

CONSULTANT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL



City of Martinsville, Virginia

In cooperation with the



GENERAL

The City of Martinsville is seeking expressions of interest from consulting engineering firms who wish to be considered to provide **professional engineering services for:**

Repairs for Commonwealth Boulevard Bridge over Dick & Willie Trail

The Estimated Project Cost is \$2,147,244.

The City of Martinsville reserves the right to accept or reject any or all proposals received as a result of this request, to negotiate with any qualified firm or to modify or cancel in part or in its entirety the Request for Proposal if it is in the best interest of the City of Martinsville to do so. This Request does not commit the City of Martinsville to provide any payment for costs associated with the preparation of proposals submitted in response to this Request for Proposal.

The City of Martinsville reserves the right to alter the project delivery method at any time during the contract period. The City of Martinsville will notify the consultant of such decision, revise the scope of services and respective man-hours. The change will be implemented utilizing an additional task order or supplemental agreement based on the contract type.

PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE

- Expression of Interest Due Date and Time –11/18/16 at 2:00 PM
- Interviews/Technical Presentations – NLT 12/16/16, as needed
- Final Consultant Selection – NLT 12/30/16
- Selected Consultant Pre-Award Documents Due – NLT 1/13/17
- Completed Negotiations Agreement Due – NLT 1/20/17
- Consultant Contract Signed – NLT 1/27/17

CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

The change in a project delivery method for this contract may result in a potential conflict of interests for the consultant and any of its team members. As such, the scope of services and their role may be revised and redefined to meet the project need as identified by the City of Martinsville. The consultant and its team members may not be allowed to participate in ANY subsequent contracts (design and/or construction) related to this project. The Conflict of Interest determination will be made in accordance with the VDOT's policy. The policy is available at:

<http://www.virginiadot.org/business/resources/LocDes/IIM-APD-2.pdf>

SCOPE

The scope of work shall consist of providing professional engineering services including initial deck evaluation, design plans, specifications, and construction inspection services for the repair of the Commonwealth Boulevard Bridge, Structure #1803. The bridge consists of 2 spans of 2 lanes, each being approximately 180 in length, and spanning the Dick & Willie Walking Trail. Repairs include Class I, II, and III surface preparation, latex concrete, joint repairs, repainting of the structure, bearing modifications, flexible pavement planning, SM-2B asphalt, guardrail upgrades, and epoxy concrete overlay. The most recent bridge inspection report is attached for reference.

This work is to be accomplished utilizing computerized design and drafting systems compatible with VDOT's automated design and drafting systems. VDOT's roadway design system is GEOPAK Civil Design Software and the drafting system is MicroStation. This project will be developed utilizing VDOT's policies and procedures and FHWA's guidelines. This Request for Proposal does not commit the City of Martinsville to award a contract, to pay any costs incurred in the preparation of a proposal for this request, or to procure or contract for services.

All procurement related questions or information should be directed to Karen Mays, Purchasing Manager at kmays@ci.martinsville.va.us.

EXPRESSION OF INTEREST (EOI)

1. The Expression of Interest shall be organized in the following order:
 - Transmittal letter
 - Table of Contents
 - Understanding of Scope of Work
 - Response to RFP Expression of Interest Items 2-15
 - **Standard Form (SF) 330 Part I** – one combined for the project team
 - **Standard Form (SF) 330 Part II** – one for each firm
 - Team Organization Chart – Section D Standard Form (SF) 330 Part I
 - A table or matrix containing the requested information in item 15
 - Full size copies of Commonwealth of Virginia SCC and DPOR supporting registration/licensing documentation for each firm (including that of each pertinent branch office)
 - Full size copies of Commonwealth of Virginia DPOR registration certificate for the Key Personnel
 - Firm Data Sheet
 - Certification Regarding Debarment form
 - DBE Commitment and Confirmation Letter (if applicable)
2. Furnish current SF 330 Part II for each firm involved, and one (1) combined SF 330 Part I for the project team. Please follow the instructions included on the form, unless indicated otherwise within this RFP.
3. As referenced in SF 330 Part I, Section D (Organizational Chart of Proposed Team), a one page organizational chart showing all firms involved and key personnel assignments and responsibilities is required to be included.
4. Indicate KEY PERSONNEL ONLY resumes in SF 330 Part I, Section E (Resumes of Key Personnel Proposed for This Contract). Key personnel are defined as those to whom the contract will be assigned and who will be performing the actual management of the work and be responsible for inspection, administrative and design services. Each resume shall be limited to one page per person with a font no less than 10 point.

Furthermore, all individuals identified as Key Personnel in the EOI shall remain on the Consultant's Team for the duration of the procurement process and, if the consultant is awarded a contract, the duration of the contract. If extraordinary circumstances require a proposed change, it must be submitted in writing to the City of Martinsville's Project Manager for approval, who, at his/her sole discretion, will determine whether to authorize a change. Unauthorized changes to the Consultant's Team at any time during the procurement process may result in elimination of the Consultant's Team from further consideration.
5. In SF 330 Part I, Section F (Example Projects Which Best Illustrate Proposed Team's Qualifications for This Contract), limit example projects to no more than ten (10).
6. In SF 330 Part I, Section G (Key Personnel Participation in Example Projects), limit example projects to no more than ten (10). The example projects listed in Section G (#29) should match the example project list provided in Section F.

7. In SF 330 Part I, Section H (Additional Information), the consultant should detail the plan to assure the City of Martinsville that the staff submitted for evaluation will be available for the services requested by the RFP. Section H of SF 330 Part I is limited to a maximum of ten (10) pages with a font no less than 10 point. This section should describe the organization of the proposed project staff indicating the role of each by individual. If subconsultants are proposed, the role of each subconsultant should be discussed. It should also include statements that are responsive to the attached Consultant Short List Score Sheet that will be used to evaluate your submission. This is the **ONLY** section of the submission which may include pictures or graphics (included in the ten page limit). List any computer and CADD equipment and any specialized computer software packages that you will use on this City of Martinsville project.
8. It is the policy of the Virginia Department of Transportation and the City of Martinsville that Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) as defined in 49 CFR Part 26 shall have the maximum opportunity to participate in the performance of federally funded consultant contracts. A list of Virginia Department of Small Business and Supplier Diversity (DSBSD) certified DBE firms is maintained on their web site (<http://www.dmbv.virginia.gov/>) under the **DBE Vendor Directory of Virginia Unified Certification Program**. Consultants are encouraged to take all necessary and reasonable steps to ensure that DBE firms have the maximum opportunity to compete for and perform services on the contract, including participation in any subsequent supplemental contracts. If the consultant intends to subcontract a portion of the services on the project, the consultant is encouraged to seek out and consider DBE firms as potential subconsultants. The consultant is encouraged to contact DBE firms to solicit their interest, capability and qualifications. Any agreement between a consultant and a DBE firm whereby the DBE firm promises not to provide services to other consultants is prohibited. The Department believes that these services support 10% DBE participation.

