

STRUCTURAL EVALUATION

CONSULTANT EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SIGN STRUCTURE INSPECTION

I. SCHEDULE

The work performed shall be in accordance with the various schedules as stated in the Scope of Work and 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, MOT, etc.).

RATING

- 5 Field inspections completed in conformance with approved field schedule. 60% of the final 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. Final sign structure database CD (and working files CD) was submitted to Department with the last batch of final reports. If corrections were required to any deliverable^ψ, they were submitted within one (1) month from the receipt of the State's comments. Final invoice was submitted within 30 days after submission of final database CD, or working files CD, whichever was later.

- 4 Field inspections completed in conformance with approved field schedule. 60% of the final reports were submitted at least three (3) months before the end of the project and the remaining at least one (1) month before the end of the project. Final sign structure database CD (and working files CD) was submitted to Department with the last batch of final reports. If corrections were required to any deliverable^ψ, they were submitted within one and a half (1½) months from the receipt of the State's comments. Final invoice was submitted within 30 days after submission of final database CD, or working files CD, whichever was later.

- 3 Field inspections completed in conformance with approved field schedule. 60% of the final reports were submitted at least two (2) months before the end of the project and the remaining before the end of the project. Final sign structure database CD (and working files CD) was submitted to Department within one month (1) month of the last batch of final reports. If corrections were required to any deliverable^ψ, they were submitted within two months (2) months from the receipt of the State's comments. Final invoice was submitted within 30 days after submission of final database CD, or working files CD, whichever was later.

2 Format reports submitted at least four (4) months before the end of the project. 60% of the final reports were submitted before the scheduled end of the project and the remaining within three (3) months after the scheduled end of the project. Final sign structure database CD (and working files CD) was submitted to Department within two (2) months of the last batch of final reports. If corrections were required to any deliverable^ψ, they were submitted within three (3) months from the receipt of the State's comments. Final invoice was submitted within 60 days after submission of final database CD, or working files CD, whichever was later.

1 Failure to meet the above criteria.

^ψ Deliverables typically include: All Reports & Priority Letters, Working files CD (containing Word, CADD, Visio, etc.), Database CD (if applicable) and MPT/Equipment usage spreadsheet. (NOTE: If the only failure is to submit the Working Files CD, the maximum rating reduction shall be 1 rating point.)

WEIGHT OF CATEGORY 30%

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 data fields of the report/database. Corrective work shall not require repeated submissions to the Department.

RATING

- 5 Documented errors and omissions did not exceed **4%** based on the items[†] reviewed. No re-submission of the format or final reports was required. Any database errors were considered minor. CD was complete. All Priority E (Emergency) repairs were properly identified; we were notified by telephone, and letters written (and sent) within two (2) days of the inspection date. All Priority 1 repairs were properly identified and notification letters written (and sent) within one (1) week of inspection date. At least 50% of Priority 2 Repairs were properly identified and notification letters written within two (2) weeks.
- 4 Documented errors and omissions did not exceed **8%** based on the items[†] reviewed. Re-submission of individual sheets of less than 10% of the final reports was required. Resubmission of no more than two (2) format reports was required. Any database errors were considered medium, requiring a clean-up resubmission. All Priority E repairs were properly identified; we were notified by telephone, and letters written (and sent) within one (1) week of inspection date. All Priority 1 repairs were properly identified and notification letters written (and sent) within two (2) weeks of inspection date.
- 3 Documented errors and omissions did not exceed **16%** based on the items[†] reviewed. Re-submission of individual sheets of less than 20% of the final reports was required. Resubmission of no more than 5% of the final reports was required. Database was rejected and required a resubmission due to numerous defects. All Priority E repairs were properly identified; we were notified by telephone, and letters written (and sent) within two (2) weeks of inspection date.
- 2 Documented errors and omissions did not exceed **25%** based on the items[†] reviewed. Re-submission of individual sheets of greater than 20% of the final reports was required. Resubmission of more than 5% of the final reports was required. Database was rejected and required multiple resubmissions due to numerous defects or Consultant not following. At least one Priority E repair was not properly identified, notified, or written as per scope of work.
- 1 Failure to achieve the above criteria, and/or a gross failure to perform the job correctly.

