TYPE OF WORK: Right of Way - Consultant Rating

Prime Consultant Sub Consultant

Consultant Name: _Consultant Example

Project Number : Rating Number : 1

P.O. / Contract:

Project Description: Consultant Rating Example Form.

Type of Work: Right of Way

N/A

Subject Rated:

Comments: Example of the "Right of Way" Consultant Rating Form.

NOTE: Example Only - Questions Subject To Change.

NOTE: Contract Management Components Issued Only When Prime Consultants Are

Selected For Rating.

Rating Score: 0.0

Rating Score Summary:

Contract Management: 0.0 (No Criteria Rated In This Section)

Appraisal: 0.0 (No Criteria Rated In This Section)

Negotiation and Acquisition: 0.0 (No Criteria Rated In This Section) Relocation Assistance: 0.0 (No Criteria Rated In This Section) Speciality ROW: 0.0 (No Criteria Rated In This Section)

PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE

5 Outstanding Performance

Consistently Exceeded Expectations

4 Above Satisfactory Performance

Often Exceeded Expectations

3 Satisfactory Performance

Met Expectations

2 Marginal Performance

Occasionally Below Expectations

1 Unacceptable Performance

Consistently Below Expectations

TOTAL RATED SCORE FOR ALL QUALITY CRITERIA

Note: An overall score of 3 is considered satisfactory performance. The maximum score attainable is 5.

2 3 4 5 N/A

00000

00000

CONSULTANT TECHNICAL EVALUATION

TYPE OF WORK: Right of Way - Consultant Rating

Instructions:

Comments:

2

For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale: 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

Administered the Contract in an organized manner and was proficient in applying

Contract Management - Administration of Contract

Effectively and proactively controlled the Contract.

administrative, procedural and technical skills to Contract. Effectively coordinated with Department personnel to ensure effective Contract 0000 management, with required submittals made timely, in the subscribed format, with no material errors. Submitted properly documented invoices; contract funds were tracked and reported as requested to avoid rush amendments, out-of-fund conditions or supplemental agreements 5 Complied with established DBE commitment 6 FOR TASK DRIVEN CONTRACTS ONLY: Responded to the Department in a timely manner regarding tasks requests. For accepted tasks, promptly developed an understanding of the assignment, prepared and submitted an accurate time/fee package, and efficiently initiated the assignment Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) 0.0 Comments: **Contract Management - Management of Issues and Resources** 2 3 4 5 N/A Effectively resolved issues; made decisions based on solid logic and sufficient 1 0000 supporting detail. Effectively minimized the unnecessary involvement of Department staff. 00000 3. Effectively managed resources. Continuously provided experienced staff as proposed; 0000 was responsive to Department staffing requests; if personnel changes occurred, the credentials of replacement staff were equal to or exceeded the qualifications of the original staff approved, and Department approval was received. 4. FOR PROJECTS INVOLVING PERMITS: Sufficiently identified, analyzed and verified that all permit conditions were addressed. Thoroughly documented and proactively worked to resolve permitting issues in a timely manner. 5. FOR PROJECTS INVOLVING UTILITIES: Sufficiently verified that utilities were coordinated properly and shown in the plans/schedules including providing a summary of changes at subsequent phase submittals. ADDITIONALLY, FOR PROJECTS INVOLVING CONSULTANT UTILITY COORDINATION: succeeded in getting the utility agencies to accept the schedule, and consistently tracked and communicated with the utility companies so they complied with the schedules. Took appropriate action when schedules were not met. Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) 0.0

TYPE OF WORK: Right of Way - Consultant Rating

Instructions:

For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale: 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

Contract Management - Communication, Documentation and Coordination 1 2 3 4 5 N/A Provided the necessary project information to the Department and all project stakeholders in a timely manner. 2 Scheduled, conducted and documented meetings in a timely manner. Immediately notified the Department of issues impacting schedule and costs; acted 3 proactively by working with various stakeholders to minimize impacts; and resolved issues in a timely manner. Prepared thoroughly organized and completed project documentation including calculations, emails, memoranda, etc. and clear documentation of oral communications. 5 Effectively tracked and monitored comment resolution and other action items to ensure timely resolution. 6 Properly and efficiently logged, documented, tracked and took appropriate action on all public initiated inquiries from first contact through disposition or resolution. 0.0 Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) **Comments:**