If portions of the services are to be subcontracted to a DBE, the following needs to be submitted with your EOI and both must reference the project number(s) for the services:

- Written documentation of the prime's commitment to the DBE firm to subcontract a portion of the services, a description of the services to be performed and the percent of participation.
- Written confirmation from the DBE firm that it is participating, including a description of the services to be performed and the percent of participation.

49 CFR Part 26 requires VDOT to collect certain data about firms attempting to participate in VDOT contracts. This data must be provided on the enclosed Firm Data Sheet.

VDOT is also required to capture DBE payment information on all professional services contracts. The successful prime consultant will be required to complete C- 63 form for both state and federally funded projects on quarterly basis.

Any DBE firm must become certified (with the Virginia Department of Small Business and Supplier Diversity) prior to your response being submitted. If DBE firm is the prime consultant, the firm will receive full credit for planned involvement of their own forces, as well as the work that they commit to be performed by DBE subconsultants. DBE prime consultants are encouraged to make the same outreach efforts as other consultants. DBE credit will be awarded only for work actually being performed by them. When a DBE prime consultant subcontracts work to another firm, the work counts toward DBE goals only if the other firm is itself a DBE. A DBE prime consultant must perform or exercise responsibility for at least 30% of the total cost of its contract with its own force.

DBE certification entitles consultants to participate in VDOT's DBE program. However, this certification does not guarantee that the firm will obtain VDOT work nor does it attest to the firm's abilities to perform any particular work.

Business Opportunity and Workforce Development (BOWD) Center - The BOWD Center is a VDOT developmental supportive services program and partnering initiative funded by FHWA for selected DBE firms of various skill and competence levels interested in entering, enhancing or expanding highway contracting opportunities with prime consultants. The partnering initiative between prime consultants and BOWD DBE firms provides the opportunity for the further development of DBE firms through performance on contracts and guidance from prime consultants. The intent of this partnering initiative is to increase capacity by perfecting existing skills and knowledge, expanding into new work areas, and prime consultant joint venturing with DBE firms.

The prime consultants are encouraged to achieve all or a percentage of the required DBE participation/goals determined for this project by the utilization of BOWD approved firms. To assist consultants in taking advantage of this opportunity for utilization of approved BOWD firms, please contact the BOWD Center for additional information, details, resources and support. The BOWD Center can be contacted at (804) 662-9555 or via email to BOWDCenter@vdot.virginia.gov.

10. Give names and detailed addresses of all affiliated and/or subsidiary companies. Indicate which companies are subsidiaries. If a situation arises in responding to this questionnaire where you are unsure whether another firm is or is not an affiliate, doubt should be resolved in favor of affiliation and the firm should be listed accordingly.

Affiliate - Any business entity which is closely associated to another business entity so that one entity controls or has the power to control the other entity either directly or indirectly; or, when a third party has the power to control or controls both; or where one business entity has been so closely allied with another business entity through an established course of dealings, including but not limited to the lending of financial wherewithal, engaging in joint ventures, etc. as to cause a public perception that the two firms are one entity. Firms which are owned by a holding company or a third party, but otherwise meet the above conditions and do not have interlocking directorships or joint officers serving are not considered affiliates.

A firm (prime) shall not submit more than one Expression of Interest (EOI) in response to this Request for Proposals (RFP). If more than one EOI is submitted by an individual, partnership, Corporation, or any party of a Joint Venture, then all EOIs submitted by that individual, partnership, Corporation, or any party of a Joint Venture shall be disqualified. If more than one EOIs are submitted by an affiliate, or subsidiary company of an individual, partnership, Corporation, or any party of a Joint Venture, then all EOIs submitted by that individual, partnership, Corporation, or Joint Venture shall be disqualified.

11. In 2 page(s) or less, provide information that will indicate your firm's ability to meet the time schedule for this project. The schedule is as follows:

- Begin Design: 2/3/17
- Advertisement: 12/30/17
- Begin Construction: 5/21/18
- Completion: 10/26/18

12. In 2 page(s) or less, please emphasize your qualifications in the following areas: Bridge rehabilitation and project management/inspection.

13. A project approach discussion is required for this project and shall be limited to a maximum of 3 page(s).

14. In addition to the page restrictions listed above, a maximum of 5 additional pages may be included in the Expression of Interest. All pages are to be 8 1/2" X 11" and printed on one side with single-spaced type no smaller than 12 pitch.

15. Please indicate, by executing and returning the attached Certification Regarding Debarment forms, if your firm, subconsultant, subcontractor, or any person associated therewith in the capacity of owner, partner, director, officer or any position involving the administration of Federal or State funds:
- Is currently under suspension, debarment, voluntary exclusion or determination of ineligibility by any federal agency.
 - Has been suspended, debarred, voluntarily excluded or determined ineligible by any federal agency within the past 3 years.
 - Does have a proposed debarment pending; or has been indicted, convicted, or had a civil judgment rendered against it or them by a court of competent jurisdiction in any matter involving fraud or official misconduct within the past 3 years.

Any of the above conditions will not necessarily result in denial of award, but it will be considered in determining offeror responsibility. For any condition noted, indicate to whom it applies, initiating agency, and dates of action. Providing false information may result in Federal criminal prosecution or administrative sanctions.

16. If the prime consultant or subconsultant does not have the in-house capability to provide non-professional services, each with an estimated cost of \$5,000 or greater, such as diving services, soil drilling, sampling services or laboratory testing, these services must be subcontracted in accordance with State procurement procedures once a contract is executed, with no DBE or SWaM credit in the selection of the most qualified firm or team. Clearly indicate these services in the EOI.
17. Each business entity (prime and subconsultants) on the proposed team who is practicing or offering to practice professional services in Virginia, including, but not limited to, those practicing or offering to practice engineering, surveying, hydrologic and hydraulic analysis, geotechnical analysis and landscape architecture, should provide evidence including full size copies of appropriate commercial professional registrations and licenses for all main and branch offices proposed for this Project, as well as providing full size copies of appropriate individual registrations/licenses for those professional occupations per the requirements listed below. The EOI should convey the requested information for each regulant by the use of a concise table or matrix. (All full size copies of the Commonwealth of Virginia State Corporation Commission (SCC) and Department of Professional and Occupational Regulation (DPOR) supporting registration documentations should be included in the EOI and will not be counted towards page restriction):

.1 The Commonwealth of Virginia SCC registration detailing the name, registration number, type of corporation and status of the business entity.

