



U.S. Department  
of Transportation

**Federal Highway  
Administration**

FHWA VA Division  
& VDOT

# Program Review

## **Compliance Assessment Program (CAP) Summary Fiscal Year 2021**

**January 2022**

**FINAL REPORT**



## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Background .....	3
Scope and Methodology.....	4
Observations, Findings and Corrective Actions.....	5
Appendix A.....	10
Appendix B.....	18
Appendix C.....	20



## **Executive Summary**

This report summarizes the FY2021 Compliance Assessment Program (CAP) review results. CAP is one component of the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Risk-Based Stewardship and Oversight approach to delivering the Federal-aid highway program. It provides an assessment of how well recipients comply with key Federal requirements for highway construction projects and gives FHWA reasonable assurance that States have effective controls in place to meet these requirements.

The VA Division reviewed 55 randomly selected active construction projects out of a population of 275 projects. These included 32 – State administered projects and 23 – Locally administered projects. This report summarizes non-compliance findings from those reviews. The report will also serve as the primary record to capture the significant issues and trends to be addressed for continuous program improvements in Virginia.

The table below summarizes the level of compliance for the 12 key Federal requirements reviewed. FHWA found that VDOT is in 100% compliance with four key Federal requirements for highway construction projects and identified findings on eight of the key requirements. Findings indicate a program, process, or internal control weakness. In addition, it was noticed documentation wasn't always available at the time of the review. All applicable approval documentation should be in the official project file and available to FHWA upon request for each project.

Note: VA1 does not constitute a key Federal requirement therefore it's Non-Applicable (N/A).

Please provide a plan of action to address each question with a finding by February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2022.



<b>Level of Compliance for Key Federal Requirements</b>					
<b>Core Compliance Question</b>	<b>Question Description</b>	<b># of Findings</b>	<b>All Compliance %</b>	<b>State Administered Compliance % (Total – 32 projects)</b>	<b>Local Administered Compliance % (Total – 23 projects)</b>
CQ1	Wage Rates	8	85%	94%	74%
CQ2	Award	2	96%	97%	96%
CQ3	Bid Considerations	0	100%	100%	100%
CQ4	Impermissible Procedure	0	100%	100%	100%
CQ5	Bid State Restriction	0	100%	100%	100%
CQ6	Thirty Day Payment	1	98%	100%	96%
CQ7	Retainage	1	98%	100%	96%
CQ8	Cost Estimate Adjustment	0	100%	100%	100%
CQ9	Accurate Quantities	12	78%	88%	65%
CQ10	DBE Subcontract	4	93%	97%	87%
VA 1	Subcontract Monitoring	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
VA 2	Materials	7	87%	94%	78%
VA 3	Material Testing	5	91%	97%	83%



## Background

CAP was established by FHWA on March 28, 2014 and is one aspect of FHWA's Risk-Based Stewardship and Oversight. The CAP is implemented on a 3-year cycle.

The goal of risk-based stewardship and oversight is to optimize the successful delivery of programs and projects and help ensure compliance with federal requirements. FHWA Risk-Based Project Stewardship and Oversight involves three main avenues of project involvement: 1) project approval actions, 2) data-driven compliance assurance (i.e., CAP), and 3) risk-based stewardship and oversight involvement in Projects of Division Interest (PoDI). The CAP assesses a statistically valid sample of projects to inform the FHWA on the degree of compliance to an acceptable level of certainty. The approach is objective and will inform risk assessments with valid information and data. CAP will also strengthen the agency's movement toward being more data-driven and risk-based.

The program includes levels for both a national and Division assessment. The FHWA VA Division Area Engineer (AE) or Program Specialist (PS) leading the review used one CAP Review Guide, encompassing ten core questions and three additional VA specific questions. Both the Core Question Guide and VA specific questions include compliance questions for key regulatory requirements and were used for all sampled projects.

The CAP program has four standard answers for each of the questions: "Yes," "No," "Don't Know," and "Not Applicable (N/A)." Answering "No" or "Don't Know" are counted as "not in compliance" and answering "Yes" or "N/A" are counted as "in compliance". The appropriate answer depends on the information available during the project review. The Division AE/PS validated the answers to each CAP question with source documentation. If documentation is not available during the time of review, the response is noted as "Don't Know". To determine the level of compliance from the completed reviews, the compliance formula is determined by dividing those answers of Yes and Not Applicable by the number of total questions.




## Scope and Methodology

The Virginia Division conducted CAP reviews on 55 randomly selected projects authorized for construction or advance construction out of a population of 275 projects between January 1, 2019 and December 31, 2019. The bar graph below represents the number of State administered and Locally administered projects in each District.

This year's CAP reviews consisted of the CAP Core Question Guide and three Virginia specific questions. The CAP Core Question Guide is required annually when reviewing CAP projects because the questions are designed to solicit information about compliance with key Federal requirements and cover a cross section of project delivery technical areas. The VA specifics questions were added to this year's core questions from findings on previous CAP Reports.

The VA Division's Technical Program Team, in coordination with VDOT Central Office and District Staff led reviews of documentation between November 2020 and March 2021. The results were reviewed by VA Division Leadership; the VDOT Leadership will be briefed on the findings; and the results will be submitted to FHWA Headquarters no later than September 30, 2021.





