CITY OF LEAGUE CITY VENDOR REPORT CARD: GOODS Vendor Name: Chastang Enterprises, Inc. Contract/PO # 2240597 Form completed by: Wesley Baker Date: 9/26/2024 Fiscal Years: 2024 **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** Renewal Period (annotate with an X in box **VENDOR RESPONSIVENESS** Vendor is knowledgeable and competent about product 5 Service level agreements are met 5 5 Communication is relevant and timely Vendor provides timely response to questions 4 Broad contact with City of League City 4 Total Vendor Responsiveness Score 23 0 0 0 0 0 0 **QUALITY AND DELIVERY** Deliveries are on-time 5 5 Product(s) meet specifications 4 Product(s) is free of defects Product(s) is reliable 5 Product(S) is available 5 Product(s) mistakes can/will be corrected 5 Warranty is competitive and upheld 5 Depth of vendor's team 5 Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score 39 **FINANCIAL** Value of product is high 4 Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely 4 Pricing is competitive 4 Invoice pricing matches contract pricing 5 Total Vendor Financial Score 17 0 0 0 REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data 4 Organizational stability and resiliency 4 Industry reputation is in good standing 5 Total Vendor Reputational Score 13 0 0 0 0 **Total Vendor Score** 92 0 0 0 0 0 0 Would you hire them again? ☑ Yes ■ No Chastang Ford provides timely qoutes and works diligently to ensure the city receives the vehicles as soon as possible. Overall Comments:

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.

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

CITY OF LEAGUE CITY VENDOR REPORT CARD: GOODS Vendor Name: Mal Technologies Fleet Contract/PO # 2240818 Form completed Date: 10/1/2024 by: Wesley Baker Fiscal 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 ear 1 Score ear 2 Scor ear 4 Sco **Evaluation Criteria** Renewal Period (annotate with an X in box **VENDOR RESPONSIVENESS** Vendor is knowledgeable and competent about product 5 Service level agreements are met 4 Communication is relevant and timely 5 Vendor provides timely response to questions 4 Broad contact with City of League City 4 Total Vendor Responsiveness Score 22 0 0 0 0 0 0 QUALITY AND DELIVERY Deliveries are on-time 5 Product(s) meet specifications 5 Product(s) is free of defects 4 Product(s) is reliable 5 Product(S) is available 4 Product(s) mistakes can/will be corrected 5 Warranty is competitive and upheld 5 Depth of vendor's team 5 Total Vendor Quality and Delivery Score 38 0 0 0 FINANCIAL Value of product is high 4 Proposals and invoices are accurate and timely 4 Pricing is competitive 4 Invoice pricing matches contract pricing 4 Total Vendor Financial Score 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 REPUTATIONAL Confidentiality and security of documents and data 5 Organizational stability and resiliency 5 Industry reputation is in good standing 5 Total Vendor Reputational Score 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 **Total Vendor Score** 91 0 0 0 0 0 0 Would you hire them again? ☑ Yes ■ No Mal Technologies Fleet has a positive standing on quality upfitting for local municipalities. 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.