.2 For this Project/Contract, the Commonwealth of Virginia DPOR registration information for each office practicing or offering to practice any professional services in Virginia: Provide the business name, address, registration type, registration number, expiration date.

.3 For this Project/Contract, the Commonwealth of Virginia DPOR license information for each of your Key Personnel practicing or offering to practice professional services in Virginia: Provide the name, the address, type, the registration number, and the expiration date. Provide the office location where each of the Key Personnel is offering to practice professional services.

.4 For this Project/Contract, the Commonwealth of Virginia DPOR license information for those services not regulated by the Board for Architects, Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors, Certified Interior

Designers, and Landscape Architects (e.g. real estate appraisal): the business name, the address, the registration type, the registration number, and the expiration date.

Failure to comply with the law with regard to those requirements in Virginia (whether federal or state) at the time of the EOI submittal regarding your organizational structure, any required registration with governmental agencies and/or entities, and any required governmental licensure, whether business, individual, or professional in nature may render your EOI submittal(s), in the sole and reasonable discretion of the Department, non-responsive and in that event your EOI submittal(s) may be returned without any consideration or evaluation.

ADMINISTRATIVE

1. Prior to the time of submittal of the EOI, all business entities, except for sole proprietorships, are required to register with the Virginia State Corporation Commission. Information about entity formation can be found at <https://www.scc.virginia.gov/default.aspx>. Foreign Professional corporations and Foreign Professional Limited Liability Companies (i.e., organized or existing under the laws of a state or jurisdiction other than Virginia) must possess a Commonwealth of Virginia Certificate of Authority from the State Corporation Commission to render professional services. Any business entity other than a professional corporation, professional limited liability company or sole proprietorships that do not employ other individuals for which licensing is required must be registered in the Commonwealth of Virginia with the Department of Professional & Occupational Regulation <http://www.dpor.virginia.gov/>, Virginia Board for Architects, Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors and Landscape Architects (Board). Board regulations require that all branch offices of professional corporations and business entities located in Virginia, which offer or render any professional services relating to the professions regulated by the Board shall be registered as separate branch office with the Board. All offices, including branches, which offer or render any professional service, must have at least one full-time resident professional in responsible charge who is licensed in the profession offered or rendered at that office. All firms involved that are to provide professional services must meet these criteria prior to submitting an Expression of Interest to the City of Martinsville. Individual engineers shall meet the requirements of Chapter 4, Title 54.1 of the Code of Virginia.
2. The Department will not consider for award any cost proposals submitted by any consultants and will not consent to subcontracting any portions of the contract to any subconsultants in violation of the provisions of the Federal Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, which prohibits employment of illegal aliens.
3. The method of payment will be [lump sum/actual costs] for each project assignment based on fixed billable rates. For purpose of determining the [lump sum fee/fixed billable rates], an overhead rate shall be established in compliance with cost principles contained in the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) of Part 31 of Title 48 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The overhead rate shall be established by an audit by a cognizant government agency or independent CPA firm.
4. All firms submitting Expressions of Interest (prime consultants, joint ventures and subconsultants) must have internal control systems in place that meet Federal requirements for accounting. These systems must comply with requirements of 48CFR31, "Federal Acquisition Regulations, Contract Cost Principles and Procedures," and 23CFR172, "Administration of Negotiated Contracts." All architectural or engineering firms selected for a project (prime consultants, joint ventures and subconsultants) must submit their FAR audit data along with a Contractor Cost Certification for indirect cost rates required by FHWA order 4470.1A dated October 27, 2010 to the Department within 10 work days of being notified of their selection, whereby an official of an architectural or engineering firm shall certify that the indirect cost rate submitted does not include any costs which are expressly unallowable and that the indirect cost rate was established only with allowable costs in accordance with the applicable cost principles contained in the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) of 48CFR31. A sample Contractor Cost Certification is available for architectural or engineering firm's use on VDOT website at <http://www.virginiadot.org/business/gpmmps.asp>. Should any firm on the consultant team fail to submit the required audit data and certification within the 10 work days, negotiations may be terminated by

the City of Martinsville and the next most qualified team invited to submit a proposal.

5. Records Exclusion from Public Disclosure: Pursuant to the provisions of §2.2-3705.6 (22) of the Code of Virginia, trade secrets, as defined in the Uniform Trade Secrets Act (§ 59.1-336 et seq.), including, but not limited to, financial records, including balance sheets and financial statements, that are not generally available to the public through regulatory disclosure or otherwise, and revenue and cost projections supplied by a private or nongovernmental entity to the Inspector General of the City of Martinsville for the purpose of an audit, special investigation, or any study requested by the Inspector General's Office in accordance with law may, subject to a determination by the Inspector General as described herein, be withheld from public disclosure under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). To enable the Inspector General to identify data or records that may be subject to this exclusion from disclosure under FOIA the private or nongovernmental entity shall, in accord with procedures adopted by the Inspector General, make a written request to the Inspector General of the Virginia Department of Transportation:

- invoking such exclusion upon submission of the data or other materials for which protection is sought;
- identifying with specificity the data or other materials for which protection is sought; and stating the reasons why protection is necessary.

The Inspector General of the Virginia Department of Transportation shall determine whether the requested exclusion from disclosure is necessary to protect the trade secrets or financial records of the private entity. The City of Martinsville shall make a written determination of the nature and scope of the protection to be afforded by it. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Contractor's failure to comply with the requirements stated herein and procedures established by the Inspector General for seeking an exclusion pursuant to §2.2-3705.6 (22) of the Code of Virginia shall result in a denial of the exclusion. Requests for exclusion that are submitted after data or other materials for which protection is sought have been submitted will be denied.

If litigation directly or indirectly results from or arises out of a granted exemption, the contractor will be responsible for all litigation costs incurred by contractor and/or City of Martinsville associated with such litigation. In no event shall the City of Martinsville or its officers, employees or agents be liable to the contractor as a result of any disclosure of records or data collected by the City of Martinsville, its officers, employees or agents, pursuant to an audit, special investigation, or any study requested by the Inspector General's Office, whether or not the Inspector General has determined that the requested exclusion from disclosure under FOIA is necessary to protect the trade secrets or financial records of the private entity, and in no event shall the City of Martinsville, or its officers, employees, or agents be liable to the contractor for any damages or other claims arising directly or indirectly from a determination that the exclusion from public disclosure will not be granted.

