POST-CONSTRUCTION REPORT ON A+C CONTRACTING

St. Johns (Portland) Bridge Section

Northeast Portland Highway

Multnomah County

Contract No. 12793

Key No. 9393

Exemption No. 2002-02

APRIL 25, 2006

Prepared by:
Greg K. Gifford, PE
Construction Project Manager
Frank J. Nelson, PE
Bridge Preservation Manager

Table of Contents

1 – Introduction

1-1 Purpose

2 – Background

2-1 The Project

2-2 A+C Contracting

3 – Report

3-1 Scoring of Technical and Price Submittals

3-2 Actual Costs Compared with Original Estimate

3-3 Amount of Any Guaranteed Price

3-4 Change Orders Issued by ODOT

3-5 Savings as a result of using A+C Contracting

3-6 Description of Successes and Failures during Design, Engineering, and Construction

3-7 Objective Assessment of Use of Alternative Contracting Process

4 – Summary

4-1 How Can the Use of the A+C Contracting Process Be Improved

5 – Appendices

5-1 St Johns Bridge A+C Exemption Order Approving Use

5-2 St Johns Bridge A+C SEP-14 Approval by FHWA for Use

5-3 St Johns Bridge Project Special Provisions Detailing A+C

5-4 St Johns Bridge Technical Score Summary

5-5 St Johns Bridge Technical Score Detail Sheets

1 – INTRODUCTION

1-1 Purpose

This report is an end of construction project evaluation of the A + C alternative bidding method used for the St. Johns Bridge project. This report is required under Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 00279.103 "Evaluation of certain public improvement projects not contracted by competitive bidding" for any public improvement contract in excess of $100,000. It is also required by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), under its Special Experimental Project No. 14 (SEP-14) Innovative Contracting, which approved Federal participation using this contracting method. The Exemption Order and the approved SEP-14 Work Plan are included as Appendices 5-1 and 5-2, respectively.

2 – BACKGROUND

2-1 The Project

This bridge rehabilitation project included removing all of the coatings on the suspension spans and west truss spans, exposing the bare metal and repainting the spans with a high-tech, long-wearing three-part coating system; removing the cracked and worn deck and failing joints and replacing them with a new reinforced deck made composite with the stringers; building a new drainage system, which includes new inlet boxes poured into the curb and sidewalk, 8-inch collection piping and storm water treatment prior to discharge into the Willamette River; refurbishing the handrails to meet the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) 10,000 pound horizontal force requirement while maintaining the historic style; replacing the 1950 style lighting with replicas of the originals; waterproofing the main cables with a state-of-the-art elastomeric over-wrap; replacing the damaged suspender cables and adding traction rods to reduce the stress on the cables.

2-2 A+C Contracting

A + C contracting is an alternative method of bidding whereby the contractor's technical qualifications (the "C" component) are measured and weighed along with their price bid for the

project (the "A" component). Bidders were first prequalified to participate in the process. In addition, on this project, incentives/disincentives were used to reduce the duration on a portion of the project, but were available to all bidders and were not considered during the evaluation and award process. Appendix 5-3 provides the actual special provisions, which described the process to the bidders.

3 – REPORT

3-1 Scoring of Technical and Price Submittals

Ten potential bidders submitted for special prequalification. Eight were determined qualified under the pass/fail system used for this step in the award process. Two appealed to the Department of Administrative Services (DAS), which, in a formal hearing, found they had clearly not met the advertised requirements. Of the eight prequalified bidders, four submitted Technical and Price Bids, the second step in the award process. These are technically proposals; however, bids, bidders and bidding have been used in place of proposals, proposers and submitting proposals throughout the contract documents and this report, as being more familiar to the contracting community.

