendor Reputational Score	4 4 4 4 20 4 4 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score FINANCIAL Value of products/services is high Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely Budget is upheld Pricing is competitive Invoice pricing matches contract pricing Total Vendor Financial Score REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data Drganizational stability and resiliency Industry reputation is in good standing Total Vendor Reputational Score Total Vendor Score	4 4 4 4 20 4 4 5	0	0	0				
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score FINANCIAL Value of products/services is high Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely Budget is upheld Pricing is competitive Invoice pricing matches contract pricing Total Vendor Financial Score REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data Drganizational stability and resiliency Industry reputation is in good standing Total Vendor Reputational Score Total Vendor Score Nould you hire them again? Yes No	4 4 4 4 20 4 4 5 13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score FINANCIAL Value of products/services is high Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely Budget is upheld Pricing is competitive Invoice pricing matches contract pricing Total Vendor Financial Score REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data Drganizational stability and resiliency Industry reputation is in good standing Total Vendor Reputational Score Total Vendor Score	4 4 4 4 20 4 4 5 13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score FINANCIAL Value of products/services is high Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely Budget is upheld Pricing is competitive Invoice pricing matches contract pricing Total Vendor Financial Score REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data Drganizational stability and resiliency Industry reputation is in good standing Total Vendor Reputational Score Total Vendor Score Nould you hire them again? Yes No	4 4 4 4 20 4 4 5 13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score FINANCIAL Value of products/services is high Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely Budget is upheld Pricing is competitive Invoice pricing matches contract pricing Total Vendor Financial Score REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data Drganizational stability and resiliency Industry reputation is in good standing Total Vendor Reputational Score Total Vendor Score Would you hire them again? Yes No Unifirst has performmed well this past year and continue to deliver a good of	4 4 4 4 20 4 4 5 13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

CITY OF LEAGUE CITY VENDOR REPORT CARD: GENERAL SERVICES Vendor Name: Unifirst by: Cameron Parker Fiscal Years: Scoring Guide 1 Does not meet criteria 2 Generally does not meet criteria 3 Meets criteria 4 Exceeds some criteria 5 Exceptional criteria ear 1 Score ear 2 Score ear 3 Score **Evaluation Criteria** Renewal Period (annotate with an X in box) **VENDOR RESPONSIVENESS** Vendor is knowledgeable and competent about service 1 Service level agreements are met 1 Communication is relevant and timely 1 Communication is professional 2 Vendor provides timely response to questions 2 **Total Vendor Responsiveness Score** 0 0 0 0 0 0 QUALITY AND DELIVERY Services on-time and schedule is upheld 2 Satisfies scope of services 1 Service is reliable 2 Quality of deliverables 2 Product or service provides significant added value 3 Quality of personnel assigned 2 Depth of vendor's team 1 Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score 13 FINANCIAL Value of products/services is high 2 Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely 1 Budget is upheld 1 Pricing is competitive 2 Invoice pricing matches contract pricing 1 **Total Vendor Financial Score** 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data Organizational stability and resiliency Industry reputation is in good standing **Total Vendor Reputational Score** 0 0 0 0 0 0 **Total Vendor Score** 0 27 0 0 0 0 0 Would you hire them again? ■ Yes ■ No Weekly invoicing issues, inaccurate contract pricing for services, no communication or follow through from management to insure safe gaurds, Overall Comments: Grade: 86-100 = A, 76-85 = B, 66-75 = C, below 66 = F If a contract is not being renewed and/or is being broken due to performance issues, please send a copy of the report card to the vendor.

CITY OF LEAGUE CITY VENDOR REPORT CARD Vendor Name: UniFirst Contract/PO # 3230088	D: GE	NERA	L SI	ERV	ICES	5		
Form completed Date: 9/29/2025 by: Misty Ferro Fiscal Y	Years:	2025						
Scoring Guide								
1 Does not meet criteria								
2 Generally does not meet criteria								
3 Meets criteria								
4 Exceeds some criteria								
5 Exceptional criteria								
Evaluation Criteria		Year 1 Score	Year 3 Score	Year 4 Score	Year 5 Score	Year 6 Score	Year 7 Score	Year 8 Score
		× ×	>	>	>	>	>	>
Renewal Period (annotate with an X in I	рох)							
VENDOR RESPONSIVENESS								
Vendor is knowledgeable and competent about service Service level agreements are met	and the same	5 5	5					
Communication is relevant and timely		4 4	4					
Communication is professional	1000	4 4	4					
Vendor provides timely response to questions	3	3 3	3					
Total Vendor Responsiveness S	Score 2	0 20	20	0	0	0	0	0
QUALITY AND DELIVERY								
Services on-time and schedule is upheld Satisfies scope of services		5 5	5					
Service is reliable		5 5 5	5					
Quality of deliverables	100 C 100 C	5 5	5					
Product or service provides significant added value	- 100	4 4	4					
Quality of personnel assigned		5 5	5				1881	
Depth of vendor's team		5 5	5					
Total Vendor Quality and Delivery S	Score 3	4 34	34	0	0	0	0	0
FINANCIAL Value of products (comisses in high								
Value of products/services is high Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely	5		5					
Budget is upheld		1 4	4					
Pricing is competitive	4	1 4	4					
Invoice pricing matches contract pricing		1 4	4					
Total Vendor Financial S	core 2	2 22	22	0	0	0	0	0
REPUTATIONAL								
Confidentiality and security of documents and data	4		4					
Organizational stability and resiliency Industry reputation is in good standing			4					
Total Vendor Reputational S	-		12	0	0	0	0	0
Total Vendor Sco			88	0	0	0	0	0
Would you hire them again? ■ Yes ■ No	one o	0 00	00	U	U	U	0	U
Unifirst offers exceptional customer service, including change of schedu Overall Comments:	ules, tim	ely deliv	eries,	and/o	or rep	airs to	unifo	orms.
Grade: 86-100 = A, 76-85 = B, 66-75 = C, below 66 = F								
If a contract is not being renewed and/or is being broken due to performance issues, ple	ease sen	d a copy	of the	e repo	rt car	d to th	ne ver	dor.