6. Electronic EOI submittals are encouraged for this EOI, with the entire submittal in a single cohesive PDF file. Submittals shall be prepared simply and economically, providing a straightforward, concise description of the firm's capabilities to satisfy the requirements of the RFP. Emphasis should be on completeness and clarity of content. Elaborate brochures and other representations beyond that sufficient to present a complete and effective proposal are neither required nor desired. Please do not duplicate information furnished in the SF 330 Part I and Part II elsewhere in the submittal. **All information should be submitted electronically through the City of Martinsville's system and by mail (one hard copy) and received no later than 2:00 PM (local time prevailing) on 11/18/16. Responses received after this time will not be considered. An offeror choosing to submit the EOI through hard copy delivery must include one CD-ROM containing the entire submittal in a single cohesive PDF file.** All text in the PDF file shall be searchable using Adobe Acrobat software except within illustrations and scanned registration documents.

Electronic submittals shall be sent to:

kmays@ci.martinsville.va.us.

Hard-copy deliveries shall be sent to:

**Karen Mays, Purchasing Manager
City of Martinsville, Central Warehouse
990 Fishel Street, Martinsville, Va. 24112**

7. The City of Martinsville assures compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended. The consultant and all subconsultants selected for this project will be required to submit a Title VI Evaluation Report (EEO-D2) within 10 work days of notification of selection when requested by the Department. This requirement applies to all consulting firms when the contract amount equals or exceeds \$10,000.
8. The City of Martinsville does not discriminate against an offeror because of race, religion, color, sex, national origin, age, disability, or any other basis prohibited by state law relating to discrimination in employment.
9. Any offeror who desires to protest the award of a contract shall submit such protest in writing to the Department no later than ten days after the announcement of the award. Public announcement of the award shall be posted on the Department's Business Center Internet site.

FIRM DATA SHEET

Funding: ____ (S=State F=Federal)

Project No.: _____

Division: _____

EOI Due Date: _____

The prime consultant is responsible for submitting the information requested below on all firms on the project team, both prime and all subconsultants. All firms are to be reported on one combined sheet unless the number of firms requires the use of an additional sheet. Failure to submit all of the required data may result in the Expression of Interest not being considered.

Firm's Name, Address and DBE and/or SWAM Certification Number	Firm's DBE or SWaM Status *	Firm's Age	Firm's Annual Gross Receipts

* YD = DBE Firm Certified by DMBE

N = DBE or SWaM Firm Not Certified by DMBE

NA = Firm Not Claiming DBE or SWaM Status

YS = SWaM Firm Certified by DMBE. Indicate whether small, woman-owned, or small business.

DMBE is the Virginia Department of Small Business and Supplier Diversity

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT
PRIMARY COVERED TRANSACTIONS
(To be completed by a Prime Consultant)

Project: Commonwealth Boulevard Bridge Repairs

- 1) The prospective primary participant certifies to the best of its knowledge and belief, that it and its principals:
 - a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency.
 - b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; and have not been convicted of any violations of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification, or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;
 - c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph 1) b) of this certification; and
 - d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application/proposal had one or more public transactions (Federal, State or local) terminated for cause or default.
- 2) Where the prospective primary participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

The undersigned makes the foregoing statements to be filed with the proposal submitted on behalf of the offeror for contracts to be let by the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

Signature

Date

Title

Name of Firm

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT

LOWER TIER COVERED TRANSACTIONS

(To be completed by a Sub-consultant)

Project: Commonwealth Boulevard Bridge Repairs

- 1) The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals is presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.
- 2) Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

The undersigned makes the foregoing statements to be filed with the proposal submitted on behalf of the offeror for contracts to be let by the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

Signature

Date

Title

Name of Firm

CONSULTANT SHORT LIST SCORE SHEET – FEDERALLY / STATE FUNDED PROJECT
(FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES)

DIVISION: _____

EOI NO.: _____

PROJECT: _____

FIRM: _____

DESCRIPTION: _____

SUBS: _____

DATE: _____

	NUMERICAL VALUE				AVG.	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED EVALUATION
FIRM/TEAM'S EXPERIENCE IN SIMILAR TYPE OF SERVICES (Expertise, experience and qualifications of team in providing services as related to the scope of services) (1=least, 10=most)	1-10					35%	
PERSONNEL'S EXPERIENCE IN SIMILAR TYPE OF SERVICES (Expertise, experience and qualifications of team in providing services as related to the scope of services) (1=least, 10=most)	1-10					40%	
QUALIFICATIONS OF PROJECT MANAGER (Expertise, experience and qualifications in project management as related to the scope of services) (1=least, 10=most)	1-10					5%	
ORGANIZATIONAL CAPABILITY (Ability to complete work in a timely manner, size of firm(s) relative to size of project, proposed project staff resources, proposed use of sub-consultants) (1=least, 10=most)	1-10					20%	
						TOTAL	

*CATEGORIES OF WORKLOAD:

- A - TERM SURVEYING AND UTILITY DESIGNATION/LOCATION CONTRACTS
- B - PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING CONTRACTS - includes transportation planning and environmental studies, utility relocation and design, and roadway and bridge design.
- C - CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING CONTRACTS - includes construction inspection, preparation of final estimates, and bridge and traffic structure safety inspection.
- D - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS - includes operation and maintenance of traffic management systems.

† The outstanding workload of any certified DBE or SWaM prime and sub-consultant may be reduced up to \$4M and the remainder (>\$0) added to the team's total workload. When a DBE or SWaM firm graduates from the program, their workload incurred while a DBE or SWaM may be reduced up to \$4M for the next three years. Any new work obtained after graduating from the program will be counted.

In determining the final short list, the top ranked firms and their sub-consultants will have their VDOT Consultant Performance Reports reviewed and/or references checked.

GOOD FAITH EFFORT

(Federally Funded Project with DBE Goal: **until further notice, DBE goals will not be assigned to consultant service contracts**)

The Department will be accepting what consultants submit in their Expressions of Interest regarding good faith efforts. If a firm that has submitted good faith effort documentation makes the short list, the procuring Division Administrator (cannot be delegated unless he/she will be out of the office for more than 5 work days) along with a representative of the EO Division will determine if the good faith effort is acceptable.