## Observations, Findings and Corrective Actions

### CORE QUESTIONS:

- Core Question 1: Does the executed contract include the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be prevailing where the construction is located (State and county) for the date of bid opening? 23 CFR 635.117(f)
  - Findings: Six Locally administered and two State administered projects didn't include the correct David Bacon Wage rates.
  - Corrective Action: VDOT's Construction and LAP divisions must ensure current Davis-Bacon wage rates are incorporated into the contracts.
- Core Question 2: Was the contract awarded for the bid as submitted (no modification to price or contract terms between bid opening and award based on negotiation with the contractor)? 23 CFR 635.113(a)
  - Findings: One State administered project awarded the project with revisions to the price and/or contract provisions based on negotiation with the contractor. In addition, one Locally administered project didn't have the documentation available at the time of the review and
  - Corrective Action: Provide requested/necessary information within the specified timeframe to avoid a finding.
- Core Question 3: Are the bidding / contract documents free from any applicable provision or requirement that limit submission of a bid, or prohibit consideration of a bid based on National, State or local boundaries; or race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability? 23 CFR 635.112(d)
  - Finding: None
- Core Question 4: Are the contract documents free from any impermissible procedure or requirement which discriminates or operates to discriminate against the employment of labor from any other State, possession or territory of the United States, in the construction of a Federal-aid project? 23 CFR 635.117(b)



- Finding: None
- Core Question 5: Are the bidding / contract documents free from any procedure or requirement that favors articles or materials produced within the State, or discriminates against the use of articles or materials from any other State, possession, or territory of the United States? 23 CFR 635.409(a)
  - Finding: None
- Core Question 6: Does the contract include a clause requiring prime contractors to pay subcontractors for satisfactory performance of their contracts no later than 30 days from receipt of each payment by the State DOT to the prime contractor? 49 CFR 26.29(a)
  - Finding: One Locally administered project contract did not include a clause requiring prime contractors to pay subcontractors for satisfactory performance of their contracts no later than 30 days from receipt of each payment by the State DOT to the prime contractor.
  - Recommendation: LAP and construction divisions must work with Locality to verify contracts include applicable clause to ensure payment no later than 30 days. All applicable approval documentation must be provided to FHWA upon request.
- Core Question 7: Does the contract include one of the three methods provided in 49 CFR 26.29(b) to ensure prompt and full payment of retainage by the prime contractor to the subcontractor? 49 CFR 26.29(b)
  - Finding: One Locally administered project contract did not include the applicable contract clause to ensure prompt and full payment of retainage from the prime contractor to the subcontractor.
  - Recommendation: LAP and construction divisions must work with Locality to verify contracts include the applicable clause to ensure prompt and full payment of retainage.
- Core Question 8: Did the State follow their documented process for adjusting the project cost estimate recorded in the project agreement after procurement (e.g., bid approval or contract award)? 23 CFR 630.106 (a)(4)
  - Finding: None





- Recommendation: VDOT should include date reference as part of their process to align with 23 CFR 630.106 (a)(4).
- Core Question 9: Based on a review of at least one applicable contract pay item paid in one progress payment, did the State provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately, in accordance with the State's statewide uniform procedures? 23 CFR 635.123
  - Finding: Six Locally administered and two State administered projects did not provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately, in accordance with the State's statewide uniform procedures. In addition, two Locally administered projects and two State administered projects didn't have the documentation available at the time of the review.
  - Corrective Action: LAP Division must ensure localities are following established statewide procedures for determination of acceptable pay quantities and processing pay estimates. All applicable approval documentation must be provided to FHWA upon request.
- Core Question 10: Based on a review of the work for one approved DBE that is listed on the DBE commitment plan and has an approved subcontract, does the work subcontracted to the DBE meet or exceed the work committed to that DBE at the time the subcontract was approved? 49 CFR 26.37
  - Finding: Two Locally administered projects had the value and type of the work subcontracted to the DBE not meet or exceed the work committed to that DBE at the time the subcontract was approved. In addition, documentation was not available at the time of the review for one Locally administered and one State administered project.
  - Corrective Action: VDOT OCR must ensure that proper mechanisms are put in place to ensure proper DBE compliance review are being conducted to ensure that the DBE goals are being attained at the end of the projects. All applicable approval documentation must be provided to FHWA upon request.
- VA Specific VA 1: Is the STA utilizing a monitoring mechanism to assure subcontractors have been paid for their completed and accepted work within 30 days? 49 CFR 26.29 (e)



- Finding: Does not constitute a Federal requirement therefore responses are N/A.
- Recommendation: VDOT OCR ensures mechanisms are in place to monitor prompt payments and ensure those processes are fully documented.
- VA Specific VA 2: Based on a review of a minimum of one major item of work (such as asphalt, concrete, or soils and aggregate base), did employees of the STD or their designated agent, excluding the contractor and vendor, perform all verification sampling and testing?

Note: Reviewers should be aware that alternate contracting methods such as Design-Build or Construction Manager/General Contractor have been found to be at elevated risk for this area. 23 CFR 637.205(d)

- Finding: Four Locally administered and two State administered projects didn't have an employee of the SHA or their designated agent did not perform verification sampling and testing. In addition, one Locally administered project did not have the documentation available at the time of the review.
- Corrective Actions: LAP Manual must be revised to remove the potential for conflict-of-interest, by clarifying that the same consultant company cannot provide staff to perform both Acceptance tests and Independent Assurance tests on the same project. Note, already initiated with C.O. Materials Div. & with LAD. LAP Manual needs to be revised to clarify the testing requirements for those projects on routes that may be locally maintained but continue to be owned and funded by VDOT. The requirements for Acceptance of materials & work, when performed by State Forces or Local Forces, needs to be clarified. Finally, the Design-Build Minimum QA/QC Requirements document needs to be revised to clarify that testing requirements on D-B jobs for similar materials [currently shown as one row entry] cannot be combined; each item of work must be treated separately (e.g. stone in pavement & stone in pipe runs; intermediate asphalt mix & surface asphalt mix; etc.). All applicable approval documentation should be in the official project file and available to FHWA upon request for each project
- VA Specific VA 3: Regardless of whether the project is VDOT or locally administered: if a non-VDOT laboratory\* was used for any (1) IA\*\* testing or (2) dispute-resolution testing, was that lab accredited (by the AASHTO Accreditation Program\*\*\*) in the specific test being performed? 637.209 (a) (3) & (4)



- Finding: Two Locally administered projects had at least one IA or dispute-resolution test was performed by a lab which was not Accredited to perform that specific test. In addition, two Locally administered and one State administered project didn't have the documentation available at the time of the review.
  
