



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

Proposer: Walsh/American Bridge

Technical Proposal	Maximum Potential Points	Technical Proposal Score
➤ Quality (50%)		
Experience & Authority of Key Individuals	20	15.6
Extent of Quality Control / Quality Assurance	10	6.5
Safety	10	7
Measures to Evaluate Performance in Construction	10	6
➤ Aesthetics (20%)		
Enhancements to the RFP	10	5.5
Approach to involve stakeholders	10	5.5
➤ Enhancements (15%)		
Geometric Enhancements	10	8
Structural Enhancements	5	2.75
➤ Public Relations (15%)	15	7.5 9.45
TOTAL	100	66.30

9/19/07
 9/19/07

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: *Neil Anderson*

Date: 9/19/07

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

Auditor Signature: *Quinn B. Hayes*

Date: 9/19/07



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

~~Final~~ Score sheet
Evaluator-2
Walsh/Am. Bridge

Scoring Notes
~~DO NOT WRITE~~

APPENDIX D
Individual Rating / Scoring
Sheets



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

Proposer: *Walsh/American Bridge*

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		78				W- <i>6.0</i> 5.6	Sx+52 + 51 (minor strength tempered by W1) W1, minor weakness due to extensive exp on other projects (see SA) W1 - experience is with construction engineering, not full design of bridge, limited or no steel bridge experience W5 + W1 + W3 W1 - experience is with construction engineering, not full design of bridge, limited or no steel bridge experience I inadequate experience of lead bridge designer W- W1 committee is between MnDOT + project manager, + MnDOT equality - management by committee is concerning Take charge PM will get things done right S- Significant experience of firm on bridges Very good PIC, lack of track record together
Extent of Quality Control / Quality Assurance > Design and construction relationships necessary to meet the project goals.	10			65			6.5	W1 Const QC not shown on org. chart S1 + S2 S- QA + QC will not be employed by same firm. W- They don't understand MnDOT process, which was clear in RFP, W- No design staff commitment to construction Concern about strength experience of Dr. As. Engr and effectiveness in role
Safety > Approach and commitments towards implementing a safety incentive program on the project.	10		70				7	W1 + joint determination of recordable S- provided examples of incentive programs used in past, but no commitment to implement incentive on this project W1 and committed to do something on this project W1 S- Good process to balance recording injuries against incentives W1 - W1 - must insure safety rating of all proposals
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			60			6	Although a good effort was made for measuring, there are issues with measures, wrong incentives could be provided. S- PH measures are good W- Quality measures are concerning, not not wrong incentives possible



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

Proposer: *Walsh/American Bridge*

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				55		5.5	<p>W- Piers are too massive + in direct conflict with RFP requirements to provide open views of river-graffiti problems will be incessant</p> <p>S- trees around parkway is a good effect, if they could grow to bridge height it would not be appropriate, but they won't. The misrepresentation on plans is a weakness.</p> <p>Enhancements have focused on ^{some} greening of the bridge area area, which will be embraced by public, but not clear how much is committed to.</p>
> Approach and commitments to involving stakeholders into the design process	10				55		5.5	<p>Good approach to allow MSE well input</p> <p>Few commitments to how to include input</p> <p>VQAT primary source of input. Good but not enough</p> <p>Whole team does not seem engaged with utilizing input</p> <p>Not clear if Memorial Park is part</p>



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

Proposer: *Walsh/American Bridge*

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		80				8	Would like to see more detail (profile) of future 4 th st bridge + alignment underneath. 2 nd st ^{changes} not desirable only 12' proposed. No pier in 80' portal 170' South side portal good for future trans. Wash ramps improved, Univ Bay VC improved, 16'4" 2 nd st changes not desirable
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	Increased deck width Increased deck width drains increases future maintenance costs Fairing connection will be a long-term maintenance issue



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

Proposer: *Walsh/American Bridge*

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>75</i> > Approach and commitment to involve stakeholders, designers, and construction personnel into the public relations process. <i>65</i> > Approach and commitments to mitigate nighttime construction noise impacts on nearby residences. <i>50</i> 	15			<i>63</i>			<i>9.45</i>	<p><i>+Goranson</i> KOM have great experience + is well qualified for project related communications Outreach specialists from neighborhoods is a good add Unless if Ph team has worked together before or not how well PH will be integrated into team decisions, no public-private partnerships are risky Recognizes presence of disadvantaged + immigrant communities commitment to have design + construction personnel @ public mtgs Almost nothing is offered to minimize noise concerns "notify + try to avoid" is all that is cited</p>