



Project Core Question Guide

(Core, Finance and Construction Contract Administration)

ODOT Certification Compliance and Oversight Plan (C&O)

CERTIFIED LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCY	DATE OF REVIEW	FEDERAL PROJECT # KEY #
PROJECT NAME		<input type="checkbox"/> LOCAL NON-NHS <input type="checkbox"/> LOCAL NHS <input type="checkbox"/> STATE HIGHWAY
PROJECT DESCRIPTION		
CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION DATE:		
INDIVIDUAL(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW		CERTIFICATION PROGRAM MANAGER REVIEW NAME: DATE:
ADDITIONAL C&O REVIEW GUIDE(S) USED FOR THIS REVIEW (LIST ALL)		

Instructions

1. Complete all questions in the C&O Review Guide. Do not modify questions. Additional ODOT Specific questions may be added at the bottom of the guide.
2. Directly verify all answers with source documentation.
3. Do not correct deficiencies and then adjust C&O answers. Answers must reflect status at time of review.
4. Provide clarifying comments for each answer.
5. Enter answers and comments from each C&O project review into the C&O SharePoint Site.
6. Ensure source documentation is retained by the Local Public Agency (LPA) and available as necessary for quality assurance reviews or audits.

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
CORE QUESTIONS (CQ)				
CQ1	Did the project plans follow the applicable design standards outlined in AASHTO's A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets and/or the ODOT Highway Design	23 CFR 625, 23 USC 109(b), 23 USC 109(c)(2), 23 USC 109(n), 23 USC 109(o)	Yes , the applicable AASHTO design standards were followed No , the applicable AASHTO design standards were not followed. (Comment required) N/A , requirement does not apply. (Comment required) Don't Know , could not be	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
	Manual?		verified at the time or review (comment required)	
CQ2	Did the approved project plans and specifications meet all the applicable requirements stated in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and the Oregon Supplement to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices?	23 CFR 655.603, ORS 810.200, OAR 734-020-005	<p>Yes, the approved project plans and specification met all applicable requirements</p> <p>No, the approved project plans and specification did not meet all applicable requirements. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply. (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review (comment required)</p>	
CQ3	Did the project plans follow the applicable design standards outlined in AASHTO's LRFD Bridge Design Specifications?	23 CFR 650,	<p>Yes, the applicable design standards were followed</p> <p>No, the applicable design standards were not followed. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply. (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time or review (comment required)</p>	
CQ4	Were design exceptions processed and the appropriate approvals obtained for designs that did not conform to minimum criteria established in the standards?	23 CFR 625.3(f)	<p>Yes, design exceptions were processed and the appropriate approvals were obtained when minimum design criteria was not met.</p> <p>No, design exceptions were not processed and the appropriate approvals were not obtained when minimum design criteria was not met. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply (comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review (comment required)</p>	
CQ5	If any of the following were included in the approved PS&E documents, were Letters of Public Interest Findings (LPIF) approved in accordance with the	23 CFR 635.411(a)(2) FHWA's Contract Administration Core	<p>Yes, LPIF's were approved in accordance with the Approval Authority Matrix.</p> <p>No, LPIF's were not approved in accordance with the Approval Authority Matrix. (Comment required)</p>	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
	<p>Approval Authority Matrix?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specific patented or proprietary products • agency owned and furnished materials • salvaged materials • donations • publicly owned equipment • contractor purchased equipment • public agency force account work • Union Pacific Railroad flagging. 	<p>Curriculum Manual and Reference Guide</p> <p>LAG Manual, Section A, Chapter 2 Appendix, Approval Authority Matrix,</p>	<p>N/A, requirement does not apply. (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review. (Comment required)</p>	
CQ6	<p>Were the advertisement and approved plans and specifications available to bidders a minimum of 3 weeks before opening bids?</p>	23 CFR 635.112(b)	<p>Yes, the advertisement and approved plans and specification were available to bidders at least 3 weeks before opening bids.</p> <p>Yes, while, the advertisement and approved plans and specifications were available for less than 3 weeks an exception or variance was properly approved by the Division Administrator (or the State if authority assumed) with appropriate justification.</p> <p>No, the advertisement and approved plans and specifications were not available to bidders at least 3 weeks before opening bids and no exception or variance was properly approved.</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply.</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review.</p>	
CQ7	<p>Did the executed contract include the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be prevailing where the construction is located (County) for the date of bid opening?</p>	23 CFR 635.117(f)	<p>Yes, the executed contract included the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be prevailing where the construction is located (State & County) as of the bid opening date.</p> <p>No, the executed contract did not</p>	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
			<p>include the appropriate minimum wage rates determined by the Secretary of Labor to be prevailing where the construction is located (State & County) as of the bid opening date.</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply.</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review.</p>	
CQ8	<p>Was work undertaken by a method other than low-bid contract, or the project advertised, only after the original construction authorization date in FMIS?</p>	<p>23 CFR 635.112(a)</p>	<p>Yes, the construction was advertised for bid or work was undertaken only after the original construction agreement authorization date.</p> <p>No, work was undertaken or the project advertised before the original construction agreement authorization date.</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply.</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review.</p>	
CQ9	<p>Was the Form FHWA-1273 contract provisions physically incorporated into the construction contract?</p>	<p>23 CFR 633.102(b)</p> <p>23 CFR 633.103</p>	<p>Yes, Form FHWA-1273 contract provisions was physically incorporated in the construction contract.</p> <p>No, Form FHWA-1273 contract provisions were not physically incorporated in the construction contract. (comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply (comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review (comment required)</p>	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
CQ10	<p>Did the approved project plans and specifications include a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) or provisions for the Contractor to develop a plan?</p> <p><i>For projects or classes of projects that the State determines to have less than significant work zone impacts, the TMP may consist only of a Temporary Traffic Control (TTC) plan</i></p>	<p>23 CFR 630.1012(b)</p> <p>23 CFR 630.1012(c)</p>	<p>Yes, the approved project plans and specifications included a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) or provisions for the Contractor to develop a plan</p> <p>No, the approved project plans and specifications did not include a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) or provisions for the Contractor to develop a plan (comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply (comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review (comment required)</p>	
CQ11	<p>Following opening of bids, did the LPA examine the unit bid prices of the apparent low bid for reasonable conformance with the engineer's estimated prices, including a thorough evaluation of an obvious unbalancing of unit prices or bid with extreme variations from the engineer's estimate?</p>	<p>23 CFR 635.114(c)</p> <p>23 CFR 635.114(d)</p> <p>23 CFR 635.114(k) (Design Build Contracting)</p> <p>See 23 CFR Part 636</p>	<p>Yes, the LPA examined the unit bid prices of the apparent low bid for reasonable conformance with the engineer's estimated prices and obvious unbalancing of unit prices, in accordance with State procedures</p> <p>No, the LPA did not examine the unit bid prices of the apparent low bid for reasonable conformance with the engineer's estimated prices and obvious unbalancing of unit prices</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply (comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review (comment required)</p>	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
CQ12	Was there a full time employed LPA employee in responsible charge for administering the project?	23 CFR 635.105(b) 23 CFR 635.105(c)(4) FHWA Guidance Memo: Responsible Charge issued August 4, 2011	<p>Yes, a full time employed LPA employee was in responsible charge for administering the project</p> <p>No, there was no full time employed LPA employee in responsible charge for administering the project (comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply (comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review (comment required)</p>	
CQ13	Were the DBE firms originally identified by the prime contractor at the time of contract award the same firms that are approved to work on the project at the time of this review?	49 CFR 26.53(b)(2) 49 CFR 26.53(f)(1)	<p>Yes, the DBE firms listed in the contract award documents were the same firms approved to work on the project</p> <p>Yes, the DBE firms were not the same as those listed in the original contract at the time of award, but they have been changed by "prior written consent" from the State</p> <p>No, the DBE firms listed in the contract award documents were not those approved to work on the project (comment required)</p> <p>N/A, DBE firms were listed in the contract award documents, but no DBE firms have performed work on the contract to date (comment required)</p> <p>N/A, there was no DBE goal on the project (comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review (comment required)</p>	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
CQ14	Based on a minimum review of one contract change order or extra work order, did the LPA perform and adequately document a cost analysis for each negotiated change or extra work order?	23 CFR 635.120	<p>Yes, a cost analysis was performed and adequately documented by the LPA for each negotiated change or extra work order</p> <p>No, a cost analysis was not performed and adequately documented by the LPA for each negotiated change or extra work order (comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply (comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review (comment required)</p>	
FINANCIAL QUESTIONS (FI)				
FI1	Did the Federal-aid share of eligible project costs in the project agreement or in subsequent amendments to the agreement remained unchanged?	23 CFR 630.106(f)	<p>Yes, the Federal-aid share of eligible project costs in the project agreement or in subsequent amendments to the agreement remained unchanged.</p> <p>No, the Federal-aid share of eligible project costs in the project agreement or in subsequent amendments to the agreement has been changed. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply. (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review. (Comment required)</p>	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
F12	Based on a review of one Federal-aid billing, were expenditures allocated to the appropriate Federal program fund category on multi-funded projects?	2 CFR 200.400	<p>Yes, expenditures were allocated to the appropriate Federal program fund.</p> <p>No, expenditures were not allocated to the appropriate Federal program fund category. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply. (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review. (Comment required)</p>	
F13	Were indirect charges billed under an approved indirect cost rate?	2 CFR 200.416 Appendices IV, V, VI and VII to Part 200	<p>Yes, charges were billed at the approved rate.</p> <p>No, charges were not billed at the approved rate. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply. (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review. (Comment required)</p>	
F14	Based on review of one Federal-aid billing, were payroll, fleet, and equipment charges allocated properly to the project?	2 CFR 200.430	<p>Yes, payroll, fleet, and equipment charges were allocated properly to the project.</p> <p>No, payroll, fleet, and equipment charges were not allocated properly to the project. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply. (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review. (Comment required)</p>	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
F15	Based on a review of one contract progress payment, did the LPA follow Section 00195.50 of their ODOT approved General Conditions?	<p>ODOT Construction Manual, Chapter 25</p> <p>LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions (Section 100's)</p>	<p>Yes, contract progress payments followed Section 00195.50 of the LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions.</p> <p>No, contract progress payments did not follow Section 00195.50 of the LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review (Comment required)</p>	
CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION QUESTIONS (CA)				
CA1	Was a Quality Assurance and Contract Administration Plan prepared for the project and is it included in the project records?	<p>23 CFR 635.105</p> <p>LAG Manual, Section C, Chapter 16</p>	<p>Yes, a Quality Assurance and Contract Administration Plan was prepared for the project and it is included in the project records.</p> <p>No, a Quality Assurance and Contract Administration Plan was not prepared for the project. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review (Comment required)</p>	
CA2	Before on-site work began, were the required contract submittals (project schedule, traffic control plan, erosion and sediment control plan and pollution control plan) received and approved by the LPA?	LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions, Sections 00180.40 & 00180.41	<p>Yes, the required submittals were received and approved before on-site work began.</p> <p>No, the required submittals were not received and approved before on-site work began. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply. (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review. (Comment required)</p>	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
CA3	Before on-site work began, was a preconstruction conference held and are the minutes of that meeting included in the project records?	LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions, Section 00180.40 LAG Manual, Section C, Chapter 16	Yes , a preconstruction conference was held before on-site work began and the meeting minutes are included in the project records. No , a preconstruction conference was not held before on-site work began. (Comment required) N/A , requirement does not apply. (Comment required) Don't Know , could not be verified at the time of review. (Comment required)	
CA4	Based on a minimum review of one contract time extension request involving federal participation, was the contract time extension request fully justified and adequately documented?	23 CFR 635.121(b) ODOT Construction Manual, Chapter 13 LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions, Section 00180.50	Yes , the contract time extension request is fully justified and adequately documented. No , the contract time extension request is not fully justified and adequately documented. (Comment required) N/A , requirement does not apply. (Comment required) Don't Know , could not be verified at the time of review. (Comment required)	
CA5	Was the reason, or reasons, for using force account procedures documented? <i>Note: In establishing the method of payment for contract changes or extra work orders, force account procedures shall only be used when strictly necessary, such as when agreement cannot be reached with the contractor on the price of a new work item, or when the extent of work is unknown or is of such character that a price cannot be determined to a reasonable degree of accuracy.</i>	23 CFR 635.120 (d) ODOT Construction Manual, Chapter 12G LAG Manual Section C, Chapter 16	Yes , the reason or reasons for using force account procedures were documented. No , the reason or reasons for using force account procedures were not documented. (Comment required) N/A , requirement does not apply. (Comment required) Don't Know , could not be verified at the time of review. (Comment required)	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
CA6	Based on a minimum review of one applicable contract pay item paid in one progress payment, did the LPA provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately?	<p>23 CFR 635.123</p> <p>FHWA's Contract Administration Core Curriculum Manual, October 2014.</p> <p>ODOT Construction Manual, Chapter 12D</p> <p>LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions, Section 00190.10</p>	<p>Yes, the LPA provided adequate assurance that completed work quantities are determined accurately</p> <p>No, the LPA did not provide adequate assurance that completed work quantities were determined accurately. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, project activity has not yet resulted in a progress payment for this project as of the date of review.</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review.</p>	
CA7	Based on a minimum review of one applicable pay item paid in one progress payment, did the LPA ensure that all steel or iron material manufacturing processes, including application of coatings, for that pay item occur in the United States as required under FHWA's Buy America regulations?	<p>23 CFR 635.410(b)(1)</p> <p>FHWA's Contract Administration Core Curriculum Manual, October 2014.</p> <p>LAG Manual, Section C, Chapter 16</p> <p>LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions, Section 00160.20</p>	<p>Yes, the LPA ensured that steel or iron material manufacturing processes, including application of coatings, occurred in the United States.</p> <p>No, the LPA did not ensure that steel or iron material manufacturing processes, including application of coatings, occurred in the United States.</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply.</p> <p>N/A, project activity has not yet resulted in a progress payment for this project as of the date of review.</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review.</p>	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
CA8	Does the contract specify that the percentage of work that must be performed by the prime contractor is greater than or equal to 30 percent of the total original contract price excluding identified specialty items? Is the total percentage of subcontracted work being tracked by the LPA?	<p>23 CFR 635.116(a)</p> <p>Form FHWA-1273, Section VI</p> <p>ODOT Construction Manual, Chapter 14</p> <p>LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions, Section 00180.20</p>	<p>Yes, the contract specifies that the percentage of work that must be performed by the prime contractor is greater than or equal to 30 percent of the total original contract price excluding identified specialty items and the LPA is tracking the percentage of subcontracted work.</p> <p>No, the contract does not specify that the percentage of work that must be performed by the prime contractor is greater than or equal to 30 percent of the total original contract price excluding identified specialty items and the LPA is not tracking the percentage of subcontracted work. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply. (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review. (Comment required)</p>	
CA9	Based on a minimum review of one applicable contract pay item paid in one progress payment, did the LPA provide adequate assurance that stockpiled material (Materials on Hand) conformed with the requirements of the plans and specifications?	<p>23CFR 635.122(a)(1)</p> <p>ODOT Construction Manual, Chapter 12F</p> <p>LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions, Section 00195.60</p>	<p>Yes, the LPA provided adequate assurance that that stockpiled material conformed with the requirements of the plans and specifications.</p> <p>No, the LPA did not provide adequate assurance that stockpiled material conformed with the requirements of the plans and specifications? (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply. (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review. (Comment required)</p>	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
CA10	Did the LPA ensure that prompt payment by the contractor was made for labor and materials and first-tier subcontractors?	ORS 279C.505 ORS 279C.515 ODOT Construction Manual, Chapter 26 LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions, Section 00170.10	<p>Yes, the LPA ensured that prompt payment by the contractor was made for labor and materials and first-tier subcontractors.</p> <p>No, the LPA did not ensure that prompt payment by the contractor was made for labor and materials and first-tier subcontractors. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, project activity has not yet resulted in a progress payment for this project as of the date of review.</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review. (Comment required)</p>	
CA11	Based on a minimum review of one subcontract, has the LPA authorized in writing the subcontract, or has the LPA certified that each subcontract has a written agreement containing all the requirements and pertinent provisions of the prime contract? Was the subcontractor checked for debarred / prohibited status?	23 CFR 635.116(b) ODOT Construction Manual, Chapter 14 LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions, Sections 00180.20 & 00180.21	<p>Yes, the LPA has authorized the subcontract in writing AND the LPA has certified that each subcontract has a written agreement containing all the requirements and pertinent provisions of the prime contract.</p> <p>No, the LPA has not authorized the subcontract in writing. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply. (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review. (Comment required)</p>	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
CA12	Did the LPA ensure that all materials incorporated into the work met quality acceptance requirements?	23 CFR 635 23 CFR 637, Subpart B ODOT Construction Manual, Chapter 12B LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions, Section 00165 LPA's ODOT approved Quality Program Plan	<p>Yes, the LPA ensured that all materials incorporated into the work met quality acceptance requirements.</p> <p>No, the LPA did not ensure that all materials incorporated into the work met quality acceptance requirements. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review (Comment required)</p>	
CA13	Were the manufactured materials incorporated into this project accepted using the methods in the approved Quality Assurance program? (Qualified or Approved Products List, Certified Producer, etc.)?	23 CFR 637.205(a) 23 CFR 637.207(a)(1) LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions, Section 00165.35 ODOT Non-field Tested Materials Acceptance Guide	<p>Yes, the manufactured materials incorporated into this project were accepted using the required methods.</p> <p>No, the manufactured materials incorporated into this project were not accepted using the required methods. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, does not apply. (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of this review. (Comment required)</p>	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
CA14	Did the LPA require any quality price adjustments for materials or work performed that was not in close conformance with the contract requirements?	<p>23 CFR 635 23 CFR 637, Subpart B</p> <p>ODOT Construction Manual, Chapter 12C</p> <p>LPA's ODOT approved General Conditions, Section 00165</p> <p>LPA's ODOT approved Quality Program Plan</p>	<p>No, the LPA did not require any quality price adjustments for materials or work performed.</p> <p>Yes, the LPA required quality price adjustments for materials or work performed that was not in close conformance with the contract requirements. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review (Comment required)</p>	If the answer is yes, determine the method used for quality price adjustments
CA15	Were the mitigation measures stated as commitments in the environmental document implemented on the project?	<p>23 CFR 771.109(b)</p> <p>Contract Special Provisions, Section 00290</p>	<p>Yes, mitigation measures stated as commitments in the environmental document were implemented on the project.</p> <p>No, mitigation measures stated as commitments in the environmental document were not implemented on the project. (Comment required)</p> <p>N/A, requirement does not apply (Comment required)</p> <p>Don't Know, could not be verified at the time of review (Comment required)</p>	

#	QUESTIONS	CITATION	ANSWER	COMMENT
CA16	Were erosion and sediment control measures and practices monitored and maintained or revised to insure that they fulfilled their intended function during the construction of the project?	23 CFR 650.209(c) Contract Special Provisions, Section 00280	Yes , erosion and sediment control measures and practices were monitored and maintained or revised to insure that they fulfilled their intended function during the construction of the project. No , erosion and sediment control measures and practices were not monitored and maintained or revised to insure that they fulfilled their intended function during the construction of the project. (Comment required) N/A , requirement does not apply. (Comment required) Don't Know , could not be verified at the time of review. (Comment required)	
CA17	For a completed bridge project, were the following documents submitted to ODOT's Bridge Engineering Section as required? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As-constructed plans • Pile records • Foundation report • Final load rating 	ODOT Bridge Design & Drafting Manual LAG Manual, Section C, Chapter 17	Yes , the listed documents have been submitted as required No , the listed documents have not been submitted as required (comment required) N/A , requirement does not apply (comment required) Don't Know , could not be verified at the time of review (comment required)	

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS			
Insert Question			