- Corrective Action: LAP Manual must be revised to clarify that VDOT does not have a separate system for "qualifying" labs, and that all labs performing tests which are part of the Acceptance decision [on VDOT & Federally funded projects] in Virginia must be AASHTO Accredited for the test being performed. Note, already initiated with C.O. Materials Div. & with LAD. LAP Manual needs to be revised to clarify that, because VDOT has one QA System, encompassing all routes and project types, then Independent Assurance testing is required (for applicable quantities) on all LAP projects as well. Note, already initiated with C.O. Materials Div. & with LAD.



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Federal Highway  
Administration**

## **Appendix A**

### **CAP Core Question Guide**



U.S. Department  
of Transportation

**Federal Highway  
Administration**

# FHWA Compliance Assessment Program (CAP)

**FY 2021**

## CAP Core Question Guide

Except for the statutes and regulations cited, the contents of this document do not have the force and effect of law and are not meant to bind the public in any way. This document is intended only to provide clarity regarding existing requirements under the law or agency policies and solely for the use of FHWA personnel in carrying out compliance assessments.

No.	QUESTION	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
1	Does the executed contract include the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be prevailing where the construction is located (State and county) for the date of bid opening?	23 CFR 635.117(f)	<p><b>Yes</b>, the executed contract includes the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be prevailing where the construction is located (State and county) as of the bid opening date.</p> <p><b>No</b>, the executed contract does not include the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be prevailing where the construction is located (State and county) as of the bid opening date.</p> <p><b>N/A</b>, requirement does not apply.</p> <p><b>Don't Know</b>, could not be verified at the time of review.</p>	
2	Was the contract awarded for the bid as submitted (no modification to price or contract terms between bid opening and award based on negotiation with the contractor)?	23 CFR 635.113(a)	<p><b>Yes</b>, the contract was awarded without revisions to price and/or contract provisions based on negotiation with the contractor.</p> <p><b>No</b>, the contract was awarded with revisions to price and/or contract provisions based on negotiation with the contractor.</p> <p><b>N/A</b>, requirement does not apply.</p> <p><b>Don't Know</b>, could not be verified at the time of review.</p>	
3	Are the bidding / contract documents free from any applicable provision or requirement that limit submission of a bid, or	23 CFR 635.112(d)	<p><b>Yes</b>, the bidding / contract documents are free from any applicable provision or requirement that limit submission of a bid, or prohibit consideration of a bid based on National, State</p>	

No.	QUESTION	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
	prohibit consideration of a bid based on National, State or local boundaries; or race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability.		<p>or local boundaries; or race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability.</p> <p><b>No</b>, the bidding / contract documents are not free from applicable provisions or requirements that limit submission of a bid, or prohibit consideration of a bid based on National, State or local boundaries; or race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability.</p> <p><b>N/A</b>, requirement does not apply.</p> <p><b>Don't Know</b>, could not be verified at the time of the review.</p>	
4	Are the contract documents free from any impermissible procedure or requirement which discriminates or operates to discriminate against the employment of labor from any other State, possession or territory of the United States, in the construction of a Federal-aid project?	23 CFR 635.117(b)	<p><b>Yes</b>, the contract documents are free from any impermissible procedures or requirement which discriminates or operates to discriminate against the employment of labor from any other State, possession or territory of the United States.</p> <p><b>No</b>, the contract documents are not free from any impermissible procedure or requirement which discriminates against the employment of labor from any other State, possession or territory of the United States.</p> <p><b>N/A</b>, does not apply</p> <p><b>Don't Know</b>, could not be verified at the time of this review.</p>	
5	Are the bidding / contract documents free from any procedure or requirement that favors articles or materials produced within the State, or discriminates against	23 CFR 635.409(a)	<p><b>Yes</b>, the contract documents are free from any procedure or requirement that favors articles or materials produced within the State, and from any procedure or requirement which discriminates against the use of articles or materials from any other State,</p>	

No.	QUESTION	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
	the use of articles or materials from any other State, possession or territory of the United States?		<p>possession or territory of the United States.</p> <p><b>No</b>, the contract documents are not free from a procedure or requirement that favors articles or materials produced within the State, or from any procedure or requirement which discriminates against the use of articles or materials from any other State, possession or territory of the United States.</p> <p><b>N/A</b>, does not apply</p> <p><b>Don't Know</b>, could not be verified at the time of this review.</p>	
6	Does the contract include a clause requiring prime contractors to pay subcontractors for satisfactory performance of their contracts no later than 30 days from receipt of each payment by the State DOT to the prime contractor?	49 CFR 26.29(a)	<p><b>Yes</b>, the contract includes a clause requiring prime contractors to pay subcontractors for satisfactory performance of their contracts no later than 30 days from receipt of each payment by the State DOT to the prime contractor.</p> <p><b>No</b>, the contract does not include a clause requiring prime contractors to pay subcontractors for satisfactory performance of their contracts no later than 30 days from receipt of each payment by the State DOT to the prime contractor.</p> <p><b>N/A</b>, requirement does not apply.</p> <p><b>Don't Know</b>, could not be verified at the time of review.</p>	
7	Does the contract include one of the three methods provided in 49 CFR 26.29(b) to ensure prompt and full payment of retainage by the prime contractor to the subcontractor?	49 CFR 26.29(b)	<p><b>Yes</b>, the contract includes the applicable clause to ensure prompt and full payment of retainage from the prime contractor to the subcontractor.</p> <p><b>No</b>, the contract does not include the applicable contract clause to ensure prompt and full payment</p>	

