

STRUCTURAL EVALUATION

CONSULTANT EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR BRIDGE INSPECTION

I. SCHEDULE

The work performed shall be in accordance with the approved field schedule and with the Agreement. The rating will not reflect factors totally outside the Consultant's control (such as an excessive delay by an authority to issue a right-of-way permit, notice to proceed subsequent to NBIS compliance date, etc.).

RATING

- 5 Field inspections completed in conformance with approved field schedule. Field inspections were in 100% NBIS compliance. 80% of the preliminary reports were submitted at least four (4) months before the end of the project and the remaining at least two (2) months before the end of the project. Data was submitted to Department (using PONTIS Lite) within 90 days of inspection date. Final reports were submitted within thirty (30) days from receipt of the State's or bridge owner's comments. Remaining deliverables^ψ were submitted within 30 days from State's acceptance of last final report. Final invoice was submitted within 30 days after submission of PDF CD (regular inspection reports) or interim inspection PDF CD, whichever was later.

- 4 Field inspections completed in conformance with approved field schedule. Field inspections were in 100% NBIS compliance. 80% of the preliminary reports were submitted at least three (3) months before the end of the project and the remaining at least two (2) months before the end of the project. Data was submitted to Department (using PONTIS Lite) within 90 days of inspection date. Final reports were submitted within thirty (30) days from receipt of the State's or bridge owner's comments. Remaining deliverables^ψ were submitted within 30 days from State's acceptance of last final report. Final invoice was submitted within 30 days after submission of PDF CD (regular inspection reports) or interim inspection PDF CD, whichever was later.

- 3 Field inspections completed in conformance with approved field schedule. Field inspections were in 100% NBIS compliance. 100% of the preliminary reports were submitted at least two (2) months before the end of the project. Data was submitted to Department (using PONTIS Lite) within 90 days of inspection date. Final reports were submitted within thirty (30) days from receipt of the State's or bridge owner's comments. Remaining deliverables^ψ were submitted within 30 days from State's acceptance of last final report. Final invoice was submitted within 30 days after submission of PDF CD (regular inspection reports) or interim inspection PDF CD, whichever was later.

2 Field inspections are completed later than approved field schedule for no more than one bridge. Field inspections were not in NBIS compliance for one (1) bridge. Preliminary reports were not submitted two (2) months before the end of the project. Data was submitted to Department (using PONTIS Lite) within 120 days of inspection date. Final reports were submitted within sixty (60) days from receipt of the State's or bridge owner's comments. Remaining deliverables^ψ were submitted within 60 days from State's acceptance of last final report. Final invoice was submitted within 60 days after submission of PDF CD (regular inspection reports) or interim inspection PDF CD, whichever was later.

1 Field inspections were completed later than approved field schedule for more than one bridge. Field inspections were not in NBIS compliance for more than one (1) bridge. Preliminary reports were submitted beyond the end of the project. Data was submitted to Department (using PONTIS Lite) beyond 120 days of inspection date. Final reports were submitted beyond sixty (60) days from receipt of the State's or bridge owner's comments. Remaining deliverables^ψ were submitted beyond 60 days from State's acceptance of last final report. Final invoice was submitted beyond 60 days after submission of PDF CD (regular inspection reports) or interim inspection PDF CD, whichever was later.

^ψ Deliverables typically include: All Reports & Priority Letters, Regular Inspection PDF CD, Interim Inspection PDF CD, Working files CD (containing Word, CADD, Visio, etc.), Database CD (if applicable) and MPT/Equipment usage spreadsheet.

WEIGHT OF CATEGORY 30%

NOTES:

- Field schedule submission must indicate anticipated day of inspection. If there is deviation of more than one week, a revised schedule must be submitted to the Department for approval.
- According to NBIS, bridges must be inspected every two years to the month (**not** to the day).

II. OVERALL QUALITY (CONSULTANT ERRORS & OMISSIONS/CORRECTED WORK)

Based on the performance checklists, reports submitted shall not require changes due to inaccuracies in technical areas of the report or consultant errors or omissions in the Structure Inventory and Appraisal (SI&A) Sheets or PONTIS Data. Corrective work shall not require repeated submissions to the Department.

RATING

- 5 Documented errors and omissions did not exceed **2.5%*** and these errors did not affect the Structural Deficiency or the Functional Obsolescence of the structure. No re-submission of the preliminary or final reports was required. All Priority E (Emergency) repairs were properly identified, notified by telephone, and letters written within two (2) days of the inspection date. All Priority 1 repairs were properly identified and notification letters written within one (1) week of inspection date. Both PDF & Working Files CDs were fully in compliance (less than 2 errors) with SDMS Contract Specification in current Version.
- 4 Documented errors and omissions did not exceed **5%*** and these errors did not affect the Structural Deficiency or the Functional Obsolescence of the structure. No re-submission of the preliminary or final reports was required. All Priority E repairs were properly identified, notified by telephone, and letters written within one (1) week of inspection date. All Priority 1 repairs were properly identified and notification letters written within two (2) weeks of inspection date. Either PDF or Working Files CD Quality was in moderate compliance (less than 5 errors) with SDMS Contract Specification in current Version.
- 3 Documented errors and omissions did not exceed **10%*** and these errors did not affect the Structural Deficiency or the Functional Obsolescence of the structure. No re-submission of the preliminary or final reports was required. Either PDF or Working Files CD Quality was in moderate non-compliance (more than 5 errors) with SDMS Contract Specification in current Version.
- 2 Documented errors and omissions did not exceed **10%*** and these errors did affect the Structural Deficiency or the Functional Obsolescence of no more than **5%‡** (see chart on following page) of the structures. Resubmission was required for no more than **10%†** of the submitted preliminary reports or no more than **5%†** of submitted final reports.
- 1 Documented errors and omissions did affect the Structural Deficiency or Functional Obsolescence of more than **5%‡** (see chart on following page) of the structures. Resubmission was required for more than **10%†** of the submitted preliminary reports or more than **5%†** of submitted final reports.

