



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

Proposer: CS McCrossan

| Technical Proposal | Maximum Potential Points | Technical Proposal Score |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| ➤ Quality (50%) | | |
| Experience & Authority of Key Individuals | 20 | 12 |
| Extent of Quality Control / Quality Assurance | 10 | 7.5 |
| Safety | 10 | 6.5 |
| Measures to Evaluate Performance in Construction | 10 | 7 |
| ➤ Aesthetics (20%) | | |
| Enhancements to the RFP | 10 | 5.5 |
| Approach to involve stakeholders | 10 | 5.5 |
| ➤ Enhancements (15%) | | |
| Geometric Enhancements | 10 | 5.2 |
| Structural Enhancements | 5 | 2.75 |
| ➤ Public Relations (15%) | 15 | 10.65 |
| TOTAL | 100 | 62.6 |

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:

Date: 9/19/07

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

Auditor Signature:


Date: 9/19/07



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

Scoring
CS McCosman
Eval. #2

Scoring Notes
~~DRAFT NOTES~~



APPENDIX D
Individual Rating / Scoring
Sheets



Proposer: CSMcClossan

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

Evaluator: 2

| Evaluation Category QUALITY | 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 |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---|--|
| Experience and Authority of Key Individuals > Manager, Lead Bridge Design Manger, Construction Manager, Quality Management Team on similar projects. > Authority being proposed. | 20 | | | 60 | | | 12 | a bag of experience W1, W2, W3, W4, W5 S - Bridge engineer has significant steel bridge experience, but odd place in org chart (see W5) S1 - strong individual + independent firm is valuable (kw) W - Qual Manager has no QA experience in this role has no QA experience in this role ^{on A/B} kw S - Braun is member of exec. committee, this will support quality |
| Extent of Quality Control / Quality Assurance > Design and construction relationships necessary to meet the project goals. | 10 | | | 75 | | | 7.5 | S1, S2, S3 Quality seems to be a value of team as ^{indicated} by 4 members responding to quality question W Quality efforts through Exe Comm W No design staff involvement in construction Manny Walk has demonstrated ^{his} value of doing what is fair + right, consistent with quality goals |
| Safety > Approach and commitments towards implementing a safety incentive program on the project. | 10 | | | 65 | | | 6.5 | S1 - documented talks S3 - has experience with incentive programs S - consistent requirements for all on project W - would like to see audits + reporting W - not clear if subcontractors will be safety trained Excellent safety officer |
| Measures to Evaluate Performance in Construction > ^{Methods} Objective measures that will be performed to insure the constructed product meets or exceeds the contract requirements. | 10 | | | 70 | | | 7 | S2 + S3 Quality dollars pledged to workers S1 - pg 12 S - Practical measures ^{re:} management + operational systems (p.13), but meetings need to be more frequent than quarterly S p.12 - identified the right items, very important ^{work-types} chosen |



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

Proposer: *CS McCrossan*

Evaluator: *Z*

| Evaluation Category AESTHETICS | 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 | | | | <i>55</i> | | <i>5.5</i> | <p><i>S- similar architectural lines, mass ^{+ pattern placement} should be addressed through stakeholder process, too large</i></p> <p><i>W- Greenscaping is very weak</i></p> <p><i>W- white steel bridge is not an option, what will bridge really look like</i></p> <p><i>W- Scale of piers</i></p> <p><i>W- Does not meet intent of RFP guidance, too dominant + bulky</i></p> <p><i>S- Architect is committed to staying involved.</i></p> |
| > Approach and commitments to involving stakeholders into the design process | 10 | | | | <i>55</i> | | <i>5.5</i> | <p><i>W- not enough opportunity for public, very little commitment to utilize input from public, dependent on VQAT, concern that architect will not be flexible</i></p> <p><i>W- Does not meet intent of RFP guidance in responding to public opinion, or that there isn't real opportunity for change</i></p> |



52

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

Proposer: *ES McCrossan*

Evaluator: *2*

| Evaluation Category ENHANCEMENTS | 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 |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---|--------------|--------------|---|---|
| Geometric Enhancements > Eliminate or minimize design exceptions. > Improve future clearances of I-35W at University Avenue > Improve future clearance of I-35W at 4 th Street. > Enhancements meet the requirements of Book 2, Section 11. | 10 | | | 60 60 60 52 | | | 5.2 5.2 | <p>We don't know how ramps will fit in, if they will work, or how issues might impact, NE ramp seems infeasible</p> <p>Removal of 2nd St Bridge in future</p> <p>SS on committee report</p> <p>W3</p> |
| Structural Enhancements > Innovative procedures and/or materials to minimize the life cycle costs of maintaining the corridor and to maximize the benefits to road users > Consideration of context sensitive design principals | 5 | | | 55 | | | 2.75 | <p>Only 3 pieces (good)</p> <p>No drainage structures on bridge</p> <p>prestressed deck - lower maint. costs (per KW)</p> |



5c

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

Proposer: *CS McCassan*

Evaluator: *2*

| Evaluation Category PUBLIC RELATIONS | 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"> ➤ Qualifications and experience of the Public Information Coordinator. <i>65</i> ➤ Approach and commitment to involve stakeholders, designers, and construction personnel into the public relations process. <i>73</i> ➤ Approach and commitments to mitigate nighttime construction noise impacts on nearby residences. <i>55</i> | 15 | | | 71 | | | <i>10.65</i> | <p><i>Emphasis on public trust by PIC</i></p> <p><i>Public outreach is strong - TPT stand office</i></p> <p><i>Krummen + Walk will be good with public</i></p> <p><i>No mention of adjusting construction based on noise concerns</i></p> <p><i>Team demonstrated willingness to let PIC do her job + she will do it well</i></p> <p><i>No mention of integrating construction personnel in outreach</i></p> <p><i>S - white noise machines within 500'</i></p> |