No.	QUESTION	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
			<p>of retainage from the prime contractor to the subcontractor.</p> <p><b>N/A</b>, requirement does not apply.</p> <p><b>Don't Know</b>, could not be verified at the time of review.</p>	
8	<p>Did the State follow their documented process for adjusting the project cost estimate recorded in the project agreement after procurement (e.g., bid approval or contract award)?</p>	<p>23 CFR 630.106 (a)(4)</p>	<p><b>Yes</b>, the State followed their documented process for adjusting project cost estimates in the project agreement after procurement.</p> <p><b>No</b>, the State did not follow their process to adjust project cost estimates in the project agreement after procurement.</p> <p><b>No</b>, the State does not have a documented process for adjusting project cost estimates.</p> <p><b>N/A</b>, requirement does not apply.</p> <p><b>Don't Know</b>, could not be verified at the time of the review.</p>	
9	<p>Based on a review of at least one applicable contract pay item paid in one progress payment, did the State provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately, in accordance with the State's statewide uniform procedures?</p>	<p>23 CFR 635.123</p>	<p><b>Yes</b>, the State provided adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately, in accordance with the State's statewide uniform procedures.</p> <p><b>No</b>, the State did not provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately, in accordance with the State's statewide uniform procedures.</p> <p><b>N/A</b>, requirement does not apply.</p> <p><b>N/A</b>, project activity has not yet resulted in a progress payment for this project as of the date of review.</p> <p><b>Don't Know</b>, could not be verified at the time of review.</p>	



No.	QUESTION	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
10	Based on a review of the work for one approved DBE that is listed on the DBE commitment plan and has an approved subcontract, does the work subcontracted to the DBE meet or exceed the work committed to that DBE at the time the subcontract was approved?	49 CFR 26.37	<p><b>Yes</b>, the value and type of the work subcontracted to the DBE meets or exceeds the work committed to that DBE in the DBE commitment plan.</p> <p><b>Yes</b>, the work committed to the DBE was adjusted through the DBE substitution process and the value and type of work subcontracted to the DBE meets or exceeds the work committed to that DBE in the approved substitution.</p> <p><b>No</b>, the value and type of the work subcontracted to the DBE did not meet or exceed the work committed to that DBE at the time the subcontract was approved</p> <p><b>N/A</b>, does not apply.</p> <p><b>Don't Know</b>, could not be verified at the time of this review.</p>	
VA 1	Is the STA utilizing a monitoring mechanism to assure subcontractors have been paid for their completed and accepted work within 30 days?	29 CFR 26.29	<p><b>Yes</b>, the State is using a monitoring mechanism to assure subcontractors that have completed and accepted work are paid within 30 days.</p> <p><b>No</b>, the State is not using a monitoring mechanism to assure subcontractors are paid for their completed and accepted work within 30 days</p> <p><b>N/A</b>, requirement does not apply.</p> <p><b>Don't Know</b>, could not be verified at the time of review.</p>	
VA 2	Based on a review of a minimum of one major item of work (such as asphalt, concrete, or soils and aggregate base), did	23 CFR 637.205(d)	<p><b>Yes</b>, employees of the SHA or their designated agent (excluding the contractor and vendor)</p>	

No.	QUESTION	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
	<p>employees of the STD or their designated agent, excluding the contractor and vendor, perform all verification sampling and testing?</p> <p>Note: Reviewers should be aware that alternate contracting methods such as Design-Build or Construction Manager/General Contractor have been found to be at elevated risk for this area.</p>		<p>performed verification sampling and testing.</p> <p><b>No</b>, employees of the SHA or their designated agent did not perform verification sampling and testing</p> <p><b>N/A</b>, does not apply.</p> <p><b>Don't Know</b>, could not be verified at the time of this review.</p>	
VA 3	<p>Regardless of whether the project is VDOT or locally administered: if a non-VDOT laboratory* was used for any (1) IA** testing or (2) dispute-resolution testing, was that lab accredited (by the AASHTO Accreditation Program***) in the specific test being performed?</p> <p>* i.e., neither a VDOT lab nor a lab doing consultant lab work directly under VDOT staff</p> <p>** Note, for IA, the only items that are applicable here are the ones not covered by the Systems Approach *** Alternatively, can be accredited by a comparable lab</p>	637.209 (a) (3) & (4)	<p><b>Yes</b>, the tests performed by each non-VDOT laboratory were the specific tests for which they were Accredited.</p> <p><b>No</b>, At least one IA or dispute-resolution test was performed by a lab which was not Accredited to perform that specific test.</p> <p><b>N/A</b>, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.</p> <p><b>Don't Know</b>, could not be verified at the time of this review.</p>	

No.	QUESTION	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
	accreditation program approved by FHWA, but none known for work in Virginia at this time			



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Federal Highway  
Administration**