When there is a contract goal, a consultant must make good faith efforts to meet it. The consultant can do so either through obtaining enough DBE participation to meet the goal or documenting the good faith efforts it made to do so. These means of meeting contract goal requirements are fully equivalent. 49 CFR Part 26 (the Rule) explicitly provides that the Department must not disregard showings of good faith efforts, and it gives consultants the right to have the Department reconsider a decision that their good faith efforts were insufficient. The Department is prohibited from denying a contract to a consultant simply because it did not obtain enough DBE participation to meet the goal. The Department must seriously consider consultants' documentation of good faith efforts. To make certain that consultants' showings are taken seriously, the Rule requires the Department to offer administrative reconsideration to consultants whose good faith efforts showings are initially rejected.

The Rule also ensures flexibility for consultants by requiring that any contract goal be waived entirely for a prime consultant that demonstrates that it made good faith efforts but was still unable to meet the goal.

When the Department sets a contract goal, the basic obligation of consultants is to make good faith efforts to meet it. They can demonstrate these efforts in either of two ways, which are equally valid. First, they can meet the goal, by documenting that they have obtained commitments for enough DBE participation to meet the goal. Second, even though they have not met the goal, they can document that they have made good faith efforts to do so. A refusal by the Department to accept valid showings of good faith is not acceptable under the Rule.

The Rule makes clear that the Department is not to use a "conclusive presumption" approach, in which the apparent successful consultant is summarily found to have failed to make good faith efforts simply because another consultant was able to meet the goal. However, the performance of other consultants in meeting the contract can be a relevant factor in a good faith effort determination, in more than one way. For example, when the apparent successful consultant fails to meet the contract goal, but others meet it, you may reasonably raise the question of whether, with additional reasonable efforts, the apparent successful consultant could have met the goal. It does not, by itself, prove that the apparent successful consultant did not make a good faith effort to get DBE participation, however. On the other hand, if the apparent successful consultant fails to meet the goal, but meets or exceeds the average DBE participation obtained by other consultants, the Department may view this, in conjunction with other factors, as evidence of the apparent successful consultant having made good faith efforts.

The fact that some additional costs may be involved in finding and using DBEs is not in itself sufficient reason for a consultant's failure to meet a DBE contract goal, as long as such costs are reasonable.

If the Department determines that the apparent successful consultant has failed to meet the requirements of a good faith effort, the Department must, before awarding the contract, provide the consultant an opportunity for administrative reconsideration. The Department intends that the process be informal and timely. The Department will ensure that the process is completed within a brief period (e.g., 5-10 days) to minimize any potential delay in procurements. The consultant will have an opportunity to meet with the reconsideration official, but a formal hearing is not required. As part of this reconsideration, the consultant must have the

opportunity to provide written documentation or argument concerning the issue of whether it met the goal or made adequate good faith efforts to do so. The Department's decision on reconsideration will be made by an official who did not take part in the original determination that the consultant failed to meet the goal or make adequate good faith efforts to do so. The consultant must have the opportunity to meet in person with the reconsideration official to discuss the issues of whether it met the goal or made adequate good faith efforts to do so. The Department will send the consultant a written decision on reconsideration, explaining the basis for finding that the consultant did or did not meet the goal or make adequate good faith efforts to do so. The Department's reconsideration personnel consist of the Commissioner's DBE Review Panel.

It is up to the Department to make a fair and reasonable judgement whether a consultant that did not meet the goal made adequate good faith efforts. It is important for the Department to consider the quality, quantity, and intensity of the different kinds of efforts that the consultant has made. The efforts employed by the consultant should be those that one could reasonably expect a consultant to take if the consultant were actively and aggressively trying to obtain DBE participation sufficient to meet the DBE contract goal. Mere pro forma efforts are not good faith efforts to meet the DBE contract requirements. The Department's determination concerning the sufficiency of the firm's good faith efforts is a judgement call: meeting quantitative formulas is not required.

If DBE is prime, they will be allowed to count toward goals the work they commit to performing with their own forces, as well as the work that they commit to be performed by DBE subcontractors. DBE consultants on prime contracts will be expected to make the same outreach efforts as other consultants.

When a DBE participates in a contract, the Department will count only the value of the work actually performed by the DBE toward DBE goals. When a DBE subcontracts part of the work of its contract to another firm, the value of the subcontracted work may be counted toward DBE goals only if the DBE's subcontractor is itself a DBE. Work that a DBE subcontracts to a non-DBE firm does not count toward DBE goals. Count expenditures to a DBE contractor toward DBE goals only if the DBE is performing a commercially useful function on that contract. If a DBE does not perform or exercise responsibility for at least 30 percent of the total cost of its contract with its own work force, or the DBE subcontracts a greater portion of the work of a contract than would be expected on the basis of normal industry practice for the type of work involved, you must presume that it is not performing a commercially useful function. If a DBE firm loses certification, its work no longer counts toward the DBE goal.

All consultants will be required to submit the following information to the Department with the EOI:

- The names and addresses of DBE firms that will participate in the contract;
- A description of the work that each DBE will perform;
- The percentage amount of the participation of each DBE firm participating;
- Written documentation of the prime consultant's commitment to use a DBE subcontractor whose participation it submits to meet a contract goal;
- Written confirmation from the DBE that it is participating in the contract as provided in the prime contractor's commitment; and
- If the contract goal is not met, evidence of good faith efforts.

The Department has prepared a list based on Federal Regulations of some of the kinds of efforts that consultants may make in obtaining DBE participation. It is not intended to be a mandatory checklist. The Department does not require that a consultant do any one, or particular combination, of the things on the list, nor is the list intended to be exclusive or exhaustive; it merely offers examples. Other factors or types of efforts may be relevant in appropriate cases. In determining whether a consultant has made good faith efforts, it will usually be important for the Department to look not only at the different kinds of efforts that the Consultant has made, but also of the timeliness, quantity, and intensity of these efforts.

The Department offers the following examples of efforts that may be considered:

A. Soliciting through all reasonable and available means (e.g., attendance at project showings, advertising and/or written notices) the interest of all certified DBEs who have the capability to perform the work of the contract. The consultant must solicit this interest within sufficient time to allow the DBEs to participate effectively. The consultant must determine with certainty if the DBEs are interested by taking appropriate steps to follow up initial solicitations.