The Price Bids were kept sealed and secure while the Technical Evaluation Committee scored the Technical Bids, in accordance with the scoring system that was contained in the solicitation special provisions. The Committee consisted of the Procurement Office specialist for Best Value and Special Prequalification, the AGC Representative (a retired contractor,) the project Lead Bridge Design Engineer, the Consultant Lead Bridge Design Engineer, the Bridge Preservation Engineering Manager, and the Construction Project Manager. A bidder's score on an element was the average of the six evaluators to even out slight differences in evaluation, rounded upwards to a whole number from 1 to 100. Having the AGC Representative as a member both provided the contracting community a direct view on the process and enabled immediate resolution of questions resulting from apparent differences in language between designers and constructors.

For the coating work, the single most expensive item, all of the firms selected the same subcontractor, Long Painting, and received high technical scores for this element. For the cable work, three selected the same subcontractor, and received high technical scores. The fourth, and ultimately successful firm, stated in their technical proposal that the prices they were quoted were "unreasonable" and elected to self-perform the work, taking a significant cut in their

technical score. ODOT expected that this firm would likely lower their price significantly to make up technical points lost on the price scoring. This occurred as expected.

The Technical Scores for the four firms are provided in Appendices 5-4 and 5-5.

The Price Bids were opened publicly and Price Scores calculated in accordance with the solicitation special provisions. Basically, the average of the bids was assigned 50 points. Then, for every $200,000 below the average, a bidder received 1 additional point up to a maximum of 100. For every $200,000 above the average, a bidder lost 1 point down to a minimum of zero points.

The Technical, Price and Final Scores are given in the table below:

Bidder	Technical Score Range 0 to 100	Bid Price	Price Score Range 0 to 100	Final Score Range 0 to 200
Max J Kuney	47	30,982,565.95	100	147
Kiewit Pacific	63	41,372,845.00	54	117
Mowat	69	42,140,835.44	51	120
Traylor Pacific	70	54,928,026.00	0	70
Average of Bids		42,356,068.10	50	
Engineer's Estimate		32,394,621.45		

ODOT had reasonable concern that the highest A+C score had a bid price so far below the competing firms' prices. A detailed bid review was conducted to ensure that bid price was reasonable, even though the price was just 4% below the Engineer's Estimate. Finding the bid reasonable, recommendation was made to the Transportation Commission to award to Max J Kuney Co. of Spokane, Washington.

Consideration was given to modifying ODOT's price scoring system to prevent bidders who knew they would receive low technical scores from making up the point difference in the price score by bidding very low. Any of these firms would have done a good job on this project. If we had had such a mechanism, we would have forced the public to pay a $10 million premium to have a suspension bridge contractor from the east perform the cable work. ODOT's conclusion

is that concern over the cable work resulted in too high a point value placed on qualifications for that work and that restrictions on the price component of the bid is not in keeping with the concept of "best value" for the public.

This highlights a point for future uses of this contracting method: care must be given to avoid having a specialty subcontractor or supplier extract an unwarranted premium because only they can provide the expertise required.

3-2 Actual Costs Compared with Original Estimate

The St. Johns Bridge project was awarded on January 17, 2003 to the Max J. Kuney Company (MJK) of Spokane Washington. Additional parameters to control the work were imposed on the bidders as follows:

- No work to be done below the deck within the Peregrine falcon nesting zone between March 15 and June 30,
- Completion of "Specified Reconstruction Work" in spans 13 through 15 within a 49 day window, beginning when the contractor began full bridge closures, and
- Complete all work by June 30, 2005.

A $20,000 per day incentive/disincentive was placed on the 49 day closure, with a maximum of $300,000 on incentives and no maximum on disincentives.

Below is a comparison of the actual project construction costs as compared with the original engineering project estimate.