## **Appendix B Compliance Summary**

FY21 Compliance Assessment Program (CAP) Summary																	
#	Question Description	Question	All Projects (55 Projects)					State Administered (32 Projects)					Locally Administered (23 Projects)				
			YES	N/A	NO	DON'T KNOW	% Compliance	YES	N/A	NO	DON'T KNOW	% Compliance	YES	N/A	NO	DON'T KNOW	% Compliance
CQ1	Wage Rates	Does the executed contract include the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be prevailing where the construction is located (State and county) for the date of bid opening?	43	4	8	0	85%	28	2	2	0	94%	15	2	6		74%
CQ2	Award	Was the contract awarded for the bid as submitted (no modification to price or contract terms between bid opening and award based on negotiation with the contractor)?	46	7	1	1	96%	27	4	1	0	97%	19	3	0	1	96%
CQ3	Bid Considerations	Are the bidding / contract documents free from any applicable provision or requirement that limit submission of a bid, or prohibit consideration of a bid based on National, State or local boundaries; or race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability.	54	1	0	0	100%	31	1	0	0	100%	23	0	0	0	100%
CQ4	Impermissible procedure	Are the contract documents free from any impermissible procedure or requirement which discriminates or operates to discriminate against the employment of labor from any other State, possession or territory of the United States, in the construction of a Federal-aid project?	54	1	0	0	100%	31	1	0	0	100%	23	0	0	0	100%
CQ5	Bid state restriction	Are the bidding / contract documents free from any procedure or requirement that favors articles or materials produced within the State, or discriminates against the use of articles or materials from any other State, possession or territory of the United States?	54	1	0	0	100%	31	1	0	0	100%	23	0	0	0	100%
CQ6	Thirty day payment	Does the contract include a clause requiring prime contractors to pay subcontractors for satisfactory performance of their contracts no later than 30 days from receipt of each payment by the State DOT to the prime contractor?	50	4	1	0	98%	29	3	0	0	100%	21	1	1	0	96%
CQ7	Retainage	Does the contract include one of the three methods provided in 49 CFR 26.29(b) to ensure prompt and full payment of retainage by the prime contractor to the subcontractor?	51	3	1	0	98%	31	1	0	0	100%	20	2	1	0	96%
CQ8	Cost estimate adjustment	Did the State follow their documented process for adjusting the project cost estimate recorded in the project agreement after procurement (e.g., bid approval or contract award)?	53	2	0	0	100%	32	0	0	0	100%	21	2	0	0	100%
CQ9	Accurate quantities	Based on a review of at least one applicable contract pay item paid in one progress payment, did the State provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately, in accordance with the State's statewide uniform procedures?	41	2	8	4	78%	28	0	2	2	88%	13	2	6	2	65%
CQ10	DBE Subcontract	Based on a review of the work for one approved DBE that is listed on the DBE commitment plan and has an approved subcontract, does the work subcontracted to the DBE meet or exceed the work committed to that DBE at the time the subcontract was approved?	37	14	2	2	93%	22	9	0	1	97%	15	5	2	1	87%
VA1	DBE Monitoring Mechanism	Is the STA utilizing a monitoring mechanism to assure subcontractors have been paid for their completed and accepted work within 30 days?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
VA2	Material Verification	Based on a review of a minimum of one major item of work (such as asphalt, concrete, or soils and aggregate base), did employees of the STD or their designated agent, excluding the contractor and vendor, perform all verification sampling and testing?	36	12	6	1	87%	24	6	2	0	94%	12	6	4	1	78%
VA3	Material Testing	Regardless of whether the project is VDOT or locally administered: if a non-VDOT laboratory* was used for any (1) IA** testing or (2) dispute-resolution testing, was that lab accredited (by the AASHTO Accreditation Program***) in the specific test being performed?	6	44	2	3	91%	6	25	0	1	97%	0	19	2	2	83%

\* Green = In Compliance (Yes and N/A responses)

\* Red = Not In Compliance (2 or more No and Don't Know responses)



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Federal Highway  
Administration**

## **Appendix C Summary of Findings**

Project Oversight	Project #	UPC	VDOT District	Project Description	CQ1 - Wage Rates	CQ2 - Awarded as submitted	CQ3 - Bid considerations	CQ4 - Impermissible procedure	CQ5 - Bid state restriction	CQ6 - Thirty day payment	CQ7 - Retainage	CQ8 - Cost estimate adjustment	CQ9 - Accurate quantities	CQ10 - DBE Subcontract	VA1-Monitoring Mechanism	VA2 - Verification	VA3 - Testing
State Administered	9688098	112167	Staunton	Staunton District-wide; From VARIOUS; To VARIOUS; Construction District Wide Guardrail Contract to include: Guardrail improvements, Bridge Projects, smaller safety projects as needed. Replace/upgrade guardrail terminals identified in Staunton District.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5801010	110477	NOVA	FAIRFAX County; Route 0123; From Magarity Road (Route 650); To Calshire Meadow Drive; Construction Provide improved pedestrian /bicycle connection from local neighborhoods in McLean to Route 123 businesses and Metro Station. Project includes a pedestrian walkway, lighting and two pedestrian bridges in Westgate and Scotts Run Park.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, the State did not provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately, in	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	No, At least one IA or dispute-resolution test was performed by a lab which was not Accredited to perform that specific test.
Locally Administered	5A03919	109568	Hampton Roads	Norfolk; Route 0460; From Llewellyn Avenue ; To Willow Wood Drive ; Construction The Project will rehabilitate the Granby Street Bridge, including incorporating a new concrete deck overlay, bearing repair/replacement, beam repairs, substructure concrete repairs, parapet repairs, and expansion joint replacement.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, the contract does not include a clause requiring prime contractors to pay subcontractors for satisfactory performance of	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, the value and type of the work subcontracted to the DBE did not meet or exceed the work committed to that DBE at the time	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5128406	104387	Salem	MONTGOMERY County; Route 0460; From 0.25 mi N of intersection with Cambria St (Rte 111); To 0.02 mi N of intersection with Independence Blvd; Construction Intersection upgrade at N. Franklin St./Cambria St. and access management and signal coordination improvements on N. Franklin St. between Cambria St & Independence Blvd	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	0602146	101009	Salem	MONTGOMERY County; Route 0813; From 0.10 Mile from Int. Rte. 11/460; To 0.18 Mile from Int. Rte. 11/460; Construction Bridge Repair - Rte. 813 over Roanoke River.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	5801020	114713	Culpeper	FAUQUIER County; Route 0029; From 0.96 MI. SOUTH OF ROUTE 215; To INT. OF US 29 AND ROUTE 215; Design Build The purpose of the US Route 15/29 Improvements Project is to address safety by improving the current substandard stopping sight distance in the northbound lanes of US Route 15/29 (Lee Highway) in Fauquier County, approaching the intersection of Route 215 (Vint Hill Road).	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	No, employees of the SHA or their designated agent did not perform verification sampling and testing.	Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of this review.
State Administered	0307081	109549	Culpeper	FAUQUIER County; Route 0029; From AT THE INTERSECTION OF 29 /605; To AT THE INTERSECTION OF 29 /605; Construction #HB2.FY17 WARRENTON PARK AND RIDE LOT EXPANSION AT 29/605	Yes	No, The contract was awarded with revisions to price and/or contract provisions based on negotiation with the contractor.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	5A01995	113572	NOVA	Northern Virginia District-wide; Route RDP3; From VARIOUS; To VARIOUS; Construction Reduce run-off-the-road crashes by applying low-cost solutions such as curve warning signs, chevrons, rumble strips, and raised pavement markers.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	Yes