B. Selecting portions of the work to be performed by DBEs in order to increase the likelihood that the DBE goals will be achieved. This includes, where appropriate, breaking out contract work items into economically feasible units to facilitate DBE participation, even when the prime consultant might otherwise prefer to perform these work items with its own forces.

C. Providing interested DBEs with adequate information about the plans, specifications, and requirements of the contract.

D. (1) Negotiating in good faith with interested DBEs. It is the consultant's responsibility to make a portion of the work available to DBE subcontractors and suppliers and to select those portions of the work or material needs consistent with the available DBE subcontractors and suppliers, so as to facilitate DBE participation. Evidence of such negotiation includes the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of DBEs that were considered; a description of the information provided regarding the plans and specifications for the work selected for subcontracting; and evidence as to why additional agreements could not be reached for DBEs to perform the work.

D. (2) A consultant using good business judgment would consider a number of factors in negotiating with subcontractors, including DBE subcontractors, and would take a firm's costs, qualifications and capabilities as well as contract goals into consideration. However, the fact that there may be some additional costs involved in finding and using DBEs is not in itself sufficient reason for a consultant's failure to meet the contract DBE goal, as long as such costs are reasonable. Also, the ability or desire of a prime consultant to perform the work of a contract with its own organization does not relieve the consultant of the responsibility to make good faith efforts. Prime consultants are not, however, required to accept higher quotes from DBEs if the price difference is excessive or unreasonable.

E. Not rejecting DBEs as being unqualified without sound reasons based on a thorough investigation of their capabilities. The contractor's standing within its industry, membership in specific groups, organizations, or associations and political or social affiliations {for example union vs. non-union employee status) are not legitimate causes for the rejection or non-solicitation of bids in the contractor's efforts to meet the project goal.

F. Making efforts to assist interested DBEs in obtaining bonding, lines of credit, or insurance as required by the recipient or contractor.

G. Making efforts to assist interested DBEs in obtaining necessary equipment, supplies, materials, or related assistance or services.

H. Effectively using the services of available minority community organizations; minority contractors' groups; local, state, and Federal minority business assistance offices; and other organizations as allowed on a case-by-case basis to provide assistance in the recruitment and placement of DBEs.

2015 BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT

COMMISSION NUMBER: 15057

ROUTE 457 (COMMONWEALTH BOULEVARD)
OVER
TRAIL

STRUCTURE NUMBER: 1803



SCHWARTZ & ASSOCIATES, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS

STRUCTURE INSPECTION REPORT – REGULAR

Agency ID: 1201803-00000000020635 **Date of Inspection:** 10/30/2015

Due: OCTOBER Inspection Frequency: 24 Months

County/City: CITY OF MARTINSVILLE Feature Intersected: TRAIL
 Main Route: 457 Facility Carried: COMMONWEALTH BOULEVARD
 Lead Inspector: M. B. HANSEN, ET Location: 1.20 MI FR. INT. U.S. ROUTE 220

Signature of Lead Inspector _____ Signature & Date of City/Town Reviewer _____	PE Stamp of Reviewer
---	----------------------

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS Fracture Critical Fatigue Prone Details Pin & Hanger

CONDITION RATINGS

Deck: 5
 Superstructure: 6
 Substructure: 5
 Channel/Channel Prot.: N
 Culvert: N

FIELD POSTING

Sign Legibility: N
 Sign Visibility: N
 Capacity Sign R12-1 (Tons): N
 Capacity Sign R12-5: N
 Single (Tons): N
 Semi (Tons): N

TRAFFIC SAFETY FEATURES

Bridge Railings: ★0
 Transitions: 0
 Approach Guardrail: 0
 Approach Guardrail Ends: 0

YEAR PAINTED 1972

ELEMENT CONDITION STATE DATA

No.	Description	ENV	Unit	State 1	State 2	State 3	State 4	State 5	Total

NOTE: This structure is not on the National Highway System. Element Condition State Data (Pontis) is not required.

Attachments: Structure Inventory Data Sheet Sketches Channel Profile
 Cover Sheet of Rating Calculations Other Clearance Sheet

STRUCTURE INSPECTION REPORT – REGULAR

Agency ID: 1201803-00000000020635

Date of Inspection: 10/30/2015

County/City: CITY OF MARTINSVILLE

Feature Intersected: TRAIL

Main Route: 457

Facility Carried: COMMONWEALTH BOULEVARD

Location: 1.20 MI. FROM INT. U.S. ROUTE 220

Lead Inspector: M. B. HANSEN, ET

Additional Inspectors: J. B. HANSEN

DESCRIPTION	Three simple spans with fourteen steel beams, two reinforced concrete stub abutments and two reinforced concrete bent column piers, 141'-2" long.	
ORIENTATION	Abutment A on Lester Street end of structure. Structure components numbered left to right looking towards Abutment B.	
MISCELLANEOUS (Items which are structure specific and cannot be included in another section.)	★ - Denotes changes since last inspection. Sunny, 62°F	Bridge Coordinates N 36° 41' 41.03" W 79° 52' 07.00"
SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS (Special Equipment needed or Special Inspections required such as: Fracture Critical, Underwater, Fatigue Prone, Scour Critical, Moveable Bridge, Segmental Concrete, Pin and Hanger, etc.)	Bucket truck used to access structure.	
WORK DONE	-Settled approach sidewalk at both abutments repaired. -Undermined sidewalk at Abutment B repaired. -Approaches repaved where breaking up.	
STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS	Revised Structural Analysis in progress.	
OVERALL CONDITION	FAIR. -Deck surface and approach slabs have cracking, concrete scale and aggregate polishing. -Deck surface has spalled/delaminated concrete with exposed reinforcing steel. -Underside of deck has spalled concrete at beam ends, map cracking, and moisture seepage. -Median and sidewalks are cracked. -Railing has loose bolts and section loss in bolts. -Drains are clogged with debris. -Deck expansion joint material torn and leaking. -Two broken anchor bolts. -Beams at Abutment A and at Pier 2, Span 3 jammed in expansion direction. -Structural steel has rust, corrosion and minor section loss. -Paint system failure. -Backwalls, breastwalls, pier caps, and pier columns have delaminated/spalled concrete. -Wings, backwall, and breastwall at each abutment cracked. -Footing at Abutment A undermined. -Debris on seats. -Erosion in front of abutments and around one column. -Vegetation growth. -Approach guardrail has traffic impact damage.	
RECOMMENDATIONS	-Schedule structure for deck repairs and concrete overlay. -Clean and reseal deck expansion joints. -Enlarge anchor bolt slots for beams at Abutment A and at Pier 2 and replace broken anchor bolt for Beams 7 & 12 at Abutment A.	

RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINUE ON PAGE 4

STRUCTURE INSPECTION REPORT – REGULAR

Agency ID: 1201803-00000000020635

Date of Inspection:

10/30/2015

**RECOMMENDATIONS
(CONT.)**

- Repair areas of delaminated/spalled concrete in underside of deck, backwalls, breastwalls, pier caps, and pier columns.
- Clean, prepare, and paint structural steel.
- Stabilize erosion in front of abutments.
- Replace loose or corroded bolts in railing.
- Before structure is scheduled for deck repairs, an in depth deck evaluation should be performed to determine extent of deterioration.
- Remove accumulation of debris from bearing seats at abutments, piers and deck drains.
- Repair damaged approach guardrail and trim vegetation.

DECK

Condition Rating: 5

Top of Deck

Deck surface in each span has light concrete scale, aggregate polishing and hairline map cracking over total surface area.

Deck surface in each span has random hairline cracks up to 3' length perpendicular to deck expansion joints.

Deck surface has transverse cracks (hairline to 1/16" width) and delaminated and spalled concrete (1½" depth) with exposed reinforcement steel as shown in chart below:

Span No.	Transverse Cracks (Lineal Feet)	Spalled/Delaminated Concrete (Square Feet)
1 WBL	50	★0
1 EBL	110	0
2 WBL	400	★688
2 EBL	40	★10
3 WBL	30	★0
3 EBL	50	★8
Total	680	★706

Spalled areas in Span 2 WBL have been saw cut but not repaired.

Previous deck repairs have failed.

Bottom of Deck

Deck underside behind diaphragms at abutments and piers has random spalls beneath top flange of beams totaling 40 S.F.

★Underside of deck has hairline map cracking throughout surface area. **See Photo #5.**

★Underside of deck has moisture seepage as follows:

- Span 1 – 5%
- Span 2 – 5%
- Span 3 – 15% **See Photo #6**

Bottom of deck in Bay 3 of Span 2 at Pier 1 has 4 S.F. of spalled/delaminated concrete (2½" depth) with exposed reinforcing steel.

Bottom of deck in Bay 5 of Span 2 near Pier 1 has 2 S.F. of spalled/ delaminated concrete (2½" depth) with exposed reinforcing steel.

STRUCTURE INSPECTION REPORT – REGULAR

Agency ID:	1201803-00000000020635	Date of Inspection:	10/30/2015
-------------------	------------------------	----------------------------	------------

<u>Overhang</u>	No deficiencies found.
<u>Median</u>	Median has hairline map cracking over 40% of total area.
<u>Sidewalks</u>	Sidewalks have random hairline map cracking on top surface at random locations.
<u>Railing</u>	Railing has one loose bolt at bottom left side at Abutment A, one missing at bottom left side of Span 2 at Pier 2 and one loose at top, left side, 2 nd from Abutment A. Railing bolts have up to 90% section loss at random locations due to dissimilar metals.
<u>Drains</u>	Drains are clogged with debris. ★ Drainage system adjacent to Column 1, Pier 2, Span 3 side has separated and clogged with debris.
<u>Utilities</u>	Hangers for utility line in Bay 1 have heavy rust.
<u>Expansion Joints</u>	Expansion joint compression material in raised median and sidewalk on each side of structure is torn and leaking at several locations. Expansion joint compression material in eastbound & westbound lanes at Abutment A and eastbound & westbound lanes at Pier 1 torn and leaking due to being flush with finished grade of deck. All deck expansion joints are leaking. Expansion joints at Pier 2 and Abutment B have splits/sagging up to 1" at random locations. See Photo #7

SUPERSTRUCTURE	Condition Rating: 6
<u>Bearings Devices</u>	One anchor bolt broken in Beam 7, Bay 6 and Beam 12, Bay 11 bearing assembly at Abutment A. ★ Bearings have heavy corrosion at isolated locations. See Photo #8. Anchor bolts at Beams 2-6 & 14 at Abutment A jammed in expansion slots in expansion direction at 60°F. Remaining beams have up to 3/8" remaining for expansion. ★ Bearing devices for Beams 1 - 4, 7, 12, 13 & 14 in Span 3 jammed at Pier 2 in expansion direction. Remaining beams have up to 1/4" left for expansion.

STRUCTURE INSPECTION REPORT – REGULAR

Agency ID: 1201803-00000000020635

Date of Inspection:

10/30/2015

BEAMS

Beams 1-14, Spans 1-3
 $d = 32 \frac{7}{8}$ "
 $b_f = 11 \frac{1}{2}$ "
 $t_w = 0.550$ "
 $t_f = 0.740$ "

General

Beams 10, 12 at Abutment A have heavy corrosion and up to 10% section loss (0.666" rem) on bottom flange from end out 8'-0" and 25% section loss (0.413" rem) in lower 2" of web end out 3'-0".

★Beam 11 at Abutment A has 19% section loss (0.60" rem.) end out 3'-0" in bottom flange and 45% section loss (0.30" rem.) in lower 2" of web end out 3'-0". **See Photo #9.**

★Beam 13 at Abutment A has 9% section loss (0.67" rem.) end out 2'-6" in bottom flange and 35% section loss (0.36" rem.) in lower 4" of web starting 1'-4" from end of beam and extending for 1'-2".

Beams 10, 12 & 13 in Span 3 at Pier 2 have heavy corrosion and 5% section loss (0.703" rem) in bottom flange from end out 3'-0" and 25% section loss (0.413" rem) in lower 2" of web end out 3'-0".

★Beam 11 in Span 3 at Pier 2 has 32% section loss (0.50" rem.) end out 3'-0" on one half of bottom flange and 45% section loss (0.30") in lower 2" end out 3'-0".

★Bearing stiffeners for Beams 10 & 12 in Span 3 at Pier 2 has 33% section loss (0.25" rem., 0.375 orig.) in lower 2" x entire width. Similar condition at Beam 11 and Beam 12, Spans 2 & 3 at Pier 2, Beam 13 in Span 2 at Pier 2 and Beams 3 & 4 in Span 1 at Pier 1.

★Bearing stiffeners have 100% section loss x up to 3" high x entire width in lower portion at the following locations:

Beam	Span	Location	Bay	Comments
11	1	Abutment A	11	
13	1	Abutment A	12	
13	1	Abutment A	13	
11	3	Pier 2	11	
13	3	Pier 2	12	

Diaphragms

Diaphragms at Abutment A and both piers have heavy corrosion and up to 20% section loss in top flange and pack rust up to 3/8" at random locations.