WEIGHT OF CATEGORY 50%

[†] Documented errors and omissions scored using spreadsheet, based on CD and reports that were reviewed by in-house personnel. Documented errors and omissions for Format Reports have 80% reduction in the Deduction Points.

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
SIGN STRUCTURE REPORT QUALITY CHECKLIST**

CONSULTANT NAME _____ RATING PERIOD _____
 PROJECT ENGINEER _____ DATE _____
 SIGN STRUCTURE NO. _____

FORMAT REPORT [DEDUCTIONS X 0.20] **PAGE(S) SUBSTITUTION REQUIRED** **RESUBMISSION REQUIRED**

THIS CHECKLIST IS USED FOR EACH SIGN STRUCTURE REPORT TO BE REVIEWED.

DOCUMENTED ERRORS REPORT	WEIGHT	DEDUCT
REPORTS [50 POINTS]		
1. Is Structure Name incorrect as per NJDOT Standards?	1	
2. Is the Structure Number not correct?	5	
3. Is the Date Inspected incorrect?	2	
4. Is the Status of inspection not correctly shown as Final for a Final DB submission?	2	
5. In the Overall Summary of Structure Condition:		
a. Is the reasoning behind the Overall Rating not stated HERE (not just some general phrase that references the rest of the report)?	1	
b. Is the actual structure condition not correctly reflected?	2	
6. Does Additional Comments area not includes (but is not limited to) any comments concerning difficulty in inspecting any portion of the structure (buried areas, areas behind noise walls, etc.)?	1	
7. Is New Jersey P.E. license number for certifying Engineer incorrect or incomplete?	1	
8. Are all Signage sizes not shown?	1	
9. For Sign Structures where Plans (if found) were referenced in this cycle:		
a. Is the Plan Route or Section number not indicated in the Construction Contract Designation field?	1	
b. Is the CORRECT information not shown in the Design Based on Sign Design Area field?	1	
c. Are the EXACT material types not SPECIFIED in the Truss & Tower Material Type fields?	1	
d. Is the Installation Year field is not completed?	1	
10. Is any Component Ratings not completed?	2	
11. Is any Deficiency not described (if nothing is missing "None")?	2	
12. Is any Priority Repair Ratings not completed?	2	
13. Is any Priority Repair Recommendations not completed?	2	
14. Is the Image of structure Elevation View missing any required information (including Structure Number)?	1	
15. Is Image of Anchor Bolt UT missing a sketch that shows each anchor bolt location?	1	
16. Is any Photo not clear?	1	
17. Is any Photo not referenced in the correct order in the Database?	2	
18. Is any required Image or Photo not present?	5	
19. Where a detailed description is appropriate, is the detail not provided?	2	
20. Is all data present, complete and correct (not including above defects)? [Deduct -2 per error]	10	
TOTAL REPORT DEDUCTIONS PER SIGN STRUCTURE =		

STRUCTURAL EVALUATION SIGN STRUCTURE REPORT QUALITY SUMMARY FORM

CONSULTANT NAME _____ RATING PERIOD _____
PROJECT ENGINEER _____ DATE _____

REPORT ERRORS/OMISSIONS					
1	2	3	4A	4B	4C
SIGN STRUCTURE NUMBER	IS THIS FORMAT?	DEDUCTION POINTS FOR FINAL OR FORMAT REPORT REVIEWS	RESUBMISSION REQUIRED		
			PAGE(S)	FORMAT REPORT	FINAL REPORT
		<i>(FORMAT REPORTS HAVE 80% REDUCTION IN THE DEDUCTION POINTS)</i>			
TOTAL =					
DEDUCTION POINTS =					

FORMULA "A"

TOTAL REPORT REVIEW POINTS = TOTAL NUMBER IN COLUMN 1 x 50)

$$\text{PERCENT REPORT ERRORS} = \frac{\text{TOTAL DEDUCTIONS POINTS IN COLUMNS 3}}{\text{TOTAL REPORT REVIEW POINTS}} \times 100 = \text{___}\%$$