Project Oversight	Project #	UPC	VDOT District	Project Description	CQ1 - Wage Rates	CQ2 - Awarded as submitted	CQ3 - Bid considerations	CQ4 - Impermissible procedure	CQ5 - Bid state restriction	CQ6 - Thirty day payment	CQ7 - Retainage	CQ8 - Cost estimate adjustment	CQ9 - Accurate quantities	CQ10 - DBE Subcontract	VA1-Monitoring Mechanism	VA2 - Verification	VA3 - Testing
Locally Administered	0813187	108809	Staunton	Harrisonburg; Route 0081; From I-81 NB Exit 245 Off Ramp Gore; To Intersection of Rte. 253; Construction To realign the I-81 Exit 245 NB off ramp to tie into Port Republic Road at the intersection with Forest Hill Road.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	No, employees of the SHA or their designated agent did not perform verification sampling and testing.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	5A27637	110997	Richmond	NEW KENT County; Route 0155; From .2 miles North of Charles City County Line; To .22 miles North of Charles City County Line; Construction To provide a deck replacement for the Rte. 155 (Courthouse Road) bridge over the Chickahominy River Canal (FED ID 28065)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	0092039	97712	Salem	Bedford County; Route 644; From 0.03 Mi. S. Rte 673; To 0.06 Mi. N. Rte 673; Construction bridge replacement on route 644 over big Otter River.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	BR01354	112876	Bristol	Bristol District-wide; Construction District wide Bridge Joint Contract to increase the lifespan of the bridge by replacing deteriorating joints.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	5A03945	75267	Hampton Roads	Poquoson; From Odd Street; To Poplar Road; Construction RESTORATION AND RELOCATION OF THE C.1880 TOM'S HUNT'S STORE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review.	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5132147	111177	Staunton	Waynesboro; Route 5105; From 0.04 Miles S. of CSX RR; To 0.03 Miles N. of CSX RR; Construction Replace structurally deficient bridge.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, the State did not provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately, in	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	0124047	101241	Richmond	Brunswick County; Route 630; From 0.01 miles north Route 764 to 0.06 miles north Route 764; Construction for bridge replacement Route 630 over Waqua Creek. Federal ID# 3678	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	BR05283	113409	Hampton Roads	SOUTHAMPTON County; Route 0671; From 0.30 Mile to Intersection Route 734; To 1.33 Mile to Route 650; Construction Replace Rte. 671 over Branch Fed ID 17864 Culvert	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.



Project Oversight	Project #	UPC	VDOT District	Project Description	CQ1 - Wage Rates	CQ2 - Awarded as submitted	CQ3 - Bid considerations	CQ4 - Impermissible procedure	CQ5 - Bid state restriction	CQ6 - Thirty day payment	CQ7 - Retainage	CQ8 - Cost estimate adjustment	CQ9 - Accurate quantities	CQ10 - DBE Subcontract	VA1-Monitoring Mechanism	VA2 - Verification	VA3 - Testing
State Administered	0713042	114778	Lynchburg	PITTSYLVANIA County; Route 0730; From 0.0341 MILES WEST OF SANDY CREEK; To 0.0341 MILES EAST OF SANDY CREEK; Construction REPLACE BRIDGE AND APPROACHES ON RTE. 730 OVER SANDY CREEK AS A RESULT OF DAMAGE FROM TROPICAL STORM MICHAEL, VA STRUCTURE NO. 6136, FEDERAL ID 13672	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	PM05461	114578	Hampton Roads	JAMES CITY County; Construction Perform routine maintenance activities on Ferry boat Williamsburg per Coast Guard regulations.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	5105112	80486	Staunton	ALLEGHANY County; From Int. Rte. 696 and Richmond Street; To 0.48 Mi. West Int. Rte. 696 and Richmond Street; Construction CONSTRUCT ACCESS ROAD & ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS CHESSIE SITE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	5118244	5542	Lynchburg	CAMPBELL County; Route 0622; From 0.004 MILE EAST OF ROUTE 683; To 1.231 MILE EAST OF ROUTE 683; Construction The purpose of this project is to improve alignment and reconstruct a wider roadway.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	PM01339	Various	Bristol	Bristol Districtwide Paving Construction Authorization; Various locations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	PM05462	114783, 114784, 114786, 115035, and 115766	Hampton Roads	Hampton Roads Districtwide Paving; Various locations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	PM06399	115501, 116020	Fredericksburg	Fredericksburg Districtwide Paving; Various locations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	PM07318	115082, 115083, 115084, 115077, 115076, and 115027	Culpeper	Culpeper Districtwide Paving; Various locations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, the State did not provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately, in	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.

