

RANGELAND CONTRACT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

DATE		Address	
Firm Name		City, State & Zip Code	
Firm Contact		Phone Number	

--

Solicitation Number & Name			
Project Manager		Contract Amount	
Service Provided/# of Acres		Overall Rating	

In accordance with Procurement Code 63G-6a-410(5)(e), the State of Utah has determined that it is in its best interest to conduct a contractor performance review for each rangeland project. The State agency project manager will complete a performance review according to the evaluation criteria listed.

Vendors will be aware of their performance status as they will be monitored throughout the project. Any corrective action will be communicated to the vendor verbally or through a 10-day letter to cure, depending on the issues. Vendors must complete any corrective action requested or required, if not this will be reflected in their performance review scores.

In order for a vendor to remain on the Rangeland Pre-Qualification list, they must maintain a minimum average performance score of 60. If a vendor's average performance score drops below 60, they will be removed from the pre-qualification list for that specific treatment/acreage category and all larger acreage within that same treatment category. If a vendor is removed from the pre-qualification list they may still be eligible to submit a bid on Open Bid solicitations. Once a vendor is removed from the pre-qualification list, the vendor may reapply at the next open RFSQ.

RATINGS GUIDE	Quality of Service	Timeliness of Performance	Contract Management
5-Excellent	Contractor has demonstrated an exceptional level in any of the above three categories that justifies adding a point to the score. Contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Good"		
4-Good	Contractor is in compliance with contract requirements and or delivers quality product or service.	Contractor is effective in meeting milestones and delivery schedule.	Response to inquiries, technical, service, administrative issues is effective.
3-Satisfactory	Minor deficiencies in meeting contract specifications have been identified.	Contractor is usually effective in meeting milestones and delivery schedules.	Response to inquiries, technical, service, administrative issues is somewhat effective.
2-Unsatisfactory	Major problems have been encountered.	Contractor is having major difficulty meeting milestones and delivery schedule.	Response to inquiries, technical, service, and administrative issues is marginally effective.
1-Fail	Contractor is not in compliance & is jeopardizing achievement of contract objectives.	Contractor delays are jeopardizing performance of contract objectives.	Response to inquiries, technical, service, and administrative issues is not effective.

Rate the Following	Score (1 – 5)	COMMENTS
Quality of Product or Service	_____ x 8 = _____	
Timeliness of Performance	_____ x 8 = _____	
Contract Management	_____ x 4 = _____	
Overall Rating	_____/100 pts	