Engineering Estimate

Project Cost.....$32,394,621.45
Anticipated Items.....$ 2,131,367.35

Total Cost (Excluding Contingencies).....$34,525,988.80

Low Bid Results

Project Cost (A) (contract amount).....$30,982,565.95

Final Costs **(as of 4/24/06)**

Project cost (A) breakdown:

(1) Bid Item Works:	$35,302,446.79	*Corrected Estimate*
(2) Contract Change Orders:	$2,195,475.43	*includes 1 pending*
(3) Force Account Work:	$194,958.26	
(4) State Force Order Work:	$ 1,305,786.31	*includes 1 pending*
(5) Adjustment & Bonuses:	$ 174,816.31	
Total costs part (A):	**$ 39,173,483.10**	

Construction Engineering ..... $ 2,960,439.15 (7.45%) ($2,721,457 to date)

Notice to proceed was given to MJK on February 11, 2003. MJK began work on the 49 day closure on July 11, 2003, completed the closure nine days early, and received a $180,000 incentive for early completion.

Due to extra work assigned by ODOT the project was extended to November 4, 2005. Second notification was issued effective November 18, 2005, but was not sent to the Contractor until March 30, 2006. A Final Inspection was performed on October 6, 2005

3-3 Amount of Any Guaranteed Price

This project does not have provisions on the "Guaranteed Maximum Pricing" on the work bid items or liquidated damages.

3-4 Number of Change Orders Issued by ODOT

To complete the construction within the scope of the design of this project, a number Contract Change Orders (CCO), Extra Work Orders (EWO), and State Force Orders (SFO) were issued as follow: (as of 4/24/06)

85 CCO's for a total cost of:	$ 2,195,475.43	*includes 1 pending*
8 EWO's for a total cost of:	$ 194,958.26	
14 SFO's for a total cost of:	$ 1,305,786.31	*includes 1 pending*
Adjustment & Bonuses:	$ 174,816.31	
Net change in contract work Bid Items	$ 3,871,036.31	

Summary of Changes

The 85 Contract Change Orders issued reflect the exploratory type of work associated with a rehabilitation project of this size, complexity, and nature. The significant Contract Change Orders (> $40,000) are briefly described below:

- CCO #3 – Bridge Drain Pipe Removal ($68,186)
- CCO #9 – Delete Trench Excavation and Trench Rock Excavation ($204,543)
- CCO #15 – Ornamental Rail Bottom Channel ($72,012)
- CCO #18 – Prepare and Coat Stringer Splices in Spans 1 through 9 ($79,323)
- CCO #24 – Spire Repair ($237,713)
- CCO #25 – End Blocks ($105,665)
- CCO #27 – Sidewalk Edge Plate ($149,600)
- CCO #31 – Bridge Rail Castings ($94,054)
- CCO #43 – Cleaning Interior Struts in Pier 11 ($77,762)
- CCO #44 – Sidewalk Repair ($59,617)
- CCO #49 – Lower Rail Tube and Hat Channel ($58,945)
- CCO #52 – Stud Blister Repair ($257,741 – later reduced to $70,543.70)
- CCO #78 – Sidewalk Edge Repair ($327,473.31)
- CCO #80 – Final MJK Settlement ($40,500)

Summary of EWO's

Eight Extra Work Orders were issued during the project for a total of $194,958. The largest Extra Work Order (EWO #4 - $65,591.90) is associated with the exploratory nature of the work as it related to structural steel work. EWO #5 – Diaphragm Removal and Disposal, resulted from a Third Party Neutral decision on the clarity of the plans ($22,050).

Summary of SFO's

Fourteen State Force Orders were issued during the project for a total of $1,305,786. One major SFO (#4) was issued for third-party inspection of the coatings. This $1,100,000 expenditure was an anticipated item. All major SFO's were anticipated items at the beginning of the project.

Adjustment & Bonuses

The bulk of the dollars spent on "Adjustments and Bonuses" is for the contractor's bonus for completing the full closure of the bridge early. The closure was completed 9 days early at $20,000 a day for a total of $180,000. The remaining adjustments were for minor items and had the net affect of lowering the project cost.

