



**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	8.00 ✓
Extent of Quality Control / Quality Assurance	10	4.50 ✓
Safety	10	7.90 ✓
Measures to Evaluate Performance in Construction	10	5.50 ✓
➤ <b>Aesthetics (20%)</b>		
Enhancements to the RFP	10	6.80 ✓
Approach to involve stakeholders	10	2.00 ✓
➤ <b>Enhancements (15%)</b>		
Geometric Enhancements	10	0 ✓
Structural Enhancements	5	1.00 ✓
➤ <b>Public Relations (15%)</b>	15	11.70 ✓
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>47.40 ✓</b>

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: Kevin Weston <sup>KW</sup> Date: 9/19/07

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

Auditor Signature: [Signature] Date: 9/19/07



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

Proposer: *Ames-Lunda*

Evaluator: *Kevin Western*

Evaluation Category <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> > Eliminate or minimize design exceptions > Improve future clearances of I-35W at University Avenue > Improve future clearance of I-35W at 4 <sup>th</sup> Street. > Enhancements meet the requirements of Book 2, Section 11.	10					0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The future design does not allow <del>use</del> reuse of second st Bridge</li> <li>The decision to move 20' to east creates huge problems parking, city street.</li> <li>No one else has ponding issues on North (i.e. install grit chambers).</li> <li>South ponding requires RW.</li> <li>Ramp changes actually more of a problem than solving solution.</li> <li>Not enough consideration given</li> </ul> <p>⇒ River Bridge is not convertible for future alignment - fail point <sup>in my view</sup></p>
<b>Structural Enhancements</b> > 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						1.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LRT schematically design for on 2nd st. (all have.)</li> <li>Huge movements @ pier 3 under very flexible pier (big detail &amp; design issue)</li> <li>Span 4 is unbalanced length with cause uplift @ N about - maintenance.</li> <li>Pier width for stiffness &amp; stability</li> <li>Pier 3 footing not buried</li> <li>SE transitions.</li> </ul> <p>Adv            # Pier width for SCOUR            # Benefit of X brace tightening not seen</p> <p>- SE break @ outside shoulder .07 (loss to .017) is huge safety issue, not our practice.</p> <p>Using tall, flexible piers makes AL put all expansion at Pier 3. It's flexibility; the super. grade will be maintenance problem.</p>

1.0



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

Proposer:

*Ames - Lunda.*

Evaluator:

*Kevin Western*

Evaluation Category <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>➤ Qualifications and experience of the Public Information Coordinator.</li> <li>➤ Approach and commitment to involve stakeholders, designers, and construction personnel into the public relations process.</li> <li>➤ Approach and commitments to mitigate nighttime construction noise impacts on nearby residences.</li> </ul>	15		78				11.70	<p><i>Trudy - implement, Youngs is dedicated to project, team size too small, exp? Youngs.</i></p> <p><i>How is PMT involved besides Tim?</i></p> <p><i>Meeting with stakeholders need more contacts.</i></p> <p><i>states MnDOT should form 35W leadership committee - AL should.</i></p> <p><i>En</i></p> <p><i>No nighttime pile driving</i></p> <p><i>Light &amp; noise</i></p> <p><i>New sound systems on trucks.</i></p> <p><i>- Aesthetic Vision for PR very inflexible</i></p> <p><i>- Const Design will attend public mtgs.</i></p> <p><i>Overall good, but need better &amp; more staff, PMT involvement, take on stakeholder involvement.</i></p>



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

*Ames-Lunda*

**APPENDIX D  
Individual Rating / Scoring  
Sheets**



Proposer:

AMES - LUNDA

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

Evaluator:

Kevin Western

Evaluation Category <b>QUALITY</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>Experience and Authority of Key Individuals</b> > Manager, Lead Bridge Design Manger, Construction Manager, Quality Management Team on similar projects. > Authority being proposed.	20					40	8.00	- Entire team not together before but good small bridge examples. No discussion of steel fabrication QA/QC & They <sup>have</sup> exercise steel drawing & fabrication - what does it say by not listing them. QMT - Big concerns with experience to handle, esp. Steve & Joe. Taking authority is big concern. PM - Odell, CM - Doyle - No large bridge exper. LBD - John is very good & experienced, didn't see past experience with this team. CM - No experience with this level of project. QM - Not good.
<b>Extent of Quality Control / Quality Assurance</b> > Design and construction relationships necessary to meet the project goals.	10					45	4.50	- Steel QA/QC not included but PDM/Gatti shown in executive summary. - Quality (IQR) is good idea but not soon or through enough. - IQR - why report to John? Should be MnDOT Design Manager. - Construction part of design; how about design part of construction - QA/QC separate - good. - Jensen has no bridge experience; not naming IQR or ITR bridge engineer is big (-)
<b>Safety</b> > Approach and commitments towards implementing a safety incentive program on the project.	10		79				7.90	- EMR - good in past - No awards stated. - Safety incentive - \$250 - Good. - Audits are good but frequency too little - Work training before; daily is good.
<b>Measures to Evaluate Performance in Construction</b> > Objective measures that will be performed to insure the constructed product meets or exceeds the contract requirements.	10					55	5.50	- Checks vs reviews (P10) (-) Unclear in proposal - Constr. Reviews - Design staff should have final say! (-) minor - Pre-design Meeting - good <del>but it isn't a measurable thing</del> - Integrated shop drawing - good but how does this help evaluate performance? (-) why is it better quality? Is there another level? - Increased testing (good) but is probably inherent in the overall scope. - No design involvement with construction (-) - Quality incentive as mechanism to measure (-) No, but is a "method" - All reported issues are good, but certified steps need to be taken to not repeat.



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

Proposer: *Ames - Lunda*

Evaluator: *Kevin Western*

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			(68)			6.80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Trees - where placed, <i>how can this work w/ MSE walls? our requirement.</i></li> <li>- Pedestrians + Boaters.</li> <li>- Beam to girder transition nice.</li> <li>- Long, sleek girders - nice.</li> <li>- V shape <sup>at bearings</sup> - minor but nice.</li> <li>- Blocky wall @ pier 3 is negative.</li> <li>- Nothing/minimal on landscaping; ponds.</li> <li>- No team history.</li> <li>- Fred's concepts good.</li> <li>- Abutments <sup>are</sup> different. Too bulky.</li> <li>- Architectural Lighting</li> <li>- Safety concerns at S. Abutment w/ big fingers sticking out.</li> <li>- Entry statement weak w/ trees.</li> <li>- Fred V. Good exp.</li> </ul>
> Approach and commitments to involving stakeholders into the design process	10					(20)	2.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Seek input but what to do with it?</li> <li>- V&amp;T only - Stakeholders views?</li> <li>- Public involvement &amp; selection limited</li> <li>- <del>Strong</del> No guarantee of giving choice to V&amp;T/stake...</li> <li>- Educated / don't take input was message.</li> </ul>

8.8