CITY OF LEAGUE CITY VENDOR REPORT CARD: GENERAL SERVICES Vendor Name: Unifirst Contract/PO # 3230088 Date: 9/29/2025 by: David Tickell Fiscal Years: FY22-25 **Scoring Guide** 1 Does not meet criteria 2 Generally does not meet criteria 3 Meets criteria 4 Exceeds some criteria 5 Exceptional criteria ear 1 Score ear 2 Scor ear 3 Scor ear 4 Scor ear 5 Scor **Evaluation Criteria** Renewal Period (annotate with an X in box) **VENDOR RESPONSIVENESS** Vendor is knowledgeable and competent about service 4 Service level agreements are met 4 Communication is relevant and timely 5 Communication is professional 5 Vendor provides timely response to questions 5 Total Vendor Responsiveness Score 23 0 0 0 **QUALITY AND DELIVERY** Services on-time and schedule is upheld 4 Satisfies scope of services 5 Service is reliable 4 Quality of deliverables 4 Product or service provides significant added value 4 Quality of personnel assigned 5 Depth of vendor's team 4 Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score 30 0 0 0 0 0 0 **FINANCIAL** Value of products/services is high 4 Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely 5 Budget is upheld 5 Pricing is competitive 5 Invoice pricing matches contract pricing 5 Total Vendor Financial Score 24 0 0 0 0 0 0 REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data 5 Organizational stability and resiliency 3 Industry reputation is in good standing 5 Total Vendor Reputational Score 13 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 **Total Vendor Score** 90 0 0 0 0 0 Would you hire them again? ✓ Yes No Vendor could inprove in tracking and retun of uniforms but vendor does keep uniforms up to expected standards of cleanliness. Overall

Grade: 86-100 = A, 76-85 = B, 66-75 = C, below 66 = F

Comments:

CITY OF LEAGUE CITY VENDOR REPORT CARD: GENERAL SERVICES Vendor Name: UniFirst Date: 9/30/2025 by: Lindsey Sinibaldi Fiscal Years: Scoring Guide 1 Does not meet criteria 2 Generally does not meet criteria 3 Meets criteria 4 Exceeds some criteria 5 Exceptional criteria ear 1 Score ear 2 Scol ear 4 Scor ear 5 Scor ear 6 Scor ear 3 Sco **Evaluation Criteria** Renewal Period (annotate with an X in box) **VENDOR RESPONSIVENESS** Vendor is knowledgeable and competent about service 5 Service level agreements are met 3 Communication is relevant and timely 4 Communication is professional 5 Vendor provides timely response to questions Total Vendor Responsiveness Score 0 0 22 0 0 0 **QUALITY AND DELIVERY** Services on-time and schedule is upheld 4 Satisfies scope of services 4 Service is reliable 4 Quality of deliverables 4 Product or service provides significant added value 2 Quality of personnel assigned 4 Depth of vendor's team Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score 0 0 26 0 0 0 FINANCIAL Value of products/services is high 3 Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely 2 Budget is upheld 2 Pricing is competitive 3 Invoice pricing matches contract pricing 2 Total Vendor Financial Score 0 0 12 0 0 0 REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data 5 Organizational stability and resiliency 4 Industry reputation is in good standing 4 **Total Vendor Reputational Score** 0 0 13 0 0 0 0 **Total Vendor Score** 0 0 0 73 0 0 0 0 Would you hire them again? ✓ Yes No UB is not a big contributor to this contract. Services are adequate but invoices and contract pricing has been an issue. The representative that brings our clothing and invoices weekly is excellent. Overall Comments: Grade: 86-100 = A, 76-85 = B, 66-75 = C, below 66 = F

If a contract is not being renewed and/or is being broken due to performance issues, please send a copy of the report card to the vendor.