WEIGHT OF CATEGORY 50%

NOTE: Resubmission of Structure Inventory and Appraisal or PONTIS does not constitute resubmission of reports for the purpose of evaluating overall quality. **Format Reports do not count towards Re-submission criteria.**

* As per formula "A" on Quality Summary Form.

‡ As per formula "B" on Quality Summary Form.

† As per formula "C" on Quality Summary Form.

**STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT/FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE
PROJECT SIZE**

RATING	1-10 BRIDGES	11-20 BRIDGES	OVER 20 BRIDGES
2	No more than 1 Bridge	No more than 2 Bridges	< 5% or No more than 2 Bridges (whichever is more)
1	More than 1 Bridge	More than 2 Bridges	> 5% or More than 2 Bridges (whichever is more)

III. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Rates the overall project management; NOT the individual(s) serving in the position

The Consultant Project Management:

- was organized and proficient with administrative, procedural and technical skills.
- performed the work of the project as required in the Scope of Services and as directed by the State Project Manager.
- supervised the progress of the work of his staff and that of his Sub-consultants.
- was proficient with verbal and written communication skills.
- was cooperative with the Department and/or joint operating agencies involved with the project.
- kept the State Project Manager advised of general matters and also identifies and worked to resolve problems that arise.
- was available for Department phone calls and meetings.
- received Department approval prior to making any changes to the Consultant Contract Management or team structure established through the Agreement.
- effectively managed Traffic Control and Special Equipment usage.

RATING

- 5 Has met all of the above requirements. No improvement needed.
- 4 Above average performance, did not meet one of the above requirements.
- 3 Average performance, did not meet two of the above requirements.
- 2 Below average performance, did not meet three of the above requirements.
- 1 Did not meet three of the above requirements and/or a change of the Consultant Contract Management was required by the Department.

WEIGHT OF CATEGORY 20%

STRUCTURAL EVALUATION REPORT QUALITY CHECKLIST

CONSULTANT NAME _____ RATING PERIOD _____
 PROJECT ENGINEER _____ DATE _____
 STRUCTURE No. _____

FORMAT REPORT **SD/FO AFFECTED** **PRELIMINARY RESUBMISSION** **FINAL RESUBMISSION**

DOCUMENTED ERRORS REPORT	WEIGHT	DEDUCT
<i>REPORT, STRUCTURAL INVENTORY & APPRAISAL SHEETS AND PONTIS ELEMENTS [90 POINTS]</i>		
1. Is Structural Data or Work Done Section or Rating Summary not included?	2	
2. Are Conclusions or Recommendations not provided as per Section 41 of the Design Manual?	2	
3. If bridge is Structurally Deficient, Functionally Obsolete, or Scour Critical, is major work not recommended?	8	
4. Are Priority 2 Repairs not properly identified and written in accordance with procedures?	8	
5. Is load rating analysis not provided or incorrect (if calculated in this cycle)? Not updated where necessary (or not recommended for update)? Is loss of section not considered (where appropriate) or controlling member not identified?	8	
6. Are CADD drawings not provided as per scope of work and/or final proposal ? a. Sounding profiles not done in accordance with underwater inspection manual? b. Vertical and Lateral underclearance sketch not done?	10	
7. Is any required photo or image not included? Is any photo or image not clear?	4	
8. Are field notes not completed with proper inclusion of required sheets (i.e.-Fatigue Details, Substructure Scour, etc.)? Are ratings not consistent with field condition?	4	
9. How many Federal or State SI&A Items have coding errors (Not including those items listed below)? [-2 points per error]	20	
10. Are Federal SI&A Items 92 or 93 not updated with initial submission of Item 90?	4	
11. Are Federal SI&A Items 26 or 104 not correctly coded?	10	
12. How many PONTIS Elements are not coded correctly? [-2 points per error]	10	
<i>FIELD VERIFICATION REVIEW [10 POINTS]</i>		
<i>(Dialogue with Consultant Project Manager must occur prior to final determination due to possibility that defects occurred subsequent to inspection)</i>		
13. Are major areas of deterioration (large spalls, severe scaling, wide concrete cracks, steel fatigue cracks, collision damage, etc.) missing or incorrectly documented in report? [-2 points per defect]	10	
TOTAL DEDUCTION PER STRUCTURE =		