FORMULA "B"

$$\text{PERCENT PAGES RESUB.} = \frac{\text{TOTAL NUMBER IN COLUMN 4A}}{\text{TOTAL NUMBER IN COLUMN 1}} \times 100 = \text{___}\%$$

$$\text{PERCENT FORMAT RESUB.} = \frac{\text{TOTAL NUMBER OF STRUCTURES IN COLUMN 4B}}{\text{TOTAL NUMBER IN COLUMN 1}} \times 100 = \text{___}\%$$

$$\text{PERCENT FINAL RESUB.} = \frac{\text{TOTAL NUMBER OF STRUCTURES IN COLUMN 4C}}{\text{TOTAL NUMBER IN COLUMN 1}} \times 100 = \text{___}\%$$

NOTES:

- a. COLUMNS 1 THRU 4 ARE FROM THE INDIVIDUAL SIGN STRUCTURE REPORT QUALITY CHECKLIST.
- b. FOR COLUMNS 2, 4A, 4B & 4C, CHECK IF APPLICABLE.

**STRUCTURAL EVALUATION
SIGN STRUCTURE DATABASE CD QUALITY SUMMARY**

CONSULTANT NAME _____ RATING PERIOD _____
 PROJECT ENGINEER _____ DATE _____
 SIGN STRUCTURE DATABASE CD _____

- CD NOT SUBMITTED IMAGES(S) MISSING RATING NOT REQUIRED SINGLE RESUB. REQUIRED
 CD REJECTED TRANSMITTAL ERROR COUNTY SHEET MISSED MULTIPLE RESUB. REQUIRED

THIS SUMMARY IS BASED ON THE SIGN STRUCTURE DATABASE CD CONTAINING ALL THE SIGN STRUCTURES.

DATABASE ERRORS REPORT	WEIGHT	DEDUCT
<i>SIGN STRUCTURE DATABASE CD [40 POINTS]</i>		
1. Is CD or CD-Case not labeled as specified in the SDMS Contractors Specifications?	1	
2. Are only those structures required to be submitted as a part of this submission not included in the database?	1	
3. Is any photo or image file not titled as indicated in the specifications?	1 or 2*	
4. Is final determination of each structure number done according to NJDOT guidance?	1 or 2*	
5. Is Cycle Number not correct (0 for Inventory or 1, 2, etc. for Hands-On inspections)?	1 or 2*	
6. For SRI numbers: a. Are all SRI numbers not EXACTLY correct? b. Does it not reflect the Route the structure is actually located on, per the NJDOT Straight Line Diagram? c. Are all SRI numbers for structures on ramps not display the correct 17 digit SRI number per the NJDOT Straight Line Diagram?	1 or 2* 1 or 2* 1 or 2*	
7. Is the Mile Post shown not based on the State Route associated with the structure and per the NJDOT Straight Line Diagram?	1 or 2*	
8. If the SS is on a local road, does the Location Description contains the name and mile post of the local road the structure is actually on, as well as the distance and direction from the Associated State Route centerline? Does this match the NJDOT Straight Line Diagram data unless N/A?	1 or 2*	
9. Is Latitude or Longitude not correct to within 50' (when verified by NJDOT)?	1 or 2*	
10. Is the Structure Configuration code not correct?	1 or 2*	
11. Are the Project Agreement and Group number not correct?	1 or 2*	
12. Are all the Images and Photos referenced in the Database not present on the CD(s)?	2 or 5*	
13. Type of Inspection is Inventory for Inventory or Initial for Hands-On inspections.	2 or 5*	
14. Is all data present, complete and correct (not including above defects)? [Deduct – ½ per error]	max 6	
TOTAL CD DEDUCTIONS =		

<u>RATING</u>	<u>TOTAL CD DEDUCTIONS</u>	<u>ERROR DESCRIPTION</u>
5	0	NO ERROR WITH COMPLETE DATA, NO RESUB REQUIRED.
4	NO MORE THAN 10	MEDIUM, A CLEAN-UP RESUBMISSION REQUIRED.
3	BETWEEN 10 AND 20	REJECTED, A RESUBMISSION REQUIRED DUE TO NUMEROUS DEFECTS.
2	MORE THAN 20	REJECTED, MULTIPLE RESUBMISSIONS REQUIRED DUE TO NUMEROUS DEFECTS OR CONSULTANT NOT FOLLOWING AS PER SOW.

* THE LOWER VALUE APPLIES TO ONE ERROR WHILE THE HIGHER VALUES APPLIES TO MULTIPLE ERRORS.