*This document includes a description of information requested in the Instructions to Offerors (ITO), Section 6.3 (Intermediate Technical Proposal Content) along with evaluation criteria in accordance with Section 8.2 (Technical Proposal Evaluation). Individual comments from Technical Evaluation Team (TET) members also included noting any comments, questions, or compliance issues for use during the PTI Discussion Meeting.*

*Document Key:*

**Section Requirements – Technical Proposal required submission.**

Evaluation Criteria – Pass/Fail requirements of the section.

Reviewer Comments – Review notes of the Evaluation Team

Intermediate Technical Proposal ODOT identified deficiencies – Items within the Intermediate Technical Proposal which required revisions within the Final Technical Proposal.

Intermediate Technical Proposal ODOT comments – ODOT Identified comments within the Intermediate Technical Proposal which did not need revised in the Final Technical Proposal, but were provided for information to the DBT.

**General Comments**

Proposal submitted timely. Format reasonably adheres to requested format.

**Final Proposal generally meets all requirements of the ITO.**

**Part A: Project Narrative**

A narrative summarizing the approach to the design and construction of the Project. The narrative shall be in sufficient detail so to understand the key elements of the critical work items.

1. **A general Bar Chart schedule showing the anticipated starting and completion dates of design and construction. Construction shall include MOT and construction phasing with a minimum time measurement in weeks. The schedule shall depict a reasonable phasing plan corresponding to key project dates considering NEPA status and ROW acquisition schedules. The Shortlisted Offeror may add any additional major work items to further describe the intended work.**

Intermediate Proposal Remarks: NONE

Review Notes: Revisions made to narrative reflecting removal of ATC 5 – Culvert Lining. Revisions made to Utility Coordination discussion – changes to PTI Comment.

Does Part A provide a Schedule showing the anticipated starting and completion dates of design and construction, the MOT and construction phasing with a minimum time measurement, and a reasonable phasing plan corresponding to key project dates and requirements?

Review Notes: Approach appears to meet minimum requirements.

1. **Approach to designing a cost-effective structure which meets all minimum design requirements. Describe the anticipated structure being proposed.**

Intermediate Proposal Remarks: NONE

Review Notes: Revisions made from Intermediate Proposal to remove the inclusion of ATC 2. Increase spans of 1 and 3 by 6ft (total 12ft).

Does Part A reasonably discuss the Shortlisted Offeror’s intended approach to designing a cost-effective structure, ensuring the structure meets or exceeds all clearance requirements?

Review Notes: Approach appears to meet minimum requirements.

1. **Approach to Maintenance of Traffic, at a minimum (but not limited to)**
2. **The anticipated MOT schemes (cross-over, part-width, contraflow, etc) and anticipated number of and general timing of major phases for I-70,**
3. **The anticipated MOT scheme and phasing for SR-149 construction, and**
4. **The anticipated ramp construction phasing and timing.**

Intermediate Proposal Remarks: NONE

Does Part A adequately describe a reasonable approach to the Maintenance of Traffic discussing MOT Schemes and anticipated number of and general timing of major phases for I-70, SR-149, and ramp construction

Review Notes: Approach appears to meet minimum requirements.

1. **The DBT’s approach to identifying utility risk, coordinating with potential conflicting utilities to reduce impacts and, (if necessary) coordinating the necessary DBT design and construction work of public utilities with the public agencies.**

Intermediate Proposal Comment: While the section is very well written, no discussion on if the intended “avoidance approach” is found not feasible.

Review Notes: Minor revisions made to describe avoidance if possible. No issues with revisions.

Does Part A adequately describe the approach to determining potential utility impacts and the necessary coordination and managing for potential utility impacts?

Review Notes: Approach appears to meet minimum requirements.

1. **Anticipated accepted ATCs being considered for inclusion by the Offeror, and if necessary, changes made to an ATC to address any conditions placed on an included ATC as addressed in the Department ATC Meeting Minutes Response.**

Noted Intermediate Proposal Deficiencies

ATC 2.

i. The Intermediate Proposal states “The integral diaphragm concrete will be poured prior to the deck to prevent uplift”. Final Acceptance of the ATC required “concrete below the deck shall not be used to resist uplift”. These appear to be conflicted. The final ATC approval requirements must be met.

ii. The Intermediate Technical Proposal states “Once the deck, and integral diaphragm, is complete and in place there will be no uplift due to the bridge dead load.” The final ATC approval states “uplift of the beams will not occur during all stages of construction…”. These appear to be conflicted. The final ATC approval requirements must be met.

iii. The Intermediate Technical Proposal states “There is uplift on the beam end based on strength load check if the end diaphragm is not considered. However not only is the end diaphragm in place, but the diaphragm is also tied to the footing (integral abutment details). Therefore, uplift at the beam ends is not possible.” This implies the reinforcing steel between the concrete end diaphragm and the breastwall will be used as a tie-down. The final ATC approval states “Tie-down(s) … will not be used to resist uplift.” The final ATC approval requirements must be met.

ATC 5

i. The Intermediate Technical Proposal states “The results of an HY8 analysis show the lined culverts meet the allowable headwater requirements of headwater control 1006.2.1.A and 1006.2.1.B, but fail to meet the requirement of 1006.2.2.B.” The final ATC approval states “The DBT shall ensure the drainage structures meet final design hydraulic capacity requirements.” These appear to be conflicted. The final ATC approval requirements must be met.

Review Notes: DBT will not be utilizing any approved ATCs. Revisions Acceptable.

Does Part A describe the accepted ATCs being considered for inclusion by the Offeror, and if necessary, demonstrate the changes made to an ATC to address any conditions placed on an included ATC?

Review Notes: Approach appears to meet minimum requirements.

1. **Is Part A materially consistent with Part A as depicted in the Intermediate Technical Proposal, clearly depict any material changes, and if so, are those material changes due to reasonable approach development or due to PTI Evaluation Response comments?**

Review Notes: All revisions were in response to identified deficiencies or due to comments. Revisions are all acceptable and appear to be within the requirements of the bidding documents.

**PART A EVALUTION RESPONSE:** Pass

**Part B: Technical Approach - Plans**

1. **I-70 plan sheets showing centerline and horizontal geometric data; pavement and shoulder edges, bridge limits, anticipated roadway barriers. “Roll plots” are acceptable.**

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

1. Edge of lane across the structures was not depicted.

Review Notes: Added. Acceptable.

Intermediate Proposal Comments

II. No horizontal curve date shown. Assumption is a tangent section.

III. While not specifically required, unclear if the CCTV camera will need to be replaced.

IV. Assumption is the full depth replacement for 70WB is “Begin Project” and “End Project”.

V. Validate the requirements for a trailing Bridge Terminal Assembly EB70

Does Part B contain a I-70 roll plot plan sheets showing centerline and horizontal geometric data; pavement and shoulder edges, bridge limits, anticipated roadway barriers which reasonably adheres to the Bidding Documents?

Review Notes: Approach appears to meet minimum requirements.

1. **SR-149 plan sheets showing centerline and horizontal geometric data. Include**
	1. **pavement edges, lane configurations, lane widths, turn lane locations and lengths,**
	2. **preliminary signal layout (signal support types, signal support locations, signal head locations),**
	3. **likely DBT designed utility relocations (General locations only. Details not required).**

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

I. Curve radii were not depicted at the side roads or drives. Please provide.

Review Notes: Curve radii provided. No noted deficiencies.

Intermediate Proposal Comments

1. Page 12 – Ensure “Begin Project” is correctly noted. Ensure the beginning of the resurfacing is initiated at the proper location.

Review Notes: Begin work extended.

III. Page 12 – Ensure the horizontal deflection at approx. Sta 122+15 meets allowable deflection. Unable to verify with information provided.

IV. Difficult to ascertain whether all work is contained within rights-of-way, as the ROW linework is not shown. Ensure work is within ROW (or proposed ROW).

V. Verify the proposed mast arms are sufficient. While signals generally located correctly, some signal mast arms appear approximately 6’ short, since the signal head is not within the opposing lane viewshed.

VI. Multiple locations for cross walks may require pushbuttons in final design.

VII. Limited information (but also not required) for Relocated Reco or Pilot driveways; difficult to validate criteria. The DBT shall ensure final design meets requirements.

VIII. Ensure the proposed temporary pavement on west side of SR-149 being constructed considers the steep slopes; they are prevalent immediately south and north of bridge overpass.

Does Part B contain a roll plot profile sheets for SR-149 showing centerline and horizontal geometric data, pavement edges, lane configurations, lane widths, turn lane locations and lengths, preliminary signal design (signal support types, signal support locations, signal head locations, and likely DBT designed utility relocations which all reasonably adheres to the Bidding Documents?

Review Notes: Approach appears to meet minimum requirements.

1. **Profile sheets for I-70 and SR-149 showing vertical geometric data. “Roll plots” are acceptable.**

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

I. None

Intermediate Proposal Comments

II. Appears line work on Page 13 depicts work outside of Project Limits. Appears this may be a drafting issue as it appears multiple elevations depicted at the “Ex. WB ELEV”. There appear to be multiple existing elevations depicted under the bridge.

III. While ramp vertical geometry was not specifically requested, ensure the minimum distance between deflections is correct for Ramp D, C, and B. The minimum distance between consecutive deflections is: 50' where design speed is less than 50 mph 100' where design speed is 50 mph or greater per L&D1 Fig. 203-2. The Department acknowledges that this is a transitional ramp area, but the DBT shall ensure this curve is acceptable.

Review Notes: DBT is revising the grade on WB I-70 by approximately +2ft in elevation as compared to existing. Limits of permanent roadway reconstruction extend approximately 600ft to each side of the center of structure. EB Structure raise approximately +0.2ft. Full depth reconstruction for EB approximately 200ft from center of structure.

Does Part B contain a roll plot profile sheets for I-70 and SR-149 showing vertical geometric data which reasonably adheres to the Bidding Documents?

Review Notes: Approach appears to meet minimum requirements.

1. **Bridge plans for I-70 bridges – including preliminary site plan, transverse section, abutment details, foundation type, horizontal and vertical clearance, and anticipated bearing types.**

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

1. BDM 309.3.8.5 requires a closure pour in the deck if the differential deflection between phases is greater than 1/4 in.

Review Notes: Note include demonstrating closure pour.

1. Single lane width to be a minimum of 12ft, with a toe to toe width of 16ft in a single lane MOT phase (Page 18, Phase 1 removals shown incorrectly).

Review Notes: Revisions made to demonstrate required width.

III. Ensure PCB barrier anchorage is correct. RM-4.2 requires 2 anchors on the traffic side. (Example: Page18 Rt Bridge, Phase 1 Removal shown incorrectly).

Review Notes: The plans have been revised to show a 6” offset from the toe of parapet to the cut line. This is only acceptable if SCD PCB-91 is used. In final design, the DBT will need to either uses PCB-91 with the current MOT configuration or revises the MOT configuration to achieve at least a 1’-0” offset with RM-4.2. Acceptable.

1. If within a two-lane MOT section and a lane is restricted to 10ft, ensure the 10ft lane is the exterior lane. (Page 20, Phase 3 Removal, Rt Bridge shown incorrectly).

Review Notes: Revisions made to demonstrate required width.

Intermediate Proposal Comments

V. Conflict between the intended approach slab work. Plan view and title block conflict. Ensure proper approach slab is installed.

VI. Scuppers are identified as being proposed in the plan view (Rt bridge), however ensuring they are properly located inside the fascia beam and that they satisfy the maximum parapet offset of 13” per ODOT BDM C309.7 and GSD-1-19 cannot be verified. Ensure proper locations of the scuppers, as this may affect beam spacing across this bridge if scuppers are used.

Review Notes: The DBT did not revise due to this comment. ODOT has the sole discretion to accept a non-standard scupper or require modification to the beams/beam spacing in order to comply with SCD GSD-1-19.

Note: With the submission, Form A-1 (which must be signed by the Offeror), states: FORM A-1 PROPOSAL LETTER 5.

 By submitting a Proposal, The Shortlisted Offeror agrees that:

B. The Department’s acceptance of the Proposal does not constitute any statement or determination as to its completeness, responsiveness, or compliance with the requirements of the RFP; and

C. in the event a substantive difference is identified before or after Award, between the terms for the Project offered by the Shortlisted Offeror in its Proposal and any provision in the Bidding Documents, the provisions of the relevant Contract Document will prevail, and the Shortlisted Offeror will not be entitled to alter its Price Proposal, as applicable.

Does Part B contain bridge plans for I70 structures which reasonably adheres to the Bidding Documents and contains

• preliminary site plan

• transverse section

• abutment details

• horizontal and vertical clearances

• bearing details

Review Notes: Approach appears to meet minimum requirements.

1. **Conceptual Maintenance of Traffic plans illustrating conceptual phasing, anticipated access points, cross-over details (if-applicable), MOT typical sections, and MOT spot locations (including the typical section) with reduced lane (less than 11 ft) and/or shoulder widths (less than 2ft).**

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

I. None

Intermediate Proposal Comments

II. Ensure drop-off requirements are met during phased construction on SR-149 if barrels are utilized.

III. Ensure all access is maintained to businesses and ramp, as required. Phasing provided is general, and access phases not depicted (but not requested).

IV. While not requested, the DBT shall ensure vertical and horizontal geometrics are within requirements.

Does Part B contain Conceptual Maintenance of Traffic plans which reasonably adheres to the Bidding Documents and illustrates reasonable and realistic conceptual phasing, anticipated access points, cross-over details (if-applicable), and MOT typical sections??

Review Notes: Approach appears to meet minimum requirements.

1. **Is Part B materially consistent with Part B Intermediate Technical Proposal, clearly depict any material changes, and if so, are those material changes due to reasonable approach development or due to PTI Evaluation Response comments?**

Review Notes: Part is materially consistent with the Intermediate Proposals. Revisions are mostly noted and the revisions are due to comments or required revisions.

**PART B EVALUTION RESPONSE: Pass**

**Part C: DRAFT DBE Open-Ended Performance Plan**

The Shortlisted Offeror shall submit a draft DBE Open-Ended Performance Plan (OEPP) in accordance with requirements of the [Proposal Note Special - DBE OPEN-ENDED PERFORMANCE PLAN (OEPP),](https://construction.dot.state.oh.us/DBKahlig/external/external/Lor90DB/Phase%203%20RFP/RFP%20Documents/_Posted%20through%20Digital%20Paper/243003.pdf) Part B (DBE OPEN-ENDED PERFORMANCE PLAN REQUIREMENTS) Special Proposal Note (aka. OEPP Note). Refer to specific requirements per PN 97. Revisions in accordance of the ITO are also included below.

1. **OEPP Part 1: DBE Utilization Commitment**

Revision per the ITO: OEPP Note Section 1) OEPP Part 1: DBE Utilization Commitment - the date and signature of the Company’s signatory shall be omitted.

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

I. None

Intermediate Proposal Comments

None

Does Part C contain a Draft OEPP Section 1 properly completed (except for a date and company officer signature)?

Review Notes: Meets minimum requirements.

1. **OEPP Part 2:** **DBE Utilization Manager**

The DBE Utilization Manager shall be responsible for DBE outreach, monitoring DBE utilization, DBE utilization reporting, DBE compliance, and updating the OEPP. The OEPP shall include the DBE Utilization Manager’s resume. The DBE Utilization Manager shall be employed by the Contractor and empowered to represent the Contractor in DBE contractual issues. The DBE Utilization Manager is a Key Personnel and shall report to the Contractor Project Manager or higher officer within the Contractor’s organization.

Minimum requirements of the DBE Utilization Manager include:

* 5 years minimum of demonstrated experience with a background and understanding of DBE, Commercially Useful Function (CUF), Federal Contract Compliance requirements, and EEO requirements.
* Experience with the management of federally funded projects, preferably transportation with preferably DBE outreach, DBE recruitment, and DBE development.
* Experience with establishing DBE relationships and/or currently have established relationships with the regional DBE community.

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

III. None

Intermediate Proposal Comments

1. The resume did not clearly demonstrate a background with DBE utilization reporting nor DBE compliance assurance. Assistance with these items can be supplemented with other roles, if necessary. Consider identifying other supporting personnel.

EK: No revisions noted.

Does Part C contain a Draft OEPP Section 2 identifying a DBE Utilization Manager who meets the minimum requirements?

Review Notes: Meets minimum requirements.

1. **OEPP Part 3: DBE Goal Attainment Reporting**

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

V. None

Comments

VI. None

Does Part C contain a Draft OEPP Section 3 which reasonably describes the management methodology and provides all Minimum Requirements as listed?

Review Notes: Meets minimum requirements.

1. **OEPP Part 4: Good Faith Efforts (GFEs)**

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

VII. None

Intermediate Proposal Comments

VIII. Note: Section addressed, however, was named as “Part 5”.

Review Notes: Correction made.

Does Part C contain a Draft OEPP Section 4 which reasonably describes the methodology for documenting DBE goal Good Faith Efforts (GFE) and provides all minimum requirements as listed?

Review Notes: Meets minimum requirements.

1. **OEPP Part 5: Non-Discrimination, Affirmative Action, and EEO**

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

IX. None

Intermediate Proposal Comments

X. None

Does Part C contain a Draft OEPP Section 5 which reasonably depicts a plan for ensuring compliance with the non-discrimination provisions and the affirmative action and equal employment opportunity provisions and provides all minimum requirements as listed?

Review Notes: Meets minimum requirements.

1. **OEPP Part 6: DBE Prompt Payment**

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

XI. None

Intermediate Proposal Comments

XII. None

Does Part C contain a Draft OEPP Section 6 which reasonably depicts a plan for ensuring DBE prompt payment and provides all minimum requirements as listed?

 Review Notes: Meets minimum requirements.

1. **OEPP Part 7: DBE Contracting Notification**

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

XIII. None

Intermediate Proposal Comments

XIV. While sufficiently addressed, additional DBE specific notice for DBE work could have included additional details.

Does Part C contain a Draft OEPP Section 7 which reasonably depicts a DBE Contracting Notification plan and provides all minimum requirements as listed?

Review Notes: Meets minimum requirements.

1. **OEPP Part 8: Commercial Useful Function**

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

XV. None

Intermediate Proposal Comments

XVI. While sufficiently addressed, additional CUF specific validation activities performed by the Prime contractor could improve the section.

Does Part C contain a Draft OEPP Section 8 which reasonably depicts a Commercially Useful Function oversight plan and provides all minimum requirements as listed?

Review Notes: Meets minimum requirements

1. **OEPP Part 9: DBE Work Package Notification**

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

XVII. It appears that only directly notified DBEs will be engaged. Expand on potential methods which non-notified DBEs and potentially other DBEs will be made aware of potential opportunities.

Review Notes: Additional information added. Minimally acceptable.

Intermediate Proposal Comments

XVIII. None

Does Part C contain a Draft OEPP Section 9 which reasonably depicts methods to ensure DBEs are made aware of contracting opportunities and provides all minimum requirements as listed?

Review Notes: Meets minimum requirements

1. **OEPP Part 10: DBE Planned Utilization Forecast**

 Revision per the ITO: OEPP Note Section 10) OEPP Part 10:  DBE Planned Utilization Forecast

* + - Minimum Requirement a.: Anticipated overall value of Work shall be demonstrated as a percentage as compared to overall contract value to the nearest tenth of a percent. Do not provide dollar values.
		- Minimum Requirement b.: Anticipated DBE subcontracting payments and the cumulative value of the payments shall be demonstrated as a percentage as compared to overall contract value to the nearest tenth of a percent. Do not provide dollar values.
		- Minimum Requirement c.: Cumulative value shall be demonstrated as an overall contract value percentage to the nearest tenth of a percent. Do not provide dollar values.
		- Requirement d.: Estimated work type value shall be demonstrated as a percentage as compared to overall contract value. Do not provide dollar values.

Intermediate Proposal Noted Deficiencies

XIX. No representation was provided as required. The Final Technical Proposal shall include an approximate forecast as required.

 Review Notes: Information included. Acceptable.

i. Anticipated overall value of Work to be performed corresponding to Month and Year and the subsequent cumulative value.

Review Notes: Information included. Acceptable

ii. Anticipated DBE subcontracting payments correspond to Month and Year and the subsequent cumulative value of DBE payments.

Review Notes: Information included. Acceptable

iii. A linear graph of the cumulative value information provided in (a) and (b). Format the graph so that the Y-axis corresponds to Value and the X-axis corresponds to Time.

Review Notes: Information included. Acceptable

XX. No approximate Work Type vs Time period of anticipated DBE work was provided. The Final Technical Proposal shall include an anticipated potential DBE worktype and anticipated timeperiod.

 Review Notes: Information included. Acceptable

Intermediate Proposal Comments

XXI. The OEPP, including the graphs and anticipated work, can be revised throughout the life of the project.

Does Part C contain a reasonable forecast (depicted as percentages) of anticipated DBE utilization considering overall value of work, types of work known to be performed by DBEs within the region, 100% achievement of the DBE Goal, and provides minimum requirements as listed?

Review Notes: Meets minimum requirements ll revisions were in response to identified deficiencies or due to comments. Revisions are all acceptable and appear to be within the requirements of the bidding documents.

**PART C EVALUTION RESPONSE: Pass**

**Part D: Form A-1 Proposal Letter**

The Shortlisted Offeror shall submit a completed Form A-1 Proposal Letter as provided in Appendix A.

EK: Provided. Acceptable.

**PART D EVALUTION RESPONSE: Pass**

**PTI SUBMITTAL EVALUATION RESPONSE SUMMARY**

| **Part** | **Description** | **Intermediate Technical Proposal Evaluation** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A | Project Narrative (as described in ITO Section 6.3 A) | Pass |
| B | Technical Approach – Plans (as described in ITO Section 6.3 B) | Pass |
| C | DRAFT DBE Open-Ended Performance Plan (as described as described in ITO Section 6.3 C and PN 97) | Pass |
| D | Form A-1 Proposal Letter | Pass |