



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	13.8
Extent of Quality Control / Quality Assurance	10	8.2
Safety	10	7.7
Measures to Evaluate Performance in Construction	10	7.6
➤ Aesthetics (20%)		
Enhancements to the RFP	10	8.0
Approach to involve stakeholders	10	7.4
➤ Enhancements (15%)		
Geometric Enhancements	10	7.4
Structural Enhancements	5	3.7
➤ Public Relations (15%)	15	12.9
TOTAL	100	76.7

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: *Th. Keech*

Date: 9/19/07

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

Auditor Signature: *Romas R. Davila*

Date: 9/19/07



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

McCroskey TO

APPENDIX D
Individual Rating / Scoring
Sheets



Proposer: *McCrosan*

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

Evaluator: *Tom O'Keefe*

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			.69			13.8	<i>not OB</i> PM - 16yr OB, 169/174 River - Le Sec, 174/174 LRT CM LBOB - Major Steel River Xing, 174, even 2000, also 174 OB?, 1yr subcon, ? org chart relationships - CM - 15yrs, 494 OB Dgn Coord, HART Unit Coord, Diff roles - No river x'ing QM - CAM 494 OB, BOB HART, Skyway Br Asst Rec Eng CQM - MN DOT last night Br, OB?, QM exp?, Much bridge. Some have worked together, though appears to be in diff. roles, not BO = Constr Ind Dgn Checker + Brown in EC + GA/RC same firm = QC not part of const firm = Brown QA Exp?
Extent of Quality Control / Quality Assurance > Design and construction relationships necessary to meet the project goals.	10		.82				8.2	Very good exp of Qual process in ext, MN DOT Fig 4 specific to this project Qmgrs can stop work - though must consider their exp in like positions Mult MN DOT exp, critical action points VR, Env & Pub Info mentioned Many good stop work resp Dgn errors for proposal didn't incl ramp profiles, mainline profile challenges ramps. Bruce Peterson understood design
Safety > Approach and commitments towards implementing a safety incentive program on the project.	10		.77				7.7	Safety Inc prog - safe hr prs for work MN DOT Inc in addn Cont training & daily toolbox No real detail/ except for incentive - 5 safety officers +
Measures to Evaluate Performance in Construction > Objective measures that will be performed to insure the constructed product meets or exceeds the contract requirements.	10		.76				7.6	Mgmt info for Q, Safety, Pub Info, Env Mgmt Cost of non-cont reporting Lol it Doc. Definition



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

Proposer: *McCrossin*

Evaluator: *Tom O'Keefe*

Evaluation Category	Maximum Potential Points					Evaluator's Technical Proposal Score (Max Points X Score)	Comments
		Excellent (91-100)	Very Good (76-90)	Good (61-75)	Fair (50-60)		
> Commitments to enhance the aesthetic requirements in the RFP.	10		1.80			8.0	<p><i>Doug Abern - Facilitator Don McO inv not clear in prep. better descr @ intvw</i></p> <p><i>Team does not appear to have worked together.</i></p> <p><i>Tower elements tend to dominate corridor, out of scale</i></p> <p><i>per intvw only 1/d opp to reduce, curves in road diminish intended affect</i></p> <p><i>Piers massive, blocky.</i></p> <p><i>Few commitments to enhance</i></p>
> Approach and commitments to involving stakeholders into the design process	10			7.4		7.4	<p><i>Too much UQAT not enough public.</i></p> <p><i>Will Don McO be on site?</i></p> <p><i>Workshop timing recognizes schedule constraints</i></p> <p><i>More on buy-in than input</i></p>



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

Proposer: *McCossa-*

Evaluator: *Tom O'Keefe*

Evaluation Category ENHANCEMENTS	Maximum Potential Points	Rating Scale					Evaluator's Technical Proposal Score (Max Points X Score)	Comments
		Excellent (91-100)	Very Good (76-90)	Good (61-75)	Fair (50-60)	Fails (0-49)		
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			74			7.40	<i>Meets RFP reqs</i> <i>High Pt in middle of bridge; helps drainage</i> <i>Future profile requires reconstruction of 2nd Sr SE - -</i> <i>Univ Ave - Interim clearance meets std</i> <i>Ramp profiles not provided - NW ramp questionable, NE ramp likely infeasible -</i> <i>Short vertical curves -</i> <i>Future profile > 4%</i>
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			74			3.70	<i>High Pt in middle - no drainage structures req'd +</i> <i>Steel girders - max maint</i>



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

Proposer: *McCrossin*

Evaluator: *Tom O'Keefe*

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		.86				12.9	<i>Trudy Richter - very exp, work has been tactical, this project is more strategic ie trust, quality, safety though proposal shows good understanding Not sure if team as worked together PM exp w Mpls neighborhoods a plus Storefront + Good nighttime approach Leadership committee + Commuter involvement specified Interview good</i>