Contract Ma	nagement - Execution of Work	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	project schedule submittals were submitted and reviewed in accordance Contract.	0	0	0	0	0	0
appropri	d the schedule monthly or as appropriate with the Department. Took ate action to reallocate resources if the work items fell behind schedule in the critical path to minimize impact to the overall schedule.	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Consiste	ntly met project milestone dates within the overall project schedule	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Provided	project status updates in a timely manner	0	0	0	0	0	0
	ly managed the budget and if applicable, was reasonable regarding claims egotiations of supplemental agreements.	0	0	0	0	0	0
•	ed a Quality Control/Quality Assurance Plan, and adhered to the plan out the project.	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Successf	ully met the scope and objectives of the project.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average Sco	re (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated)	0.0					

TYPE OF WORK: Right of Way - Consultant Rating

Instructions:

For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale: 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

Contract Management - Post-Design Activities 2 3 4 5 N/A Effectively and proactively controlled the contract, including submitting properly documented invoices and reports, and prompt execution of task authorizations as applicable; successfully met the scope and objectives of the project. 2 Minimized the unnecessary involvement of the Department; effectively managed resources, including providing appropriate staff. 3 Provided necessary project information in a timely manner; effectively tracked, monitored and documented actions taken during post-design activities; effectively communicated with the Department's construction support personnel during construction activities. 4 Resolved issues arising during construction in a timely manner. 5 Tracked, monitored and responded quickly and efficiently to shop drawing reviews and construction Requests for Information (RFI's). Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) 0.0 Comments:

Contract Management Section Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated)

0.0

TYPE OF WORK: Right of Way – Consultant Rating

Instructions:

For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale: 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

Appraisal, Appraisal Review and Related Valuation Services 1 2 3 4 5 N/A (Construction Cost Estimate, Business Valuation, Forester, Mineral Specialist, Petroleum Engineer) Timeliness. 000000 5 - Outstanding. Consultant was operating on an extremely compressed timeline and provided the majority of the deliverables and corrections for review and acceptance prior to the end date of the task order. 4 – Above Satisfactory. Consultant provided the majority of the deliverables and corrections for review and acceptance in advance of the end date of the task order. Consultant assisted the Right of Way section in allowing more time for subsequent ROW activities. 3 – Satisfactory. Consultant provided the majority of the deliverables and corrections in a timely manner. Consultant appropriately budgeted time for foreseeable delays and any unforeseeable delays. Delays needing time extensions were identified in a timely manner. 2 – Marginal. Consultant did not budget enough time for the majority of activities and was unable to meet projected completion date. Consultant did not provide deliverables and corrections in a timely manner. Consultant delayed subsequent ROW activities. 1 – Unsatisfactory. Consultant greatly delayed subsequent ROW activities. 2 Quality of Appraisal Reports – Appraisal Only 5 – Outstanding. Document is exceptionally easy to understand by owners and public and adheres to all guidelines set in the DOTD appraisal guide. 4 – Above Satisfactory. Document is reader friendly, users ROW form requested, Adheres to all guidelines set in the DOTD appraisal guide, flows well and analysis is provided in a logical manner. 3 – Satisfactory. Document is clear to appraisal staff and uses ROW form requested. 2 – Marginal. Document is unclear to appraisal staff. Document does not use ROW form requested. Document does not adhere to guidelines set in the DOTD appraisal guide. 1 – Unsatisfactory. Document is unclear and inconsistent with formatting requested by ROW. Document does not adhere to guidelines set in the DOTD appraisal guide. 3 Quality of Valuation Reports (Content) 5 – Outstanding. Content greatly exceeds the minimum required. All content is relevant. Conclusions are thoroughly supported. Exhibits of high quality, legible, pertinent and correctly labeled. 4 – Above Satisfactory. Content exceeds the minimum required. Conclusions are well supported. Very good exhibits. Well stocked addenda. 3 – Satisfactory. All reports were provided in compliance with any and all legal and regulatory requirements. Exhibits of average quality. 2 – Marginal. Data or information not included. Analysis incorrect. Exhibits poor, irrelevant, mislabeled. 1 – Unsatisfactory. Important data, information or content missing. Analysis incorrect. Exhibits extremely poor, missing. 4 Quality of valuation Reports (Errors and Omissions) 5 – Outstanding. Reports require no revisions to content. 4 – Above Satisfactory. Reports require minor revisions; no revisions to substantive content or analyses; no revisions that affect final valuation or Just 3 – Satisfactory. Reports require minimal revisions. 2 – Marginal. Reports require many revisions. Revisions affect final value or compensation. 1 – Unsatisfactory. Reports require excessive or extensive revisions. Consultant

is uncooperative with making requested revisions (or outright refuses).