Overrun of Contract Work Bid Items

The net change in contract bid items ($3,871,036.31) is primarily due to the need to replace 100 suspender cables instead of the original eleven. The In-Depth Consultant Inspection Contract had found nine which needed to be replaced. This contract included taking the strain off each suspender cable, disconnecting it from the stiffening truss and thoroughly examining it for wear and broken wires. The damage, in most cases was not visible until this disconnection was accomplished. The furnishing and installation of the cables added $4,473,935.65. Without the additional cable replacement the net DECREASE of contract work bid items was $602,899.34. This decrease is largely due to the elimination of trench and rock trench excavation (see CCO #9)

Summary of Change Orders Issued By ODOT

The large number of changes (Contract Change Orders, Extra Work Orders, and State Force Orders) reflects the exploratory nature of rehabilitating a 75 year old bridge. Many changes were a result of trying to upgrade the rail systems to meet current design standards. Also, the project engineering was completed in a very short time frame and did not allow full inspection or understanding of a very complex suspension bridge.

3-4 Savings as a Result of Using A + C Contracting

Direct Savings: The use of A + C contracting anticipates that a skilled contractor will be selected and assist the agency through a very complex project, shorten the amount of time needed to complete the project, and have less changes and claims. As stated above, the large

number of changes was due primarily to the exploratory nature of the project and not the lack of contractor's handling of specialized work. The contractor also would have completed the project well ahead of schedule if not for the extra and added work, again the result of the type of project. Finally, the contractor, due to their experience, was able to negotiate successfully with ODOT on a number of issues and there were no claims against the project while remaining within the adjusted budget.

Indirect Savings: There were indirect savings due to shortening the full closure of the bridge by nine days. While the contractor received $20,000 per day in incentives, the estimated cost to the traveling public is $34,000 per day. The quality of the work will also result in a long life for the structure with minimal disruptions for maintenance.

Total Savings: In addition to the direct and indirect savings the largest savings on the project appear to have come from the lower bid of MJK. In discussions with MJK it appears their lower bid was primarily due to MJK self-performing items of work such as suspender cable replacement and main cable wrapping. By using the A + C contracting method ODOT was able to pre-qualify contractors and then award the project to the contractor with the best value.

3-6 Narrative Description of Successes and Failures during Design, Engineering, and Construction

Design and Engineering

ODOT's Region 1 Project Development Team worked closely with the neighborhoods served by the bridge, in particular St. Johns, to balance staging costs for doing the deck replacement in lengthwise strips versus closing the bridge and rerouting traffic through metropolitan Portland. Similarly, repairs to the Mill St. Bridge, repairs to bridge-style roadway railings, sidewalk and drainage improvements on the Southwestern approach road were included to avoid repetitive disruptions to the communities affected.

The contracting method, including the A+C bidding, the special prequalification and the decision to use incentives and disincentives on the portion of deck replacement that required bridge closure resulted from a Value Engineering Study.

With only one suspension bridge owned by the State, and never having done a significant project for it, ODOT consulted out part of the design effort. OBEC Consulting Engineers, of Eugene, Oregon, was tasked to analyze the suspension span to ensure it would remain stable with one

third of the bridge deck removed for replacement. OBEC was also tasked with reviewing the recommendations made by then Steinman Consulting Engineers in their inspection report regarding cable repairs and corrosion protection of the main suspension cables. OBEC performed this very professionally and integrated their work very smoothly into ODOT's design efforts to replace the deck, sidewalks, drainage system and overall coating system.

On OBEC's recommendation, ODOT requested and was approved to use a proprietary thermal set elastomeric over-wrap of the main cables, CableGuard by D.S. Brown, with drain ports to allow removal of any trapped moisture. This was the second full installation in the nation.

Because of this project, and the fact that this bridge has been the home of a pair of peregrine falcons who have been very successful in fledging young birds, ODOT developed a Falcon Management Plan for metropolitan Portland, which has become a model for both accommodating this recovering species and accomplishing needed work on now five bridges, on which falcons have taken up residence.

