OPTIONAL - PLEASE RETURN

CFLHD SOLICITATION DOCUMENT SURVEY

CFLHD requests your feedback on the quality of documents to assist in prioritizing improvement opportunities. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the best score, please rate the following based on your review of the solicitation documents at the bid preparation stage. Please provide written comments in the space provided.

SURVEY FOR INFORMATION ONLY - In no manner will the survey influence or be used during the administration of the contact. It is appreciated if the survey is returned within 7 days of bid closing. Please return survey to:

Central Federal Lands Highway Division
Office of Project Delivery
F. Dave Zanetell, Director of Engineering
12300 West Dakota Avenue
Lakewood, CO 80228-2683
or e-mail **to: Jennifer Turkington, Administrative Assistant, Attn: Director of Engineering**
or FAX to: (720) 963-3596

Click to e-mail

A. **CONTRACT INFORMATION**
Solicitation Number & Name

B. **GENERAL OBSERVATIONS**

Please provide your thoughts regarding the solicitation documents or contracting method. Include positive and negative comments and recommendations for improvement.

C. **DOCUMENT QUALITY**

Biddable

(Ratings: Poor (1), Below Average (2), Average (3), Above Average (4), Excellent (5)

1. The plans were complete, well organized, and easy to understand	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5
2. The specifications were clear, complete, and consistent with other contract requirements	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5
3. Sufficient detail was provided for bid preparation	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5
4. Payment for work items was clear	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5
5. The estimate of quantities agreed with your independent estimate	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5
6. Risk allocation between the Government and Contractor was appropriate	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5
7. The contract completion date was reasonable and achievable	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5

Please provide general comments on Biddability, particularly on any statement receiving a rating less than 3:

Constructible

(Ratings: Poor (1), Below Average (2), Average (3), Above Average (4), Excellent (5)

8. All contract work is constructible as shown in the plans or required in the specifications ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5
9. Technical requirements for the project are in alignment with industry standards and the nature of the project ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5
10. Specifications, technical requirements, and acceptance criteria were effective and equitable for the surfacing components of the work (i.e. pavement bid items). ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA
11. The construction window for completing the work is appropriate for the type of contract work to be performed ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Please provide general comments on Constructability, particularly on any statement receiving a rating less than 3:

Consistent

(Ratings: Poor (1), Below Average (2), Average (3), Above Average (4), Excellent (5)

12. If you have bid other CFLHD work how consistent are these bid documents with other CFLHD bid documents ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ NA

Please provide general comments on Consistency, particularly on any statement receiving a rating less than 3:

Contracting

(Ratings: Poor (1), Below Average (2), Average (3), Above Average $), Excellent (5)

13. The contracting method was appropriate for the work requirements and best utilization of industry skills ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5
14. The contracting method was appropriate for current construction industry climate and contractor interest ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Please provide general comments on Contracting, particularly on any statement receiving a rating less than 3:

D. _OVERALL RATING

Compared to other CFLHD or State highway contract documents, how would you rate the overall quality of this contract?

☐ Above Average ☐ Average ☐ Below Average

E. _CONTACT INFORMATION (Optional)

☐ Prime Contractor ☐ Sub Contractor ☐ Supplier

Name / Company
Address:
Phone:

Email: