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# BACKGROUND:

This project consists of replacement of the structure (CUY-77-1409) carrying Broadway Avenue (SR-43) over IR-77 as well as reconfiguring the ramps from IR-490EB/WB to IR-77SB to provide standard lane width and merge distances. The existing ramp from Broadway Avenue to IR-77SB will be reconstructed into a Frontage Road to Pershing Avenue. The intersections of Broadway Avenue with Gallup Avenue, Roseville Court and Dille Avenue shall also be reconstructed to match any vertical changes to Broadway and improve curb radii. The mainline lanes of IR-77SB adjacent to the ramp work shall also be resurfaced as part of this project. A multi-use path will be constructed along the Frontage Road between Broadway and Pershing Avenues. Broadway Avenue is a major utility corridor so construction will need to be completed within prescriptive utility outage time frames and/or design and construction around existing major utility facilities. Broadway Avenue also crosses I-77 at a major skew requiring a high skew bridge.

ODOT is using a two-phase procurement process to select a design-build contractor to deliver this Project. ODOT initiated the process with the release of a Request for Qualifications / Instructions to Proposers on 9/1/2016. Interested Offerors were required to provide ODOT with a list of qualifications including past experience, project understanding and approach and capabilities of the team in the format outlined in the RFQ. After an evaluation by the Department, a Short-list of the Offerors is determined. Short-listed Offerors are to be the three most highly qualified Offerors that submitted SOQs. In the second phase, ODOT will issue the Project Proposal and Scope of Services (the “RFP”) for the Project to the short-listed Offerors. Only the short-listed Offerors will be eligible to submit bids for the Project.

Statements of Qualifications (SOQs) were received from (6) Offerors on 09/29/2016 by the required deadline from the following:

| **OFFEROR** | **DESIGN BUILD CONTRACTOR** | **DESIGN BUILD DESIGNER** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Beaver Excavating Company | Beaver Excavating Company | WSP/Parsons Brinckerhoff |
| Brayman Construction Corporation | Brayman Construction Corporation | HDR Engineering, Inc. |
| Great Lakes Construction Company | Great Lakes Construction Company | PRIME AE Group, Inc. |
| Kokosing Construction Company, Inc. | Kokosing Construction Company, Inc. | E.L. Robinson Engineering of Ohio Co. |
| Ruhlin/Trumbull CCG6B JV | Ruhlin/Trumbull CCG6B JV (JV of The Ruhlin Company and Trumbull Corporation) | ms consultants, inc. |
| Walsh Construction Company II, LLC | Walsh Construction Company II, LLC | American Consulting, Inc., DBA American Structurepoint, Inc. |

The SOQs were checked-in to verify general formatting and general responsiveness. All submitted SOQs met the general formatting requirements and were thereby accepted as being eligible for review.

This document is a summary of the evaluation performed by the Technical SOQ Evaluation Team.

# SCORING PROCESS:

A project specific SOQ Evaluation Manual was established and reviewed by the TET prior to receiving the SOQs from interested Offerors. This manual is to ensure the impartial, equitable and comprehensive evaluation of each Offeror’s SOQ in accordance with the Design Build Project’s RFQ. This document provided the general methodology and procedures for evaluation of the SOQs.

The members of the Technical SOQ Evaluation Team (TET) independently reviewed each Offeror’s SOQ. Upon completion of these independent reviews, the evaluation group met to discuss the SOQs and determine a scoring recommendation to present to the Executive Level Evaluation Team. The TET conferred on Oct 19th, Oct 20th, and Oct 24th 2016.

For each of the evaluation topics listed in the following table, the TET focused on an open discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of each SOQ.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Evaluation Criteria** | **Maximum Points** |
| Project Understanding and Approach  | How well does the Offeror demonstrate an understanding of the design and construction requirements of the project, including key risks associated with this project and the approach to mitigate these risks? | 30 |
| Organization, Firm Experience, and Key Personnel  | How well does the Offeror demonstrate the members’ abilities, demonstrate an effective organization, and demonstrate experience on similar projects? How well do the Offeror’s members’ Key Personnel qualifications, experience, and time availability relate to the requirements of this Project? | 35 |
| Offeror’s Capabilities and Experience | How well does the Offeror demonstrate its recent design, construction and management experience and capabilities? How well do its experiences and capabilities relate to this Project? | 35 |
| Total | 100 |

Strengths and weaknesses as well as other items of note identified during these open discussions are listed in the SOQ Review Notes.

Strengths and weaknesses are defined as follows:

Significant Strength – That part of the SOQ that has a considerable positive influence on the proposer’s ability to advance the project goals and values or exceed requirements.

Strengths – That part of the SOQ that ultimately represents a benefit to the Project and is expected to increase the Offeror’s ability to meet or exceed the Project’s goals.

Minor weakness – That part of a SOQ which a slight negative influence on the proposer’s ability to advance the project goals and values, meet requirements or provide efficient or effective performance.

Weaknesses – That part of a SOQ which considerably detracts from the Offeror’s ability to meet the Project’s goals or may result in inefficient or ineffective performance.

Each of the three rating topics was evaluated as an overall category, considering all the subcomponents of the overall category.

At the conclusion of open discussion for each rating topic, team members identified the strongest and weakest SOQs relative to the involved topic. In accordance with the Request for Qualifications (RFQ), the highest ranked DBT received the maximum number of rating points for that topic. Lower ranked DBTs received commensurately lower scores based on a relative comparison to the highest ranked DBT. The evaluation group’s rationale with respect to ranking of the DBTs is outlined in the below sections.

The evaluation group members achieved consensus on the rating topic scoring for each DBT.

Note: The order of information concerning the submitted SOQs presented in this summary does not indicate any order of preference and is organized alphabetically by the offeror’s name.

## RFQ SCORING TOPIC: PROJECT UNDERSTANDING AND APPROACH (Maximum 30 Points)

**Basis of Evaluation for Project Understanding and Approach:**

The TET evaluated the Offerors on how well the Offeror’s demonstrated a preliminary understanding of the design and construction requirements of the project by considering how well the Offeror addressed the following:

* Evaluate how well does the Offeror demonstrated an understanding of the design and construction requirements of this Project specifically by addressing the following:
1. Evaluate the description of the top three (3) major tasks involved with the Project as identified by the Offeror
2. Evaluate the potential risks associated with the identified major tasks, planned methods to mitigate those risks.
3. Evaluate the Offeror’s anticipated level of Department involvement in the mitigation of the risk.
4. Likely risks to be discussed include:
	1. Overall timing and scheduling, including utility phasing for bridge construction.
	2. Pier foundation construction in median workzone.
	3. Design and construction challenges of a long span, high skew bridge.

Discussion of Scoring Recommendations for Project Understanding and Approach:

The TET identified the following differentiators in the DBTs’ project understanding and approach.

### BEAVER (18/30)

The offeror identified the following three appropriate major tasks:

1. Utility Coordination
2. Bridge Construction
3. MOT / Construction Phasing

General Observations: While the Offeror did address appropriate and key issues to the project, the SOQ did not present many project specific topics. Risks associated were general to the topic with mitigation strategies which were appropriate. Structure discussion focus centered primarily on timing and phasing, but the Offeror missed, in the opinion of the Reviewers, a key component to the project which were the challenges specific to designing and constructing a high skew structure.

The evaluation team identified the following Strengths:

* Additional SUE to accurately locate existing facilities”. Committing to doing additional subsurface engineering. (Strength)
* “During the bid phase, our DBT will work together to develop a comprehensive Risk Register to expand on the table.” (P 4 of 28) (Strength)

The evaluation team identified the following Weaknesses:

* “ODOT’s Involvement: Minor Demolition sequence approval” (Note: Approval of demolition plan not an ODOT Role – Acceptance only by ODOT. Minor Weakness)
* Note: No discussion of high skew issues and construction impact. The offeror did not discuss the issues related to a high skew structure which is a major challenge in the design and construction of the Broadway Avenue Bridge. (Weakness)

### BRAYMAN (27/30)

The offeror identified the following three appropriate major tasks:

1. Utilities
2. Maintenance of Traffic and Coordination with Other Projects
3. Design and Construction of Project Structures

General Observations: The Offeror did appropriately address the key issues to the project. The offeror identified the major challenges associated with this project and demonstrated an understanding of those challenges and potential mitigations in their discussion. Utilities discussion demonstrated good project specific understanding. The utilities discussion gave good project specific details with a commitment of providing a full time utility coordinator. The structures section demonstrated a good understanding to the complications of the high skew design and committed to a 3D finite analysis for redecking (which was above minimum design requirements).

The evaluation team identified the following Strengths:

* “…monitoring of the 60” combined sewer running parallel to Dille Road, beneath a portion of Broadway, and the proposed Retaining Wall 1A. The sewer is a 60” brick sewer built in 1957 which flows to Southerly treatment plant. The location of the sewer is approximately 40’-50’ below the existing ground in this area. The exact location will need to be determined and then monitored during the construction of Wall 1A.” *Note: Key project detail clearly understood.)* (p. 3 of 28) (Strength)
* “A key difference with the utility coordination necessary for this Project is the additional coordination necessary with nearby projects which are also placing facility relocation demands on these utility companies.” (Pg 3/4 of 28) *Note: Demonstrates an understanding of the overall needs of impacts to the utilities and relocation needs within the region*. (Strength)
* “The 3D FEM will be used for design, as well as investigate a steel erection sequence, the specified deck placement sequence, and a future redecking procedure.” (Pg 5 of 28) *Note: Performing the 3D Analysis for future redecking above scope requirements.* (Strength)
* Additionally, HDR was a co-principal investigator on the NCHRP 12-79 research project that resulted in the aforementioned NCHRP Report 725 and several improvements regarding the analysis of curved and skewed steel girder bridges that have been adopted by the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications. (Pg 5 of 28) Note: Ability to contact recognized nationwide expert who is internal to Designer. (Strength)

No weakness were identified.

### GREAT LAKES (19/30)

The offeror identified the following three appropriate major tasks:

1. Utility Coordination
2. Maintenance of Traffic (Vehicular and Pedestrian)
3. Structure Design and Construction (Bridge and Retaining Wall)

General Observations: While the Offeror did address appropriate and key issues to the project, the SOQ did not present many project specific topics. Risks were generalized with few project specific details. While the key issues were appropriate, the descriptions could have been used on any reasonably complicated project constructing a structure, a project with utilities, and a project with phasing constraints. Overall the DBT’s description of the risks and approach lacked specifics to demonstrate an understanding of the project specific issues.

The evaluation team identified the following Strength:

* “…Independent Technical Reviews (ITR) of all submittals. The ITR is performed by a Senior Engineer, not directly involved in the development of the work product, to validate assumptions, conclusions, and recommendations. “ (Pg 3 of 28) (Independent Technical Reviews above minimums – Strength)

The evaluation team identified the following Weakness:

* Note: Overall approach to major task does not provide significant details demonstrating an understanding of project specific approach, risks, or mitigation efforts. SOQ identified the Project Tasks as the risks without expanding on details. Did not list what actual risk was specific to the tasks or this specific project. Table and identified risks potentially applicable to any project.(Weakness)

### KOKOSING (28/30)

The offeror identified the following three appropriate major tasks:

1. Utility Coordination

2. Structures (Bridge/Wall)

3. Schedule Management

General Observations: The offeror demonstrated a good to excellent understanding of the project risks and offered specifics in the approach to manage those risks. The offeror identified the major challenges associated with this project and demonstrated an understanding of those challenges and potential mitigations in their discussion. Utilities discussion demonstrated good project specific understanding, but the offeror did try to assign responsibility to ODOT for coordination clearly identified as the responsibility of the DBT in the scope. The utility section clearly discussed timing risks with the utilities.

The evaluation team identified the following Strengths:

* “Early coordination is particularly critical for the AT&T line that shall be exposed by April 15, 2017, roughly a month after expected Notice to Proceed.” (p. 4 of 30) (Note: Key project detail clearly understood.) (Strength)
* Obtain additional SUE and field verification of utility locations (Strength)
* Note: Overall – demonstrated a good understanding of specific project issues with utilities and the needed relocation timelines. Expectations of parties involved clearly described and indicated. (Strength)
* Note: Overall approach to identifying Scheduling and Timing for the project and the provided details demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the risks of the project. Realistic expectations of parties identified, including the required completion of design in 2017. (Strength)
* “Multiple tracking logs including a Project Risk Register and the Utility Impacts Matrix will be maintained.” (p. 3 of 30) (Strength)

The evaluation team identified the following Weakness:

* The District Utility Coordinator will be an active participant in all utility meetings. (Minor Weakness – More assignment to ODOT than Scope of Services. Role to be assigned to the DBT)

### RUHLIN-TRUMBULL (30/30)

The offeror identified the following three appropriate major tasks:

1. Utility Coordination

2. Skewed Structure

3. Maintenance of Traffic

General Observations: The offeror provided a good discussion to the overall approach, and further demonstrated a good to excellent understanding of the project risks and offered specifics in the approach to manage those risks. The Offeror have good project specifics in regards to key dates. The offeror clearly identified the risk to the skewed structure and committed to Designer review of shop drawings. The offeror demonstrated a good understanding and description of the major task, risks and approach to the project.

The evaluation team identified the following Strengths:

* Clearing utility conflicts along the alignment of the Frontage Road is the first major task of this project. There are waterline, sewer, electric and communication utilities in conflict with the new Frontage Road, retaining walls, and rear abutment to the Broadway Avenue Bridge. AT&T’s communication duct bank has a long-specified duration for relocation and will require early coordination to keep the project on schedule. (from table on p. 6 of 28) (Note: Key project detail clearly understood - Strength)
* SUE investigation to supplement existing data (from table on p. 6 of 28) (Strength)
* Steel fabrication shop drawing review Task Force/ms (from table on p. 7 of 28) (Note: Shop drawing review by Designer of Record - Strength)
* Note: Demonstrated good understanding of construction and design requirements of high skew structure. Provided detailed discussions specific to project. (Strength)
* “Early focus on utility construction in the area of Frontage Road and the rear abutment of the Broadway Avenue bridge is key to kicking off the project effectively.” (p. 4 of 28) “With an anticipated award of February 13, 2017, Utility Coordination, Roadway & Structure design and permitting will begin immediately. Frontage road and retaining wall construction will be completed by the end of the construction season in 2017 to allow for the Broadway Avenue closure early in 2018. Demolition and utility relocations will begin as soon as possible in 2017, starting with the uncovering of the AT&T duct bank prior to April 15, 2017. Additional interim milestones in 2017include the demolition of 1748 East 27th prior to October 1, 2017.” (p. 5 of 28) (Note: Overall approach to identifying Scheduling and Timing for the project and the provided details demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the risks of the project.) (Strength)

No weakness were identified.

### WALSH (21/30)

The offeror identified the following three appropriate major tasks:

1. Extensive Utility Coordination

2. Complex Maintenance of Traffic

3. Bridge Design and Construction

General Observations: While the Offeror did address appropriate and key issues to the project, the SOQ presented limited project specific topics. Risks associated were general to the topic with mitigation strategies which were appropriate. The Offeror did demonstrate a good understanding of high skew structures, but the offeror did not give project specific information concerning MOT and the utilities. Risk and mitigation strategies were generally appropriate to any project.

The evaluation team identified the following Strengths:

* Engage Cardno (SUE subconsultant company) to complete SUE (Strength)
* Note: Demonstrated good understanding of construction and design requirements of high skew structure. Provided detailed discussions. (Strength)

The evaluation team identified the following Weakness:

* Did not include project specific utility conflicts. Approach and discussion to utility risk and mitigation potentially applicable to any project. (Weakness)

## RFQ SCORING TOPIC: Organization and Key Personnel (Maximum 35 Points)

**Basis of Evaluation for the Offeror’s Organization and Key Personnel:**

The TET evaluated the Offeror’s Organization and Key Personnel in relation to the requirements of the Project by evaluating

1. The Offeror’s proposed organization by considering the organizational chart showing the “chain of command” of the anticipated roles proposed for the Offeror’s organization regarding the Project. Consider how the proposed organizational chart gives confidence to the success of the Project by addressing key project goals.

2. The experience of the firms that are part of the Offeror. Consider the roles proposed for each firm, how those roles relate to each firm’s past experience, and how the experience gives confidence that the firm will ensure success for this project.

3. The Key Personnel (Project Manager, Design Project Manager, Lead Structural Designer, Construction Project Manager).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **KEY PERSONNEL** | **DUTIES** |
| Project Manager | Ultimately responsible for the Offeror’s performance. Ensures that personnel and other resources are made available. Handles contractual matters. Responsible for the overall construction of the Project, and may actively manage the Construction of the project. Responsible for overall utility coordination. Shall be an employee of the Lead Contractor |
| Design Project Manager | Actively manages the overall design of the Project. Must be an employee of the Lead Designer. Responsible for overall design of the Project inclusive of all structures and structural elements (Bridge substructure and superstructure, Retaining walls) and roadway items (Alignment, drainage, pavement, maintenance of traffic, etc.) Must be an Ohio P.E. at the time of Award. |
| Lead Structural Designer | Responsible for overall design of structures and structural elements. Responsible to ensure that all requirements of the design for all structural elements on the Project, including bridges, box culverts, walls, and foundations are met. Must be an Ohio P.E. at time of award. |
| Construction Project Manager (Field Manager/Supervisor) | Actively manages the overall construction of the Project. Responsible for overall daily operations and construction of the project including structures and structural elements, maintenance of traffic, roadway, utility and drainage items. Shall be an employee of the Lead Contractor |

Evaluate by considering, how the Offeror’s description of the Key Personnel provide confidence to ODOT that the Project and the Project risks will be effectively managed through competence, accountability, and relevant experience. Considering the following:

1. Professional registrations, education and other components of qualifications applicable to the role.
2. Specific previous projects and experiences, similar in nature to the proposed Project, for which the individual may have performed a similar function. Consider the specific information on how those experiences relate to meeting the requirements of this Project and role.
3. Unique qualifications which will provide value to this Project and/or help ensure this Project’s requirements will be met. Ensure the Offeror provides factual information which will provide confidence to ODOT that this Project and this Project’s risks will be effectively managed through personal competence and accountability.
4. Individual concurrent responsibilities during the duration of this Project and the anticipated time commitment to this Project (estimated percentage format).
5. A statement indicating that the individual is currently employed by a member of the Offeror at the time of the SOQ submittal and name the Offeror’s member.

Discussion of Scoring Recommendations for the Offeror’s proposed Organization and Key Personnel:

### BEAVER (31/35)

*Organizational Chart/Firm Capabilities:*

* Capable contractor. Focus of experiences on large earth moving projects. Capable Lead Designer with good company wide experiences.
* Named utility coordinator (Stephen Gage). Utility coordinator shown to be interacting with design and construction. Aligns role to consistent with identified risk. (Strength)
* Named a Design QC/QA role (Jane Jordan) (Strength)
* Depicting the Deputy Project Manager reporting to Project Manager, but managing construction related items. Depicting Design Deputy Project Manager. Roles unclear. (Minor Weakness)

*Key Personnel*

DB Project Manager - Brian Francis

* Good Qualifications.
* B.S., Business Administration, University of Akron, Akron, Ohio
* 18 years of experience
* Proven competence in recent past projects with similar specifications. (Strength)
* Limited DB experience demonstrated (Minor Weakness)

DB Design Project Manager - Brian Gilhousen, PE

* 24years of experience
* B.S., Civil Engineering, Cleveland State University, 1992
* Certified Manager of Quality/Operational Excellence, ASQ, 2014
* Positive experiences on projects, but limited experience in similar role for DB projects. DB projects involve IQF role.

Lead Structural Designer - Charles Boltz, PE

* M.S., Civil Engineering, Purdue University, 2002
* B.S., Civil Engineering, Purdue University, 2001
* 14 years of experience
* Much of the experiences listed are not applicable (Preliminary design, deck replacements, and overlays). (Minor Weakness)

Construction Project Manager (Field Manager/Supervisor) - Bill Ertle

* 28 Years of Experience
* Good general experiences, but did not demonstrate strong background with project specific details.

### BRAYMAN (34/35)

*Organizational Chart/Firm Capabilities:*

* Capable contractor with history of large complex structures.
* Capable Lead Designer with good company wide experiences.
* Showed two positions for utility coordinator (Design/Construction). Potential “hand-off” concerns from design to construction for 3rd party entities.
* Limited field people/roles identified. (Minor Weakness)

*Key Personnel*

DB Project Manager - Tom Hesmond

* Bachelor of Science, Engineering Specialization in Construction, Ohio State University
* 18 years of experience
* Limited DB experience demonstrated (Minor Weakness)
* Recent positive experiences on complicated river crossing structure. Good experience in multiple complicated structures.) (Strength)

DB Design Project Manager - Joanne Shaner, PE

* Master of Science, Civil Engineering Ohio University
* Bachelor of Science, Civil Engineering Ohio University
* 19 years of experience
* Recent positive experiences on projects. Known to be responsive, but limited experience in similar role for DB projects.

Lead Structural Designer - Brian Avarello, PE

* Bachelor of Science, Civil Engineering Ohio Northern University
* 19 years of experience
* Good general recent experiences, but limited demonstration on high skew structures.
* No LARSA software listed, while SOQ states HDR familiar and uses LARSA software.

Construction Project Manager (Field Manager/Supervisor) - Gary Chesnoski

* Bachelor of Science, Economics, Slippery Rock University
* 30 Years of Experience
* Some good experiences, but not on projects of similar size and complexity.

**GREAT LAKES (33/35)**

*Organizational Chart/Firm Capabilities:*

* Capable contractor with history of large complex structures.
* Capable Designer, but some concerns with design firm’s experience with accelerated design-build projects. (Minor Weakness)
* Named Design QC personnel (Greg Boyer). (Minor Strength)
* DB Coordinator shown and named (Chris Stutz) (Minor Strength)
* Utility coordination not addressed (Minor Weakness), even though discussed in Part B.

*Key Personnel*

DB Project Manager - Tom McGonigle

* BS/Civil Engineering/University of Pittsburgh
* 34 years of experience
* Recent regional experiences have not been positive. (Minor Weakness)

DB Design Project Manager - Fernando Rodriguez, PE

* BS/Civil Engineering/University of Akron/1991
* 25 years of experience
* Recent positive experiences on projects. Known to be responsive. Good relevant experience in similar role for DB projects with positive results. (Strength)

Lead Structural Designer - Tom Stora, PE

* BS/Civil Engineering/Cleveland State University/1996
* 27 years of experience
* Recent relevant experiences in similar role on DB projects.
* Noted no design/check initials on the structures plans of Col-30 or SUM-271.

Construction Project Manager (Field Manager/Supervisor) - Mark Nash

* BS/Civil Engineering/University of Akron/1999
* 17 Years of Experience
* Good DB experience on projects of similar size.

**KOKOSING (34/35)**

*Organizational Chart/Firm Capabilities:*

* Capable contractor with history of large complex structures.
* Capable Lead Designer with good company wide experiences. Named Design QC personnel (Greg Boyer). (Minor Strength)
* DB Coordinator role shown. (Minor Strength)
* Utility Coordinator shown in construction only, without addressing design concerns (Minor Weakness)

*Key Personnel*

DB Project Manager - Jack Weaver, Jr.

* B.S., 1999, Construction Management, Bowling Green State
* 17 years of experience
* Positive corridor experiences with projects (08-0211, 03-0586). Good DB experiences, but not in similar role. (Strength)

DB Design Project Manager - Rick Rockich, PE

* B.S., Civil Engineering, University of Akron, 1978
* M.S., Structures & Foundations, University of Akron, 1983
* 38 years of experience
* Positive experiences on projects. Some experience in similar role for DB projects in a subconsultant role. Some experience in similar role on projects of lesser complexity.

Lead Structural Designer - Dave Traini, PE

* B.S., Civil Engineering, Ohio State University, 1979
* 37 years of experience
* Positive design experiences with strong technical skills. (Strength)
* Concerns with availability with concurrent difficult projects (Philo project). (Minor Weakness)
* Minor issues with missing deadlines on previous projects (Cuy-480-18.42).

Construction Project Manager (Field Manager/Supervisor) - Steve Linder

* 23 Years of Experience
* Good experience with complicated structures with some DB experience in similar role.

**RUHLIN-TRUMBULL (35/35)**

*Organizational Chart/Firm Capabilities:*

* Capable contractor with history of large complex structures.
* Capable Lead Designer with good company wide experiences.
* Trumbull’s role only shown as Executive oversight.
* Named Utility Coordinator named (Scott Vura). (Minor Strength)

*Key Personnel*

DB Project Manager - Mark Myers

* The University of Akron, BS Construction Technology
* 29 years of experience
* Note: Excellent experiences with projects of similar scale and complexity. Good corridor experiences. Good DB experiences, but not in similar role. (Significant Strength)

DB Design Project Manager - Todd Long, PE

* Ohio State University, BS Civil Engineering
* 20 years of experience
* Experiences in similar role, but for project not of similar scope and during later phases (Portsmouth).

Lead Structural Designer - Jonathan Hren, PE

* North Carolina State University, BSCE; University of Florida, ME Structural Engineering
* 20 years of experience
* Good experiences in similar role. General positive experiences.
* Noted no design/check initials on any structures design on projects listed.

Construction Project Manager (Field Manager/Supervisor) - Jim Ruhlin, Jr.

* Bucknell University, BS Civil Engineering
* 11 Years of Experience
* Did not demonstrate DB experience in role, but good experiences on complex structures. Positive recent regional experiences and known to be responsive.

**WALSH (34/35)**

*Organizational Chart/Firm Capabilities:*

* Capable contractor with history of large complex structures.
* Capable Lead Designer with good company wide experiences.
* Named DB Coordinator (Dan Klienhernz) (Minor Strength)
* Named Design Quality Manager (Steven Fleming) (Strength)
* Showed two positions for utility coordinator (Design/Construction). Potential “hand-off” concerns from design to construction for 3rd party entities.
* All position shown include named individual.

*Key Personnel*

DB Project Manager - Pete Jerrell

* B.S., Construction Management, Purdue University
* 16 years of experience
* Good experiences on projects of similar size and complexity in similar role. (Strength)
* No experience in proposed specifications and standards. (Minor Weakness)
* Experiences list in SOQ inconsistent with experiences listed in 670/71 SOQs.

DB Design Project Manager - Bruce Fraser, PE

* B.S., Civil Engineering, Ohio State University
* 27 years of experience
* Recent positive experiences on projects. Known to be responsive, experience in similar role for DB projects but of lesser complexity.

Lead Structural Designer - Chris Bettinger, PE

* M.S., Civil Engineering, Ohio University; B.S., Civil Engineering, Ohio University
* 17 years of experience
* Good experiences in similar role on projects of lesser complexity, but with experience of projects with high skews structures. Noted experiences on structures with considerable structure mounted utilities. (Strength)

Construction Project Manager (Field Manager/Supervisor) - Matt Cunningham

* B.S., Construction Engineering Technology, The University of Akron
* 15 Years of Experience
* Good overall experience in role. Good experience on complex projects, but not as primary superintendent.

## RFQ SCORING TOPIC: Offeror’s Capabilities and Experience (Maximum 35 points)

**Basis of Evaluation for DBT Capabilities:**

The TET evaluated how well the Offeror demonstrate their design, construction and management experience and capabilities and how well does their experiences and capabilities relate to this Project. The TET identified difference in Offerors by noting any strengths or weaknesses for the evaluation topics.

Past Project Summaries must include the following information:

1. Name of the project and location.
2. Dates of design (if applicable to the Designer(s)) and construction (if applicable to the Contractor(s)).
3. The original scheduled completion deadlines and the actual completion dates, as applicable to the Designer(s) and/or Contractor(s). Offeror must provide an explanation for projects not meeting the completion date.
4. Size of the final project (in dollars), Offeror’s original & final contract (in dollars), and the final amount of the contract the Offeror self-performed (in dollars).
5. A narrative describing the project, including the description of the work or services provided in sufficient detail to demonstrate the Offeror’s role on the project.

Past Project Summaries should demonstrate experience in the following areas:

1. For Contractor(s) - The construction of projects of similar scope and complexity and how those experiences are applicable to the requirements of this Project.

For the Designer(s) – The design of projects of similar scope and complexity and how those experiences are applicable to the requirements of this Project.

* 1. Experience with a similar length, multi-span, highly skewed vehicular bridge designed per AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications. If applicable to the Offeror’s Lead Designer or Sub-Consultants, Design of projects of similar scope and complexity and how those experiences are applicable to the requirements of this Project.
	2. Project requiring three dimensional modelling for structural analysis.
	3. Relevant experience with complicated utility coordination and relocation, including experiences working to relocate public utilities and working alongside private utilities, including role of Key Personnel on related projects.
1. Evaluate how the proposed Offeror’s Team members and/or Key Personnel have worked together as an integrated team, if applicable, and how those experiences will ensure successful completion of this Project.
2. Evaluate the timely or early completion of projects of similar scope and complexity and how those experiences relate to this Project.
3. Evaluate notable project challenges and subsequent mitigation efforts by the Offeror to overcome those project challenges. Evaluate how the challenges and mitigation efforts may relate to this Project.

### BEAVER (24/35):

The Evaluation Team identified the following projects as relevant in demonstrating the firm’s capabilities and relevancy to this project:

* ODOT 100503, I-71/SR-665 Interchange: Single Point Urban Interchange
	+ Superintendent and Project Manager teaming (Strength)
* ODOT 130002, I-75 Reconstruction Phase I: Phased reconstruction of 4.32 miles of 4-lane highway, 2 interchanges, and 8 bridges consisting of a combination of mainline and overheard structures
	+ Superintendent and Project Manager teaming. Some similarities in regards to complexity. Some structures with skew considerations. (Strength)
* ODOT 050583, IR-77 Major Reconstruction: Added a third lane to 1.2 miles of IR-77 and reconstructed 2 interchanges
	+ Superintendent and Project Manager teaming (Strength)
* Cuyahoga County, Schaaf Road (CR 97) Bridge Replacement over CSXT RR
	+ Relevancy in critical project considerations (utility complications and high skew) with involvement of Design Manager. (Strength)

### BRAYMAN (31/35):

The Evaluation Team identified the following projects as relevant in demonstrating the firm’s capabilities and relevancy to this project:

* ODOT, Ironton-Russell Bridge, New Bridge Construction
	+ Complex large bridge project. Key personnel involvement. (Strength)
* PENNDOT, SR 356 Freeport Bridge, Major Bridge Rehabilitation
	+ Complex large bridge project with utility issues. Key personnel involvement. (Strength)
* PENNDOT, Hulton Bridge, SR 2082 Sec. A08, New Bridge Construction
	+ Large bridge project. Some teaming of firms, similar scope complexity with utility involvement, but no Key Personnel involvement. (Strength)
* PENNDOT, SR 28 Widening / Prep. RR Reloc., New Bridge Construction
	+ Complex urban project with similar utility issues. Key personnel involvement. Positive overall project evaluation (PennDot). (Strength)
* PENNDOT, SR 28 / I-279 Connector, New Bridge Construction
	+ Smaller complex urban project. Some similar utility issues, but project was not of similar size. Key Personnel involvement in similar role with positive evaluation. (Strength)
* ODOT HAM-71-3.81, MLK Design-Build, New Interchange
	+ DB project with similar complexity with considerations for utilities. Some key personnel involvement (Lead Designer). (Strength)
* Illinois State Tollway, IL-72 Higgins Road Bridges over I-90, Bridge Replacement
	+ DBB project with similar complexities and size. Extremely high skew structure. (Strength)

### GREAT LAKES (24/35):

The Evaluation Team identified the following projects as relevant in demonstrating the firm’s capabilities and relevancy to this project:

* ODOT 143005, IR-271 3rd Lane Widening (Design-Build)
	+ DB project with some similar complexity/high skew structures. Key Personnel teaming, but with different firms. (Significant Strength)
* ODOT 130314, Lakefront West – West 73rd Street, New Construction (RR Grade Separation)
	+ Complex urban project, 3rd party complications, with some similar utility issues. Structure not as complicated. Some key personnel. (Strength)

### KOKOSING (31/35):

The Evaluation Team identified the following projects as relevant in demonstrating the firm’s capabilities and relevancy to this project:

* ODOT 113000, I-670/71 Columbus Crossroads Interchange Reconstruction Design Build
	+ Complex urban projects with similar complexities. Involvement of Key Personnel, but not in similar role. Consultant and Contractor teaming (with the designer in subconsultant role). (Significant Strength)
* ODOT 080211, I-77 Reconstruction and Widening
	+ Complex project in nearby corridor. Key Personnel teaming. (Strength)
* ODOT 060372, Fulton Road Bridge
	+ Complex project, but not necessarily similar scope. Key Personnel involvement. (Strength)
* ODOT 030586, I-77 Fleet/Grant Bridge Reconstruction
	+ Project of lesser complexity and scope with utility coordination. Project within corridor. Key Personnel and teaming. (Strength)
* ODOT PID 88965, MUS-70-9.61 Structure Replacement
	+ Note: Project with similar complexities (High Skew structures). Traditional DBB project. Key personnel involvement. (Strength)
* ODOT CUY-480-18.42, Finite Element Fracture Critical Analysis
	+ Highly technical project with complex issues. Key Personnel involvement. (Strength)

### RUHLIN-TRUMBULL (33/35):

The Evaluation Team identified the following projects as relevant in demonstrating the firm’s capabilities and relevancy to this project:

* ODOT 130184, Interstate 77 (I-77 over Granger and Canal Roads, CSX and Cuyahoga River)
	+ Complex urban large bridge deck replacement within the corridor with similar construction complications. Key personnel involvement. (Strength)
* ODOT 090496, Interstate 75, Cincinnati
	+ Large complex urban project with similar complications. Key Personnel involvement. (Strength)
* ODOT 080436, International Gateway, Columbus International Airport
	+ Similar size complex project with similar construction complications. Key Personnel involvement. (Strength)
* ODOT 133000, Cleveland Innerbelt CCG2 DB
	+ Large DB project with complications (as part of JV). Some similar construction complications. Key Personnel involvement. (Strength)
	+ Note: Recent issues with some unprofessional conduct in regards to bridge painting. (Minor Weakness)
* PENNDOT, Project SR-28 (A21) (SR-28 Interchange with Route 8 Reconstruction)
	+ Project with similar complexity, scope, size, and utility coordination, but no Key Personnel. (Strength)
* ODOT SCI-823-0.00, Southern Ohio Veterans Memorial Highway
	+ Some similar scope items. Key personnel involvement. (Strength)
* ODOT FRA-70/71, South Innerbelt, Phase 6A, Columbus
	+ Complex urban project with considerable utility issues. Key Personnel involvement. (Strength)
* ODOT FRA-70/71 East Interchange, Phase 2, Columbus
	+ Complex urban project with difficult design considerations. Key Personnel involvement. (Strength)

### WALSH (35/35):

The Evaluation Team identified the following projects as relevant in demonstrating the firm’s capabilities and relevancy to this project:

* ODOT, Innerbelt CCG1 Design-Build, Cleveland
	+ Complex, large, DB project with complex utility coordination. Project within corridor. Key Personnel involvement. (Significant Strength)
	+ Some coordination issues in regards to buildable units, fabrication fit-up issues, and schedule. (Minor Weakness)
* INDOT, I-70 “Super 70” Design-Build, Indianapolis
	+ Complex DB urban project of larger size with similar complexity. Key Personnel involvement. (Strength)
* INDOT, US 31 Reconstruction – Hamilton County
	+ Project with some similar complexities (accelerated timeframe / utilities), size, and Scope. Key Personnel involvement. (Strength)
* INDOT, Accelerate I-465, Indianapolis
	+ Larger DB urban project with some similar complexities and of greater Scope. Key Personnel involvement. (Strength)
* ODOT MOT-75-11.01 Phase 1B, I-75 Modernization Project
	+ Large complex urban project with similar complications. Key Personnel involvement. (Strength)
* ODOT AUG-67-3.45, SR 67 over I-75 Bridge Rehabilitation
	+ Project with some similar complexity (high skew structure), but not of similar size. Traditional DBB project. Key Personnel involvement. (Strength)
* ODOT CUY-77-12.12, Harvard Avenue Bridge Replacement
	+ With some similar Scope complexities (utilities) and Key Personnel involvement. Project yet be sold, but design substantially complete. (Strength)
* INDOT, Ohio River Bridge East End Crossing P3
	+ Complex project of larger size with some similar considerations. Teaming with Lead contractor (as a subconsultant). (Strength)

**SCORING** **SUMMARY**

Based on the evaluation group’s comprehensive review and discussion of the SOQs, we provide the following scoring to the Executive Level Evaluation Team:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Proposal Point Breakdown*** | Beaver | **Brayman** | Great Lakes | **Kokosing** | **Ruhlin-Trumbull** | Walsh |
| **Part B - Project Understanding and Approach (30 points max)** | 19 | **27** | 19 | **28** | **30** | 21 |
| **Part C - Design Build Project Team (35 points max)** | 31 | **34** | 33 | **34** | **35** | 34 |
| **Part D - Design Build Team Capabilities and Experience (35 points max)** | 24 | **31** | 24 | **31** | **33** | 35 |
| ***Totals*** | 74 | ***92*** | 76 | ***93*** | ***98*** | 90 |