As the existing coating system was lead based paint, which had not been touched since the State Legislature transferred custody from Multnomah County to ODOT, at the County's request, ODOT had its environmental consultant, Mason, Bruce & Girard develop and conduct a river bottom sampling plan to establish lead levels at randomly selected points upriver, downriver and under the bridge, before, during and after the project. This was the second of what has now become a standard feature of lead removal projects.

ODOT's Traffic Management section contributed a very significant idea in removing the "cobra head" style highway lighting fixtures and installing replicas of the original lighting on the bridge rails and towers, using downward focused light emitting diode (LED) lamps. This has resulted in returning a truer historic look to the bridge and a more pedestrian friendly atmosphere, while reducing glare and electricity costs.

State-of-the-art inspection safety cables were added to the main suspension cables and tower tops as well as new safety ladders up the tower spires.

One element was missed. The massive concrete piers under the main towers and the concrete piers under the Northeastern spans were not pressure washed and sealed.

Overall, the objective of making this an omnibus rehabilitation project with the full support of the State Historic Preservation Office was achieved.

Construction

Workload & structure of PM's office: At the beginning of the project the PM Office was solely focused on this project, including the PM, two Assistant PM's, a Project Coordinator focused on roadway and electrical issues, and a Project Coordinator acting as the lead on all field related issues. Inspectors were assigned to shifts and rotated on a regular basis. All inspectors were assigned specific responsibilities divided by bid items. This crew had recently completed the I-5 @ Hwy 217/Kruse Way project and was accustomed to aggressive, fast-paced work.

Additional Resources: An outside firm, George Ardizzone Contracting (GAC) was hired to provide most of the coatings inspection under the direction of ODOT staff. This was awarded competitively, using an indefinite quantity contract, with award based on the lowest "hourly flat rate." ODOT specified the qualifications of personnel provided and the requirement to monitor all coating work, with a minimum guarantee of hours provided. ODOT retained the professional responsibility to decide what to do if work was found "not in compliance," but had the ability to always have technically competent personnel present during the Construction Contractor's coating work.

Partnering: ODOT and the contractor achieved Formal Partnering for the project.

Outside Consultants: In addition to the firm utilized for coatings inspection ODOT hired consultants for Construction Engineering support (OBEC), Construction Schedule review and analysis (DEA), and a Third-Party Neutral (Bill Peckham), who provided non-binding, dispute resolution assistance. In light of MJK's election to self-perform the cable work, the contract with OBEC was modified to include inspection of the preparation and installation of the CableGuard elastomeric over-wrap on the main suspension cables.

3-6 Objective Assessment of the Use of Alternative Contracting Process

Did the project deliver the high quality expected of a contractor team especially experienced in the work items and overall supervision of such a complex project?

The special prequalification process assured that ALL bidders would be capable of performing the work. The A + C bidding further refined the process to obtain the best value. MJK provided a high quality project manager who was very capable of leading the team and keeping the project on schedule. By self-performing several important work tasks – main cable wrapping and

suspender cable replacement – the contractor minimized potential conflicts with subcontractors. The high quality of work performed will ensure a long life for the bridge.

Was the project an environmental success minimizing environmental impact below stated requirements, in particular to perigrine falcons residing on the bridge?

MJK worked closely with the ODOT Construction Office and project biologist to ensure the environment was not adversely affected. Due to the extra and added work the contractor had to deal with three nesting seasons of the Peregrine falcons. They provided assistance and access for biologists to manipulate the nest during all three seasons. They were also careful to stay out of closed areas during restricted periods and quickly rectified minor intrusions. MJK's strict safety policies and practices on the bridge also minimized potential hazardous spills and releases. When one of their subcontractors spilled a small amount of hazardous material in a drainage that led to the Willamette River, MJK responded promptly to resolve the issue, not waiting for the subcontractor.

Did the project meet schedule and budget with a minimum of modifications, in particular planning and scheduling based issues?

