

CITY OF LEAGUE CITY VENDOR REPORT CARD

Professional Services

Engineering, Construction Materials Testing, Surveying, Environmental, Etc.

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

| Project Name: | A-D Clear Creek Tributar | ies Select Clearing and Desnag | Date Contract Began: | 9/26/2019 |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| Contract Number: | | | Date Contract Ended: | |
| Project Number: | DR1910 | _ | Date Report Card Completed: | 7/18/2023 |
| | | - | Previous Report Card Rating: | 7 - 7 |
| | | | Trevious Report cura Ruting. | |
| | | | Below Contractual Expectations 1 - 3 | |
| | | SCORING METHOD: | Met Contractual Expectations 4 | |
| | | | Exceeded Contractual Expectatic 5 | |
| | | Cells in 'bli | ue' highlight MUST be completed | |
| Evaluation Criteria Score | | | | |
| A. PERFORMANCE AND PROFESSIONALISM | | | | |
| 1. Satisfaction with Overall Performance. | | | | |
| 2. Would you recommend this Consultant for future projects? | | | | 5 |
| Consultant was knowledgeable, competent and professional? Consultant was responsive to City directed changes to priorities and/or schedule? | | | | 5 |
| 5. Consultant was responsive to city directed changes to priorities and/or schedule: 5. Consultant exhibited professionalism, courtesy and respect toward Citizens and City Staff? | | | | 3 5 |
| Consultant exhibited professionalism, courtesy and respect toward Business Community? | | | | 5 |
| 7. Consultant demonstrated they complied with the Scope of their contract? | | | | 4 |
| 8. Consultant attended required project meetings and documented the meetings accordingly? | | | | 4 |
| 9. Consultant attended required site visits and submitted documents accordingly? | | | | 4 |
| 10. Consultant provided adequate project staffing, supervision and quality control? | | | | 4 |
| | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |
| | | | Total Vendor Responsiveness: | 43 |
| B. QUALITY AND D | FLIVERY | | Total Vendor Responsiveness. | 43 |
| | the project milestones in sche | edule provided? | | 3 |
| 2. Consultant completed the contract on time? | | | | 5 |
| 3. Consultant responded to communications/questions in a timely manner? | | | | 4 |
| 4. Information provided was reliable and accurate? | | | | 4 |
| 5. Quality of deliverables was satisfactory? | | | | 4 |
| Data and documents provided in a format compatible with City resources? Data and documents provided in a secure and confidential manner? | | | | 5 |
| 7. Data and docum | ients provided in a secure and | d confidential manner? | | 5 |
| Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | Total Vendor Quality and Delivery: | 30 |
| C. FINANCIAL | | | | |
| | | needed, was accurate and fair? | | 5 |
| 2. Invoices were ac | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | 5 |
| 3. Responsiveness | to billing requests? | | | 5 |
| Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | Total Financial: | 15 |
| | | | Average Score: | 4.40 |
| | | | Total Vendor Score: | |
| | | | | 88.00 |
| Would you hire | them again? | es | □ No | |
| | | | | |
| List positives or | There were obstacles that were caused by both, City and Consultant. The consultant was delayed due to hurdles in obtaining right-of-way (ROW) acquisitions and change in | | | |
| negatives that stood scope of work by the City. However, there were obstacles that were created by the consultant beccasue they did accurately follow-up with TxDOT of their requirements, nor did | | | | |
| out on the job: they control internal scheduling conflicts. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| DIRECTIONS: | | | | |
| 1. Form must be completed within 30 days of contract completion. | | | | |
| Lead Project Manager on contract will complete the form with input from Accounts Payable and any other departmens affected by contract. One copy of report card to be kept in project folder; send copy to Purchasing. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 4. If contract is not being renewed and/or is being terminated due to performance issues, send copy of report card to the contractor. | | | | |

James Doyle

11/1/2023 Date