 5 Communication with DOTD, other consultants and property owners. 5 – Outstanding. Communications are open, frequent and easily understood by all. 4 – Above Satisfactory. Communications are regular. Updates and information are provided frequently, without request. Reviewer is kept abreast of any and a potential issue regarding the project, parcels, ownership, etc. 3 – Satisfactory. Communication with DOTD and other consultants is adequate. Updates and information are provided regularly and upon request. 2 – marginal. Communication is inadequate. Communications are not clear and are often misunderstood. Issues which may affect delivery schedule are not brought up in a timely manner. Consultant is slow to respond to reviewer requests. 1 – Unsatisfactory. Communication is difficult or nonexistent. Consultant is unresponsive to inquiries. Communications are negative, inaccurate, irrelevant, misleading or often misunderstood. 	all
 Cooperation and Team Work 5 – Outstanding. Extremely cooperative with DOTD, all other consultants, property owners, and any state agencies involved (levee boards, Army Corps, utility companies, zoning commissions, etc.). 4 – Above Satisfactory. Excellent cooperation with DOTD, all other consultants and property owners. Provided a higher level of due diligence than minimally required. 3 – Satisfactory. Cooperation is adequate with DOTED, other consultants and property owners. 2 – Marginal. Does not cooperate well. Often does not follow through on requests or follow guidance given. Consultant is slow to respond to reviewer requested corrections or addressing potential issues. 1 – Unsatisfactory. Cooperation is largely nonexistent. Lack of cooperation causes major delays with product delivery. Does not follow instructions or guidance. Fails to investigate issues and/or ignore them in the report. 	
Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated)	0.0
Comments:	

STATE OF LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DEVELOPMENT

CONSULTANT TECHNICAL EVALUATION

TYPE OF WORK: Right of Way – Consultant Rating

Instructions:

For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale : 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

Ne	Negotiation and Acquisition		1	2	3	4	5 1	N/A
1	All work product was completed in a timely manner.		0	0	0	0	0	0
2	All work product was provided in compliance with all legal and regulatory requirements.	4	0	0	0	0	0	•
3	All work product was provided in compliance with DOTD policy and procedure requirements.	7	0	0	0	0	0	•
4	There were no complaints from property owners or other interested parties which stemmed from consultant's actions or failure to act.	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	All corrections and revisions were provided on time when requested.	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
ŝ	Promptly and accurately maintained project status on AARS.	L	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	Recommendations for administrative settlements were clearly written providing full explanation and support for making a decision.	⋖	0	0	0	0	0	•
A۱	verage Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated)	0	0.0					
Cc	omments:							

TYPE OF WORK: Right of Way – Consultant Rating

Instructions:

For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale: 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

Relocation Assistance and Advisory Services 2 3 4 5 N/A All relocation assistance and advisory services were provided in compliance with all applicable legal and regulatory requirements. 2 All payment calculations were proper, correct, properly documented, approved by the relocation officer, and made in a timely manner. All files were complete and contained all required forms and documentation complete with all required signatures and dated. 4 All comparable replacement housing was inspected to ensure conformance to DS&S requirements and replacement housing was offered in a timely manner with documentation of comparable housing selections. Promptly and accurately maintained project status on AARS. Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated) 0.0 Comments:

TYPE OF WORK: Right of Way – Consultant Rating

Instructions:

For each numbered item below, please select a score from 1 to 5 in accordance with the performance rating scale. Select N/A if the item is not applicable. Comments must be entered for ratings of 1 through 5.

Rating Scale: 1 - Unsatisfactory, 2 - Marginal, 3 - Satisfactory, 4 - Above Satisfactory, 5 - Outstanding, 0 - N/A

Specialty Right of Way Consultant Services (forester, business valuation, asbestos inspection and assessment, architect, construction cost, et al.)

- 1 All specialty right of way consultant's reports where correct, usable and provided in a timely manner.
- 2 Specialty right of way consultant attended all scheduled meetings and was punctual, prepared and contributed to discussions.
- 3 Specialty right of way consultant communicated effectively with DOTD and returned telephone calls and emails promptly.
- 4 Specialty right of way consultant was friendly, respectful, helpful and made the project flow smoothly.

Average Score (Total Score / Number of Sub-Criteria Rated)

Comments:

