



**CONFIDENTIAL**  
**St. Anthony Falls (35W) Bridge**  
**DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT**

Proposer: Ames/Lunda

| Technical Proposal                               | Maximum Potential Points | Technical Proposal Score                  |
|--|--------------------------|---|
| ➤ <b>Quality (50%)</b>                           |                          |   |
| Experience & Authority of Key Individuals        | 20                       | 12  |
| Extent of Quality Control / Quality Assurance    | 10                       | 5.5                                       |
| Safety   | 10                       | 8   |
| Measures to Evaluate Performance in Construction | 10                       | 5   |
| ➤ <b>Aesthetics (20%)</b>                        |                          |   |
| Enhancements to the RFP                          | 10                       | 7.5                                       |
| Approach to involve stakeholders                 | 10                       | 5   |
| ➤ <b>Enhancements (15%)</b>                      |                          |   |
| Geometric Enhancements                           | 10                       | 0   |
| Structural Enhancements                          | 5                        | 1.5                                       |
| ➤ <b>Public Relations (15%)</b>                  | 15                       | 10.95 <sup>10/19/07</sup>                 |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                     | <b>100</b>               | <del>55.5</del> 55.45 <sup>10/19/07</sup> |

I hereby certify that the scores reflected above indicate my personal assessment and evaluation of the Technical Proposal for the above mentioned Proposer.

Evaluator Signature: *Heidi Hunter*

Date: 9/19/07

I hereby certify that I have audited this evaluation form for the above mentioned Proposer.

Auditor Signature: *Quibet B. Hayes*

Date: 9/19/07



**CONFIDENTIAL**  
St. Anthony Falls (35W) Bridge  
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT

Ames/Londa  
Eval 2  
Scoring

Scoring Notes  
~~DRAFT NOTES~~

**APPENDIX D**  
**Individual Rating / Scoring**  
**Sheets**



Proposer: Amos/Lunda

**CONFIDENTIAL**  
**St. Anthony Falls (35W) Bridge**  
**DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT**

Evaluator: 2

| Evaluation Category<br><b>QUALITY</b>   | Maximum Potential Points | Excellent (91-100) | Very Good (76-90) | Good (61-75) | Fair (50-60) | Falls (0-49) | Evaluator's Technical Proposal Score (Max Points X Score) | Comments  |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---|---|
| <b>Experience and Authority of Key Individuals</b><br>> Manager, Lead Bridge Design Manger, Construction Manager, Quality Management Team on similar projects.<br>> Authority being proposed.           | 20                       |                    |                   |              | 60           |              | 12  | S1, S2, S3<br>W1, W2<br>(Lack of team cohesion & coordination apparent in interview + proposal contents)<br>No DB experience of PM per interview<br>W- QM reports to JV; PM will functionally report to JV, not MnDOT; structure does not ensure quality is top priority required by MnDOT<br>W- Independent quality review has no direct connection to MnDOT; PM insulates from MnDOT<br>S3<br>W- DM has <del>many</del> <sup>some</sup> design before beginning to end, somewhat limited<br>W- Experience with QM team leaves significant doubt about commitment (TW)<br>W- Team seems disorganized, design in proposal confirms this, disorganization does not lead to quality<br>S- Commitment to resolve design issues interactively (p.6)<br>S3 QM <del>does</del> does not indicate he has ever stopped work required Issues in proposal design leave doubt about quality<br>S- require subcontractors to have quality plans + enforce with QC personnel (p.7)<br>S- \$250k Quality incentive plan (p.11) for A-L + subs<br>S- Significant confusion about contents of proposal + meaning of ITR, IQR etc. leaves doubt about their understanding of their own process<br>S- Design QC Manager <del>separate</del> W- No design staff commitment to construction<br>+ Commitment to have safety pre on-site whenever work occurring<br>+ Insurance <del>is</del> indicates good record <del>not</del> relevant<br>S1, S6 (p. 9-10)<br>S2 |
| <b>Extent of Quality Control / Quality Assurance</b><br>> Design and construction relationships necessary to meet the project goals.  | 10                       |                    |                   | 55           |              |              | 5.5   | S- \$250k Quality incentive plan (p.11) for A-L + subs<br>S- Significant confusion about contents of proposal + meaning of ITR, IQR etc. leaves doubt about their understanding of their own process<br>S- Design QC Manager <del>separate</del> W- No design staff commitment to construction<br>+ Commitment to have safety pre on-site whenever work occurring<br>+ Insurance <del>is</del> indicates good record <del>not</del> relevant<br>S1, S6 (p. 9-10)<br>S2  |
| <b>Safety</b><br>> Approach and commitments towards implementing a safety incentive program on the project.   | 10                       |                    | 80                |              |              |              | 8   | + Commitment to have safety pre on-site whenever work occurring<br>+ Insurance <del>is</del> indicates good record <del>not</del> relevant<br>S1, S6 (p. 9-10)<br>S2  |
| <b>Measures to Evaluate Performance in Construction</b><br>> Objective <sup>Methods</sup> measures that will be performed to insure the constructed product meets or exceeds the contract requirements. | 10                       |                    | 80                |              | 50           |              | 5   | S- <del>is</del> Audits will be conducted + results discussed with <del>the</del> appropriate discipline (p.11)<br>W2 only repeated mistakes targeted for improvement<br>S- Constructability review with MnDOT is a good thing <sup>esp.</sup> for this job<br>S- quality incentive \$50k <sup>in addition to</sup> <del>more than</del> MnDOT incentive.<br>Significant confusion by PM about contents of section 4.3.3.4 leaves doubt   |



