



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

Proposer: McCROSSAN

Technical Proposal	Maximum Potential Points	Technical Proposal Score
➤ Quality (50%)		
Experience & Authority of Key Individuals	20	10.40 ✓
Extent of Quality Control / Quality Assurance	10	6.50 ✓
Safety	10	7.60 ✓
Measures to Evaluate Performance in Construction	10	7.30 ✓
➤ Aesthetics (20%)		
Enhancements to the RFP	10	5.00 ✓
Approach to involve stakeholders	10	2.50 ✓
➤ Enhancements (15%)		
Geometric Enhancements	10	2.00 ✓
Structural Enhancements	5	3.00 ✓
➤ Public Relations (15%)	15	10.50 ✓
TOTAL	100	54.80 ✓

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 Western^{KW} Date: 9/19/07

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

Auditor Signature: [Signature] Date: 9/18/07



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

McCROSSAN

APPENDIX D
Individual Rating / Scoring
Sheets



Proposer: **McCrossan**

CONFIDENTIAL

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

Evaluator: **Kevin Western**

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				52		10.4	Manny Walk - CM - ^{limited} exp. Manny & Bruce Together on Hiwatha. Tom Martin - DM - limited DB exp. Bruce Peterson QM - Design QM exp. for this type. limited (-) Bob Beckel RSM - disconnent. Authority depicted has Tom away from design Manager - strange. - Did try to clarify not they were unsure. o Dave R. - Good MUDG experience o QA/QC same firm - negative. o Steabit -
Extent of Quality Control / Quality Assurance > Design and construction relationships necessary to meet the project goals.	10				65		6.5	Design complete to construction (RFC) no process for feedback. - No steel QA/QC. Quality - experience; lessons learned (-) Quality managers can stop work (Dave R good, Bruce I question) QA/QA away from groups to minimize influence. Design background QA for construction w/o background negative Fig 4 flow chart good.
Safety > Approach and commitments towards implementing a safety incentive program on the project.	10				70		7.6	- 100% mention to workers / field personnel (+) - Daily toolbox, no prework training (-), documented. - If it all go to workers, how drivers are managers? - No audits - 5 safety officers, but 2 req'd per OSHA/other needs. How is design part of construction?
Measures to Evaluate Performance in Construction Objective measures that will be performed to insure the constructed product meets or exceeds the contract requirements.	10				73		7.3	Defining Documentation Training, Certification Data Collection Contin improve. mentioned but how implemented? Man; Open Sys Measures. - Additions of Inspection; testing plan items. - Quality # to worker -> Good Design needs higher emphasis; discussion.

31.8



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

Proposer:

McCrossan

Evaluator:

Kevin Westerman

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				<u>50</u>		5.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - pylons - Iner columns - Pier wings are strange. - Green scape below bridge? - Only trail access - no thought - Color coordination/possibilities ^{not} realistic. - No commitment to Landscaping. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trying to minnie piers from 10th ave - Views from roadway does not integrate into views of river(--) - Piers too blocky. - 2:1 met.
> Approach and commitments to involving stakeholders into the design process	10					<u>25</u>	2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time over VA (-) - 5 day workshop for input. - how much ^{authority} not stated. - After that it appears we get what they have.

19



Proposer:

McCrossan

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

Evaluator: Kevin Western

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					20	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited enhancements. - Several major issues with enhancements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wash Ave. NB ramp grade not good at acceptable level. • Future 35W > 4% - No good. 3.95 - 4.05 listed as max. • Missing grades for future - Why didn't they show? • 2nd lane @ Washington is a neutral. • Bridge @ 2nd needs removal @ future build; river bridge stays. but w/ > 4% who knows if it will work. • Ramps not shown
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			60			3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No drainage structures - Walls & fill (mudat item) - 3' @ Univ. - 14-6" VC @ 2nd - RR okay. - 2 lane exit @ university. - Wash Ave. ramps. <p><i>It appears NE Ramp is feasible</i></p> <p>Structural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + RT loads for 2nd - PCB span - overhang too long + No drainage needed (they say) - is needed @ rollover N PCB good @ 2nd st. Low Maint Cost <p>- Minimal con Structural Enhancements.</p>



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

Proposer:

McCrossan

Evaluator:

Kevin Western

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. ➤ Approach and commitment to involve stakeholders, designers, and construction personnel into the public relations process. ➤ Approach and commitments to mitigate nighttime construction noise impacts on nearby residences. 	15			10			10.5	<p><i>Ms. Youngs; minimal experience; Trudy figure head only (maybe) level of commitment?</i></p> <p><i>4 outreach areas good!</i></p> <p><i>Leadership Committee good!</i></p> <p><i>Hotline - that do more than 10g calls ^(performance) _(message) - No mention of construction personnel involved.</i></p> <p><i>*TPT program - okay but has possible issues, if it works I like it!!</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>Good process but didn't say they would try to eliminate noise</i></p> <p><i>Night mitigation good.</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>Trudy has little exp. w/ McCrossan team.</i></p>