

## CEAO BRIDGE LOAD RATING PROJECT PROCESS TO FOLLOW;

### STEP NO. 1

- A) If project cost is less than \$25,000, the county may direct-select a consulting firm from the list posted on the CEAO web site.  
If the project falls into this category, skip step B.
  
- B) If project cost is greater than or equal to \$25,000, the county must short list the firms using the following process:

#### ***Short List Selection***

- a. County Engineers will initially evaluate all firms for compliance with general Letter of Interest requirements, current negligence issues, ongoing performance issues identified through ODOT's Consultant Evaluation System (CES), overall low CES rating, insufficient staff, excessive workload, or any other significant issues relative to a firm's performance. (ODOT's CES information for those firms meeting the minimum qualifications will be posted on the CEAO website). Firms with significant issues will be eliminated from further consideration, and County Engineers will document the reasons for elimination.*
  
- b. Further evaluations by the County Engineer will reduce the number of firms to 3-6 through a process of elimination. Firms may be eliminated due to fatal flaws, overall weakness of team relative to other firms, weak project approach, etc. Firms with low CES scores, overall staff weakness or general lack of experience with ODOT standards may be eliminated for these reasons.*
  
- c. County Engineers will rate each short listed firm using the following selection rating form. The selection committee will complete one form per firm with one overall score for that firm (i.e. each selection committee member will not do their own scoring and then total the score from the average score of the selection committee members). The numerical ratings must be supplemented with written comments that explain the differential scoring. Numerical ratings are required for only the short listed firms.*

Consultant Selection Rating Form  
for Programmatic Selections

Project:  
PID:  
Project Type: \_\_\_\_\_  
District:

Selection Committee Members:

Firm Name:

Category	Total Value	Scoring Criteria	Score
<b>Management &amp; Team</b>			
Project Manager	10	See Note 1, Exhibit 1	
Strength/Experience of Assigned Staff including Subconsultants	25	See Note 2, Exhibit 1	
Cost Containment including current overhead rate	10		
Firm's Current Workload/ Availability of Personnel	10	See Note 4, Exhibit 1	
<b>Consultant's Past Performance</b>	30	See Note 3, Exhibit 1	
<b>Project Approach</b>	15		
<b>Total</b>	100		

**Exhibit 1 - Consultant Selection Rating Form Notes**

1. The proposed project manager for each consultant shall be ranked, with the highest ranked project manager receiving the greatest number of points, and lower ranked project managers receiving commensurately lower scores. The rankings and scores should be based on each project manager's experience on similar projects and past performance for the LPA and other agencies. The selection committee may contact ODOT and outside agencies if necessary. Any subfactors identified should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring.

Differential scoring should consider the relative importance of the project manager's role in the success of a given project. The project manager's role in a simple project may be less important than for a complex project, and differential scoring should reflect this, with higher differentials assigned to projects that require a larger role for the project manager.

2. The experience and strength of the assigned staff, including subconsultant staff, should be ranked and scored as noted for Number 1 above, with higher differential scores assigned on more difficult projects. Any subfactors identified in the project notification should be weighed heavily in the differential scoring. As above, other agencies may be contacted.

3. The consultants' past performance on similar projects shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis, with the highest ranked consultant receiving a commensurately greater number of points. The selection team should consider ODOT CES performance ratings if available, and consult other agencies as appropriate. (The ODOT CES performance ratings will be posted on the CEAO website.)

The differential scoring should consider the complexity of the project and any subfactors identified in the project notification.

4. The consultant's workload and availability of qualified personnel, equipment and facilities shall be ranked and scored on a relative, differential scoring type basis. The selection team shall consider an equitable distribution of work to similarly qualified firms.

## STEP NO. 2

- A) County Engineers will complete a task performance request check sheet for each bridge included in the project. These will be submitted to the County's highest ranking consulting firm along with a Request for Proposal. The Request for Proposal template provided by CEAO is in an electronic Excel spreadsheet and must be used by the consultant for their fee proposal.
- B) County Engineers will review the fee proposal received by the consultant. If reasonable, the County Engineer will use the fee in the proposal to submit his funding application to CEAO. If not reasonable, the County Engineer can negotiate with the consultant. If negotiations are not successful, the County Engineer can request a fee proposal from their second highest rated consultant. And so on, until a reasonable fee is received.

## STEP NO. 3

- A) County Engineers will submit their application for funding to the CEAO office. The application will include following;
  - a. The one-page funding application form including the total application amount for all structures being load rated through this funding program.
  - b. Documentation of the quality-based consultant selection including consultant selection rating forms (not required for projects under \$25,000).
  - c. One copy of the consultant fee proposal for each structure file number, including;
    - i. The task performance request check sheets
    - ii. The electronic spreadsheet as completed by your consultant for the fee based proposal.

## STEP NO. 4

- A) ODOT's Office of Local Projects will enter each project into Ellis under PID 87270 with a separate federal agreement number. LPA Agreements will be sent to each County Engineer with approved funding.

County Engineers will sign and return two copies of the LPA Agreement to ODOT's Office of Local Projects.

ODOT will sign the LPA Agreements and request federal authorization for each project.

**County Engineers must receive the fully executed LPA Agreement and federal authorization prior to entering into a contract with their selected consultant and authorizing the consultant to begin work.**

(ODOT's Office of Consultant Services will provide a contract template for Counties to use.) County Engineers will send a copy of their signed consultant contract to the Office of Local Projects so that funds can be encumbered.

## STEP NO. 5

- A) The consulting firms will perform the work as stated in their contract. Once the work is completed, the consultant will supply the load ratings to the County Engineer in a format that can be updated by the County Engineer in the future.

For each bridge, all fracture critical members will be identified on the plans and placed with a separate folder labeled fracture critical members within the bridge file.

County Engineers will enter the load ratings into BMS or will submit the load ratings to ODOT to be entered into BMS.

County Engineers will post their bridges as necessary, as determined by the load ratings.

## STEP NO. 6

A). County Engineers will submit the completed invoice template as well as documentation that consultant invoices have been paid so that reimbursement with federal funds can be processed. Counties will be reimbursed **80%** of the costs incurred (Counties with Credit Bridge Program credit will be reimbursed 100% of the costs incurred if they choose to use their credit on the project). The percentage of reimbursement will be established in the LPA Agreement.

ODOT will perform an audit of the counties' QBS processes.