Project Oversight	Project #	UPC	VDOT District	Project Description	CQ1 - Wage Rates	CQ2 - Awarded as submitted	CQ3 - Bid considerations	CQ4 - Impermissible procedure	CQ5 - Bid state restriction	CQ6 - Thirty day payment	CQ7 - Retainage	CQ8 - Cost estimate adjustment	CQ9 - Accurate quantities	CQ10 - DBE Subcontract	VA1-Monitoring Mechanism	VA2 - Verification	VA3 - Testing
State Administered	0698046	105190	Staunton	PAGE County; Route 0211; From 0.416 Mi. West of Int. Rte 646; To 0.226 Mi. East of Int. Rte 646; Construction To replace bridge on route 211 (WBL) over SF Shenandoah River in Page Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	PM09360	116045,115028,116017,115929,115029,and 116807	NOVA	Northern Virginia Districtwide Paving: Interstate and Primary; Various locations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	Yes
State Administered	5B01032	114733	NOVA	PRINCE WILLIAM County; From Various Intersections along Lomond/OldBridge/Sudley; To Various Intersections along Lomond/OldBridge/Sudley; Construction The pedestrian upgrades on Lomond Dr, Old Bridge Rd, and Sudley Manor Rd consists of upgrading various existing crosswalks with high visibility crosswalk markings.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, does not apply	N/A, does not apply	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	No, the State did not provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately, in	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	No, employees of the SHA or their designated agent did not perform verification sampling and testing.	Yes
Locally Administered	5118295	111723	Lynchburg	Lynchburg; From ED PAGE PARKING LOT; To LINKHORNE MIDDLE SCHOOL; Construction Stabilization and renovation of existing abandoned railway trestle over Langhorne Road and extension of the City's Blackwater Creek Trail from the Ed Page parking lot entrance to Linkhorne Middle and Elementary Schools to connect Black Water Creek Trail to Linkhorne Middle and Elementary Schools.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review.	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of this review.	Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of this review.
Locally Administered	5A01890	107661	NOVA	FAIRFAX County; From 528 LF north of Knoll Street, NW; To Knoll Street, NW; Construction Construction of missing sidewalk sections along Nutley and West Streets leading to Louise Archer Elementary School	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, the State did not provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately, in	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	0811354	113847	Bristol	WASHINGTON County; Route 0081; From MP 31.70; To MP 32.10; Construction: To improve superelevation of both northbound and southbound lanes of Interstate 81 in the area of Exit 32.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	0005345	110527, 116369	NOVA	Statewide; I-95; From: Route 17 N Interchange (Exit 133) To: Route 123 Interchange (Exit 160); PE To extend the I-95 express lanes south from I-95/Route 123 Interchange (exit 160) to I-95/Route 17 N Interchange (Exit 133).	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review.	Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of this review.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	Yes
Locally Administered	5A03891	109074	Hampton Roads	Williamsburg; Route 0321; From Treyburn Drive; To Ironbound Road (SR 615); Construction To develop an asphalt trail along Monticello Avenue from Treyburn Drive to Ironbound Road with lighting.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.

Project Oversight	Project #	UPC	VDOT District	Project Description	CQ1 - Wage Rates	CQ2 - Awarded as submitted	CQ3 - Bid considerations	CQ4 - Impermissible procedure	CQ5 - Bid state restriction	CQ6 - Thirty day payment	CQ7 - Retainage	CQ8 - Cost estimate adjustment	CQ9 - Accurate quantities	CQ10 - DBE Subcontract	VA1-Monitoring Mechanism	VA2 - Verification	VA3 - Testing
State Administered	BR02434	110619	Salem	Salem District-wide; From DISTRICTWIDE; To DISTRICTWIDE; Construction FY18 SUPER REPLACEMENTS.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5A03965	109055	Hampton Roads	Virginia Beach; From Adam Keeling Road; To Southern Tip of Long Creek Bridge; Construction Project will provide sidewalk along the west side of West Great neck Road from Adam Keeling Road to the Southern side of the bridge over Long Creek. Project will provide ADA ramps, retaining wall and railing and access to three transit stops.	No, the executed contract does not include the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be	Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	No, employees of the SHA or their designated agent did not perform verification sampling and testing.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5128423	111360	Salem	Roanoke; Route 0220; From 3100 Block; To 220 Franklin Rd Bypass; Construction Construction of new sidewalk along the west side of business 220, Franklin Road, from the 3100 block to the 220 Franklin Rd Bypass. Improvements include sidewalk construction, improved pedestrian crosswalks, pedestrian signals, and additional drainage improvements.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5115233	107517	Staunton	ROCKINGHAM County; From Eberly Rd (Rt 732); To 0.1 Miles N of Int of Garbers Church Rd (Rt 910); Construction Construction of bicycle / pedestrian / buggy lanes on both sides of Rte. 42 (John Wayland Highway).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	No, employees of the SHA or their designated agent did not perform verification sampling and testing.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5223002	109026	Staunton	ROCKBRIDGE County; From Powhatan Street / Town Library; To Blue Ridge Road and Fitzlee Street; Construction Construction of a 10' wide asphalt shared-use path along Blue Ridge Road (VA 684)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, the State did not provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately, in	No, the value and type of the work subcontracted to the DBE did not meet or exceed the work committed to that DBE at the time	N/A, requirement does not apply.	No, employees of the SHA or their designated agent did not perform verification sampling and testing.	Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of this review.
Locally Administered	5801031	105990	NOVA	FAIRFAX County; From Creek Crossing Road; To Country Club Drive; Construction Construct sidewalk along Old Court House Road providing pedestrian access to Westbriar Elementary School	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, the State did not provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately, in	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	No, At least one IA or dispute-resolution test was performed by a lab which was not Accredited to perform that specific test.
Locally Administered	5A03789	106145	Hampton Roads	Chesapeake; From I664/Gum Court; To Portsmouth Boundary near Western Branch Blvd; Construction Construction of Phase I of the Chesapeake Trail along abandoned Seaboard and Commonwealth Railroad right of way from Interstate 664/Gum Court to the City of Portsmouth Boundary near western Branch Boulevard.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, project activity has not yet resulted in a progress payment for this project as of the date of review.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5A27677	98883	Richmond	Colonial Heights; Route 0144; From RTE 1; To ECL COLONIAL HEIGHTS; Construction SIGNAL COORDINATION SYSTEM ALONG TEMPLE AVENUE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.

