Clear Form

Michigan Department
of Transportation
5106R (09/20)

SERVICE VENDOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

CONTRACT NO.

Notes to Evaluator: Rate service vendor from 1 to 10. Behavioral statements are provided for ratings of 10, 8, 5 and 1 as guidance. Comments shall be given for all questions rated. A rating of 7 or less must be documented in the project files. Choose N/A for items which do not apply. The evaluator is to send a signed copy of the evaluation to the contract administrator for the respective support area and a copy to the vendor being evaluated. The evaluator should also retain a copy of the evaluation for the project files. After the evaluator has sent the evaluation to the vendor, the original evaluation should be sent to the Selection Analyst in Contract Services Division for entry into C-Trak.

Note to Vendor: Any appeal of this evaluation must be filed within 14 calendar days of the signature date on this evaluation form. The appeal process details are available in Guidance Document Number 10157, Service Vendor Performance Evaluation Appeal Process.

ORGANIZATION MDOT DSD Real Estate	VENDOR NAME	☐ PRIME ☐ SUB
VENDOR PROJECT MANAGER	SPECIAL PROJECT TYPE *(Provisional, Mentoring, N/A)* Select one	
PREQUALIFICATION CLASSIFICATION	WORK TYPE Select one	
EVALUATION TYPE Select one	PROJECT COMPLEXITY *(Simple, Medium, Complex)* Select one	
PROJECT ROUTE AND DESCRIPTION		

PARCEL #	TRACT #	START DATE
CONTROL SECTION	EVALUATION JOB NO.	CONTROLLING JOB NO.
SERVICE COMPLETION DATE	SERVICE ACCEPTANCE DATE	COST OF SERVICE

TOTAL AVERAGE	EVALUATED BY

RATING	Indicate your appraisal of the Vendor's performance and add comments for each question.
	PROJECT MANAGEMENT
	1. Was the vendor in control of the services provided to MDOT?
	Rating **Description**
	10 - Vendor displayed outstanding knowledge and control of the services and provided superior advice and counsel to the department that improved MDOT's project approach, including but not limited to communication with the public, coordination with local governments, or the project management considerations.
	8 - Vendor was always knowledgeable and in control of the services and clearly met the department's expectations.
	5 - Vendor was usually knowledgeable and in control but required guidance from department personnel.
	1 - Vendor demonstrated no control over the services and the project was harmed.
	COMMENTS

2. Did vendor communicate adequately with the department staff?

Rating Description

10 - Vendor provided superior communications with the department, communicating in a thorough, concise and timely manner, and clearly exceeded the department's expectations by identifying problems and helping to define choices faced by the department.

8 - Vendor always communicated with the department in a thorough, concise and timely manner and clearly met the department's expectations.

5 - Vendor usually communicated with the department in a thorough, concise and timely manner. Department Personnel occasionally had to initiate and clarify communications to move project forward.

1 - Vendor demonstrated no control over the services and the project was harmed.

COMMENTS

3. Was the vendor responsive to requests from the department, including requests for information and to address comments about work product?

Rating Description

10 - Vendor anticipated the need for information or changes and proactively initiated action.

8 - Vendor was always responsive and promptly complied with all requests.

5 - Vendor was usually responsive or was occasionally resistant to requests for information or minor changes. Personnel occasionally had to initiate and clarify communications to move project forward.

1 - Vendor was unresponsive, and the project was harmed.

COMMENTS

4. Did the vendor have competent and sufficient personnel with the technical expertise needed to successfully complete the project?

Rating Description

10 - Vendor provided personnel with superior qualifications who were able to complete the scope of services with minimal guidance or expertise given by MDOT.

8 - Vendor always provided personnel who were able to complete the scope of services with little more than the normal guidance or expertise given by MDOT.

5 - Vendor usually provided personnel who were able to complete the scope of services with little more than the normal guidance or expertise given by MDOT. Occasionally, the vendor's personnel demonstrated lack of knowledge and skill.

1 - Vendor did not provide competent and sufficient personnel to adequately perform the scope of services and the project was harmed

COMMENTS

5. Did the vendor have adequate and sufficient resources other than personnel (equipment, manuals, etc.) to fulfill the requirements of the scope of services?

Rating Description

10 - All resources exceeded requirements to perform the scope of services.

8 - All resources met requirements to adequately perform the scope of services.

5 - Resources usually were adequate and sufficient to perform the scope of services. On some occasions, the vendor had to be notified to provide resources to meet requirements.

1 - Vendor did not have adequate and sufficient resources to perform the scope of services and the project was harmed.