**CONFIDENTIAL**  
**St. Anthony Falls (35W) Bridge**  
**DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT**

Proposer: *Ames/Landa*

Evaluator: *2*

| Evaluation Category  | Maximum Potential Points | Excellent (91-100) | Very Good (76-90) | Good (61-75) | Fair (50-60) | Fails (0-49) | Evaluator's Technical Proposal Score (Max Points X Score) | Comments   |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---|--|
| > Commitments to enhance the aesthetic requirements in the RFP.              | 10                       |                    | <del>80</del> 75  |              |              |              | <del>8</del><br>7.5                                       | <p>Design responded well to RFP requirement but inconsistent pier design detracts from look</p> <p>Very qualified VQM, excellent addition to team</p> <p>Pier design is attractive (except LAT support + inconsistency)</p> <p>Good approach of blending in, not being centerpiece</p> <p>Enhancements for peds + bike add significant value</p> |
| > Approach and commitments to involving stakeholders into the design process | 10                       |                    |                   |              | 50           |              | 5   | <p>"Educate" public to acceptance</p> <p>The design responded</p> <p>Primary interaction with V&amp;AT, little commitment to making changes based on public input</p>  |



**CONFIDENTIAL**  
**St. Anthony Falls (35W) Bridge**  
**DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT**

Proposer: *Ames/Lunda*

Evaluator: *2*

| Evaluation Category<br><b>ENHANCEMENTS</b>   | Maximum Potential Points | Excellent (91-100) | Very Good (76-90) | Good (61-75) | Fair (50-60) | Fails (0-49) | Evaluator's Technical Proposal Score (Max Points X Score) | Comments  |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---|---|
| <b>Geometric Enhancements</b><br>> Eliminate or minimize design exceptions<br>> Improve future clearances of I-35W at University Avenue<br>> Improve future clearance of I-35W at 4 <sup>th</sup> Street.<br>> Enhancements meet the requirements of Book 2, Section 11. | 10                       |                    |                   |              |              | 0            | 0   | <i>Geometric design is unacceptable due to future needs at Univ + 4<sup>th</sup> not being possible with river bridge reconstruction</i><br><i>Plans indicate 19<sup>th</sup> Ave will be encroached upon + stormwater</i><br><i>Schematic indicates 8<sup>th</sup> Ave will have to go - unacceptable right of way takings and triggering municipal consent issues that would be likely to delay project</i><br><i>See report of weaknesses from Geometric Committee 53, 54, 59-513, 514-515</i> |
| <b>Structural Enhancements</b><br>> Innovative procedures and/or materials to minimize the life cycle costs of maintaining the corridor and to maximize the benefits to road users<br>> Consideration of context sensitive design principals                             | 5                        |                    |                   |              |              | 30           | 1.5   | <i>Tall, narrow pier susceptible to problematic movement, risk is greater, <del>is</del></i><br><i>Uplift @ north abutment is a concern</i><br><i>Bridge must be reconstructed to meet future needs @ Univ. + 4<sup>th</sup> based on grade</i><br><i>Deck placement concerns regarding ability to construct <del>at</del> good reliability</i><br><i>(LRT girders - uneven deflection)</i>   |



**CONFIDENTIAL**  
**St. Anthony Falls (35W) Bridge**  
**DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT**

Proposer: *Ames/London*

Evaluator: *Z*

| Evaluation Category<br><b>PUBLIC RELATIONS</b>  | Maximum Potential Points | Excellent (91-100) | Very Good (76-90) | Good (61-75) | Fair (50-60) | Fails (0-49) | Evaluator's Technical Proposal Score (Max Points X Score) | Comments  |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Qualifications and experience of the Public Information Coordinator. <i>45</i></li> <li>&gt; Approach and commitment to involve stakeholders, designers, and construction personnel into the public relations process. <i>65</i></li> <li>&gt; Approach and commitments to mitigate nighttime construction noise impacts on nearby residences. <i>70</i></li> </ul> | 15                       |                    |                   | <i>73</i>    |              |              | <del>11</del><br><i>10.95</i>                             | <p><i>Richter is very qualified but doubt about commitment of team to allow her PR team to be effective (<del>she</del> wasn't allowed to say much in interview), Team does not seem integrated towards supporting PR statement that design + const. personnel will be involved in process but no solid quantified commitment</i></p> <p><i>No commitment about how public input will be used to influence design</i></p> <p><i>Commitment to pile driving limits</i></p> <p><i>Understand noise issue + made commitment to address</i></p> |