Project Oversight	Project #	UPC	VDOT District	Project Description	CQ1 - Wage Rates	CQ2 - Awarded as submitted	CQ3 - Bid considerations	CQ4 - Impermissible procedure	CQ5 - Bid state restriction	CQ6 - Thirty day payment	CQ7 - Retainage	CQ8 - Cost estimate adjustment	CQ9 - Accurate quantities	CQ10 - DBE Subcontract	VA1-Monitoring Mechanism	VA2 - Verification	VA3 - Testing
Locally Administered	5A27681	T23338	Richmond	City of Richmond; Purchase of Ticket Vending Machines for BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) Stations	No, the executed contract does not include the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	No, the contract does not include the applicable contract clause to ensure prompt and full payment of retainage from the prime	Yes	Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5B01069	114670	NOVA	ARLINGTON County; Route 6700; From 9th St N; To 4th St N; Construction Install RRFBs (Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons) on Washington Boulevard at 9th St N and at 4th St N near high density land use and high use transit stops.	No, the executed contract does not include the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5B01070	114671	NOVA	ARLINGTON County; Route 6710; From 4th St N; To 4th St N; Construction Install RRFB (Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon at the intersection of George Mason Dr. N & 4th Street N.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5B01071	114672	NOVA	ARLINGTON County; Route 0029; From N Oakland Street; To N Nelson Street; Construction Install RRFB (Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon) at the intersection of Lee Hwy and N Oakland and N Nelson Streets.	No, the executed contract does not include the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5B01078	108720	NOVA	Fairfax County - From: Prince William County Line To: Old Centerville Road - CN - Design Build to Reduce congestion on heavily traveled section of Route 28 which provides travel in three Northern Virginia Counties (Prince William, Fairfax, and Loudoun)and two cities (Manassas and Manassas Park) The project includes intersection improvements and pedestrian/bicycle facilities	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, project activity has not yet resulted in a progress payment for this project as of the date of review.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5B01012	105266	NOVA	Fairfax County; Multiple Locations in Reston; New Construction to improve infrastructure for bike share locations in the Reston area.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	0886030	115729	Fredericksburg	Spotsylvania County; Route 17; Various Locations: Construction for bridge maintenance rehabilitation/beam end repairs Route 17 over CSX Railroad.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5128424	109611	Salem	Roanoke County; Intersection of 5th Street and Walnut Avenue; Construction of facilities for pedestrians and Bicycles; Glade Creek Greenway Trail,Phase 2A.	No, the executed contract does not include the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, the State did not provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately, in	Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of this review.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.

Project Oversight	Project #	UPC	VDOT District	Project Description	CQ1 - Wage Rates	CQ2 - Awarded as submitted	CQ3 - Bid considerations	CQ4 - Impermissible procedure	CQ5 - Bid state restriction	CQ6 - Thirty day payment	CQ7 - Retainage	CQ8 - Cost estimate adjustment	CQ9 - Accurate quantities	CQ10 - DBE Subcontract	VA1-Monitoring Mechanism	VA2 - Verification	VA3 - Testing
State Administered	5801091	116144	NOVA	Northern Virginia Districtwide; Various Locations; Construction to upgrade/replace designated guardrails on various routes.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	Yes
State Administered	0811361	115346	Bristol	Washington County; I-81; From Mile marker 25.9 to mile marker 25.24; Construction to extend the southbound acceleration lane.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
Locally Administered	5A27490	109294	Richmond	City of Richmond; Various Locations; From Spring Street to East Duval Street; Construction to construct buffered bicycle lanes on 1st, 2nd and 3rd Streets.	No, the executed contract does not include the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	5117120	113689	Staunton	City of Staunton; Various locations; From intersection of Diamond and North Lewis Street to intersection of North Lewis and Thompson Noll Streets; Construction to improve visibility of students walking and biking to Lylburn Downing Middle School by crosswalks being located to meet ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) requirements and signs placed to indicate student crossings.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	5A03992	115008, 115009, 115010, 115011	Hampton Roads	Hampton Roads Districtwide; Route 0064; From Settlers Landing Road; To I-564; Design Build project to widen the four-lane segments of the I-64 corridor in the cities of Hampton and Norfolk.	No, the executed contract does not include the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	N/A, does not apply.	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	5138172	18003, 110396	Staunton	Frederick County, Route 277; From 0.091 miles west Route Stickley Drive to 0.060 miles east of Double Church Road; RW to widen to 5 lanes.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	N/A, there were no IA or dispute-resolution tests performed by non-VDOT labs.
State Administered	5A03858	109075	Hampton Roads	City of Newport News; From Southwest intersection of CSX Railroad Construction to Bland Boulevard; Construction for construction of new multimodal passenger rail station located in the vicinity of Bland Boulevard near Newport News/Williamsburg International Airport.	No, the executed contract does not include the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A, requirement does not apply.	Yes	Yes



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Federal Highway  
Administration**



*Report prepared by:*

*Virginia FHWA Division Office  
400 North 8th Street, Suite 750  
Richmond, Virginia 23219-4825  
Tel. 804-775-3320  
Fax: 804-775-3356*

*For additional copies of this report, contact us.*