COMMENTS

WORK PERFORMANCE

6. Did the vendor follow good safety practices?

Rating		Description
10	-	Vendor took the initiative to ensure the safety and health of the employees. Safety equipment and devices were in excellent condition and were used by all vendor employees.
8	-	Safety equipment and devices were in good condition and were used by vendor's employees. Vendor immediately carried out any requests by MDOT for changes in safety measures.
5	-	Vendor usually ensured the safety and health of employees. Safety equipment and devices were in good condition and were used by vendor's employees. Vendor carried out requests by MDOT for changes in safety measures after written notification.
1	-	Vendor's safety and health practices were unsatisfactory. MDOT imposed stoppages of work for safety issues. Vendor reluctantly made changes requested by MDOT or did not make the change.

COMMENTS

7. Did the vendor provide a quality work product?

Rating		Description
10	-	Vendor's work product was excellent (complete, accurate, and professional in appearance) and MDOT requirements were exceeded.
8	-	Vendor's work product was acceptable and MDOT requirements were met without a need for MDOT to clarify deficiencies.
5	-	Vendor's work product met minimum requirements after notification of deficiencies from MDOT.
1	-	Vendor's work product was unacceptable and clearly did not meet MDOT requirements, and the project was harmed.

COMMENTS

8. Did the vendor properly notify and coordinate work with other affected parties such as utility companies, property owners, local units of government, and other MDOT areas?

Rating		Description
10	-	Vendor was proactive in initiating and executing notifications and project coordination activities.
8	-	Vendor always provided proper notification and coordinated with each affected party.
5	-	Vendor usually coordinated with, or gave proper notification to, all affected parties.
1	-	Vendor did not provide proper notification nor coordinate with affected parties, and the project was harmed.

COMMENTS

9. Did the vendor meet the applicable environmental requirements, such as documentation, enforcement, obtaining permits, studies, etc?

Rating		Description
10	-	Vendor was proactive in initiating and executing activities to meet environmental requirements without prompting by MDOT.
8	-	Vendor always met environmental requirements.
5	-	Vendor usually met environmental requirements.
1	-	Vendor's failure to meet environmental requirements harmed the project.

COMMENTS

10. Did the vendor meet deliverable date requirements?

Rating		Description
10	-	Acceptable deliverables were always received more than 15% ahead of schedule.
8	-	Acceptable deliverables were always within the schedule.
5	-	Acceptable deliverables were usually received no more than 10% behind schedule.
1	-	Acceptable deliverables were usually received more than 25% behind schedule.

COMMENTS

11. To the best of my knowledge, did the vendor comply with applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations and/or MDOT guidelines and procedures? This incudes, but is not limited to, compliance with prompt payment to subvendors (completing attachment G), submitting accurate and timely invoices, responding to contractual issues, and adhering to Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) participation guidelines.

Rating		Description
10	-	Vendor displayed outstanding knowledge of applicable federal, state and/or local laws and regulations. In addition, the vendor was proactive in assuring they complied with MDOT guidelines and procedures and therefore needed no MDOT intervention.
8	-	Vendor always knew and complied with applicable federal, state and/or local laws and regulations. In addition, the vendor always followed MDOT guidelines and procedures with normal guidance or expertise given by MDOT.
5	-	Vender was usually knowledgeable of applicable federal, state and/or local laws and regulations, but MDOT had to intervene occasionally to ensure compliance. The vendor usually followed MDOT guidelines and procedures but needed more than the normal guidance or expertise by MDOT. Any problems were corrected immediately upon notification by MDOT.
1	-	Vendor failed to comply with applicable federal, state and/or local laws and regulations and/or the vendor failed to comply with MDOT guidelines and procedures.

COMMENTS

SUB-VENDOR MANAGEMENT

12. Did the vendor coordinate work with subvendor's work, exercise authority over subvendors, provide notice of subvendor work schedule, and ensure that subvendors were in compliance with contract requirements?

Rating		Description
10	-	Vendor was proactive in exercising authority, coordinating and monitoring work operations of the subvendors to ensure acceptable completion of the scope of services.
8	-	Vendor always exercised authority, coordinated and monitored work operations with their subvendors to ensure acceptable completion of the scope of services.
5	-	Vendor usually exercised authority, coordinated and monitored work operations with their subvendors to ensure acceptable completion of the scope of services. Any problems were corrected immediately upon notification by MDOT.
1	-	Vendor's failure to exercise authority, coordinate and monitor work operations with their subvendors harmed the project.

COMMENTS

OTHER COMMENTS

Suggest listing time allowed to complete work in the bid and the actual time it took to complete

PROJECT MANAGER HAS NOTIFIED ANY SPECIALTY AREAS TO COMPLETE AN EVALUATION

IS THIS A PRIMARY EVALUATION OR A SPECIALTY AREA EVALUATION?

EVALUATED BY	DATE

EVALUATOR'S SIGNATURE