PAINT

Heavy rust/corrosion on beam ends, bearing devices and diaphragms at abutments and piers.

STRUCTURE INSPECTION REPORT – REGULAR

Agency ID: 1201803-00000000020635 Date of Inspection: 10/30/2015

<p>SUBSTRUCTURE ABUTMENTS</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>Wings</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>Backwalls</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>Bearing Seats</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>Breastwall</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>Footings</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>Piles</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>Undermining</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>Settlement</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">PIERS</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><u>Caps</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>Bearing Seats</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><u>Columns</u></p>	<p>Condition Rating: 5</p> <p>Wings at each abutment have hairline map cracking throughout.</p> <p>Backwall at each abutment has vertical hairline cracks and hairline map cracking at random locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ★Face of Abutment A backwall has 7 SF delaminated concrete. ★Face of Abutment B backwall has 6 SF delaminated concrete. <p>Moderate debris on bearing seats at abutments.</p> <p>Breastwall at each abutment has hairline vertical cracks at random locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ★Breastwall at Abutment A has 16 SF delaminated concrete. <p>★Footing at Abutment A has 8 SF delaminated concrete.</p> <p>Not Visible</p> <p>Footing at Abutment A undermined 8' length x 1' high x 2'-4" maximum under near right end.</p> <p><i>No deficiencies found.</i></p> <p>★Cap at Pier 1 has 75 S.F. of delaminated/spalled concrete (2" depth) with exposed reinforcing steel having up to 20% section loss at random locations.</p> <p>★Cap at Pier 2 has 32 S.F. of delaminated/spalled concrete (1½" depth) with exposed reinforcing steel having up to 20% section loss at random locations.</p> <p>Moderate debris on bearing seats at piers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ★Column 2 at Pier 1 has 8 S.F. of spalled/delaminated concrete (1½" depth) at ground line. ★Column 4 at Pier 1 has 2 SF of delaminated concrete. ★Column 5 at Pier 1 has 10 S.F. of delaminated concrete at ground line. ★Column 6 at Pier 1 has 6 SF of delaminated concrete. ★Column 1 at Pier 2 has 2 SF of delaminated concrete. <p>Column 4 at Pier 2 has 5 S.F. of delaminated/spalled concrete (1" deep) with exposed reinforcing steel having 20% section loss at ground line.</p>
--	--

STRUCTURE INSPECTION REPORT – REGULAR

Agency ID: 1201803-00000000020635	Date of Inspection: 10/30/2015
--	---------------------------------------

<u>Columns</u>	★Column 5 at Pier 2 has 14 S.F. of spalled/delaminated concrete (1" depth) and exposed reinforcing steel with 20% section loss near top. Column 6 at Pier 2 has 30 S.F. of delaminated/spalled concrete (2" depth) with exposed reinforcing steel having 20% section loss.
<u>Footings</u>	Not Visible
<u>Piles</u>	Not Visible
<u>Undermining</u>	<i>No deficiencies found.</i>
<u>Settlement</u>	<i>No deficiencies found.</i>

CHANNEL AND SLOPE PROTECTION <u>Embankment Erosion</u>	Condition Rating: N Embankment in front of Abutment A eroded (up to full length x 10' width x 4' depth). Eroded area due to drainage from roadway and expansion joints in three locations. Embankment in front of Abutment B eroded full length x 3' wide x 3' deep on left side down to Column 2. Eroded area due to drainage from roadway. Embankment around Column 6 at Pier 2 is eroded 4' deep x 15' diameter due to roadway drainage. See Photo #10.
<u>Vegetation</u>	Heavy vegetation along sides and beneath structure.
<u>Adequacy of Opening</u>	<i>No deficiencies found.</i>

FIELD POSTING <u>Actual Posting</u>	N/A
<u>Legibility</u>	N/A
<u>Visibility</u>	N/A
<u>Advanced Warning Signs</u> In accordance with the Virginia Supplement to the MUTCD	N/A

STRUCTURE INSPECTION REPORT – REGULAR

Agency ID: 1201803-00000000020635

Date of Inspection: 10/30/2015

<p>OTHER APPROACH SIDEWALK</p>	<p><i>No deficiencies found.</i></p>
<p>APPROACH PAVEMENT</p>	<p>Approach slab at each abutment has light concrete scale, aggregate polishing and map cracking up to hairline width over 100% of total surface area.</p>
<p>TRAFFIC SAFETY FEATURES</p>	<p><u>Bridge Railing</u> ★Substandard</p>
<p><u>Transitions</u></p>	<p>Substandard</p>
<p><u>Approach Guardrail</u></p>	<p>Substandard</p> <p>Approach guardrail at Abutment A right side has 10 L.F. of traffic impact damage.</p> <p>Approach guardrail at Abutment B right side has 20 L.F. of traffic impact damage.</p>
<p><u>Approach Guardrail Terminal</u></p>	<p>Substandard</p>
<p>OBJECT MARKERS</p>	<p>None in place.</p>

STRUCTURE INSPECTION REPORT – REGULAR

Agency ID: 1201803-00000000020635

Date of Inspection:

10/30/2015



PHOTO #1
Abutment A approach elevation.



PHOTO #2
Abutment B approach elevation.

STRUCTURE INSPECTION REPORT – REGULAR

Agency ID: 1201803-00000000020635

Date of Inspection: 10/30/2015



PHOTO #3

Side elevation looking at left side with Abutment A oriented on right.



PHOTO #4

Side elevation looking at right side with Abutment A oriented on left.

STRUCTURE INSPECTION REPORT – REGULAR

Agency ID: 1201803-00000000020635

Date of Inspection: 10/30/2015



PHOTO #5
Map cracking in underside of deck.



PHOTO #6
Moisture seepage in underside of deck, Span 3.

STRUCTURE INSPECTION REPORT – REGULAR

Agency ID: 1201803-00000000020635

Date of Inspection: 10/30/2015



PHOTO #7

Expansion joint compression seal split/sagging, Abutment B, westbound lane.



PHOTO #8

Corrosion on bearing.

STRUCTURE INSPECTION REPORT – REGULAR

Agency ID: 1201803-00000000020635

Date of Inspection: 10/30/2015



PHOTO #9

Section loss in bottom flange and web of Beam 11, Abutment A.



PHOTO #10

Embankment eroded, Column 6, Pier 2.