The project had two significant issues that greatly affected the overall schedule. Both were out of the contractor's control. During the course of the project it was discovered that 100 suspender cables needed replacement, not the 11 anticipated in the bid documents. Replacement routinely took two days per cable. The added cables COULD have taken an additional 180 working days. MJK was able to modify their planning to complete the project just 35 days over the original schedule.

Since the bridge had little time to adjust to a normal stance after work was completed final inspections observed severe cracking at the edge of the sidewalks in the suspension span. Bridge designers were consulted and concluded that the extreme movement of the bridge during construction had propagated the cracking. The contractor and ODOT worked together to define a repair procedure. These repairs extended project completion by just over two months beyond the adjusted time.

The contractor's schedule was well planned and they followed it closely. Each change was promptly added into the schedule and adjustments to the work force were made to keep the project on schedule.

Did the contracting community generally accept use of best value contracting on this project and are they open to its future use on unusual projects highly dependent on contractor skill and expertise?

Ten Contractors had been sufficiently interested to complete a Special Prequalification submittal. Eight were determined qualified and four followed through with A+C Bids. There were no oral or written comments provided at the public hearing. There were no protests of the A+C process or award.

Prior to completion of the project, ODOT invited the Associated General Contractors, Oregon and Columbia River Chapter (AGC) to discuss use of Best Value Contracting on an upcoming difficult project, the Martin Luther King (MLK) Boulevard Viaduct Replacement Project. A "Contractability Review" conference was held on June 14, 2005, to go over the proposed contracting method, scoring system and draft specifications with representatives from four of the five interested and capable firms. The fifth did not attend, but confirmed they wish to be part of the process and would submit a Best Value proposal. The St. Johns Contractor, MJK, was one of the attendees. On ODOT's side were the Procurement Officer, Bridge Engineering, Region Area Manager and Project Manager, Specifications Engineer and other technical specialists. All of the Contractors actively participated and contributed a number of ideas to improve the specifications, which have been incorporated. All accepted that this was an unusual and difficult project this contracting method was appropriate. All five Contractors stated they planned to participate. At the public hearing on August 2, 2005, no oral or written comments were received for that project and an exemption from low bid contracting has been issued.

These are clear indications that the contracting community accepts this form of contracting, as practiced by ODOT, for unusual and difficult projects. No assumptions should be made about other uses.

4 – SUMMARY

4-1 How Can the Use of the A + C Contracting Process be Improved

Starting the process earlier is always an improvement. Developing the A+C contract can and should occur concurrently with the development of plans and specifications. The key steps are:

- Recognize that the project is unusual and difficult, at initiation of design.
- Develop a draft plan, including first cut at scoring and bid specifications.
- Work with the Contracting Community and market the approach. ODOT started this process July 1, 2002, five months prior to submission of bids.

- Develop the Exemption Order permitting this contracting method.
- Discuss the intended use of Best Value with FHWA Oregon Division.
- Hold the Public Hearing at approximately Advance Plans Stage.
- If Prequalification is used, make Advance Plans available with package.
- Advertise the Prequalification and/or Best Value project at this point.
- Ensure Ad specifies date Price and Qualifications Bids must be SUBMITTTED.
- Do not permit changes in price after submission.
- Select Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC): 1 from Procurement, 1 from AGC mandatory, 1 from Region and 2 from Design recommended, for a total of 5.
- Develop specifications and scoring system; provide to Counsel, TEC and FHWA.
- Avoid radical changes, as these have a serious negative impact on bidders.
- At Final Plans, start setting up the Bid Opening and Scoring rooms, dates.
- Have scoring forms, plans, computer and final score calculation program ready.
- Plan on four submittals taking 14 hours to score.

The balance between the contractor's bid score (A) and contractor's technical qualifications (C) is complex and unique to every project. On this project, the contractor selected had the lowest technical score, but also had the lowest bid amount by quite a substantial margin. If the "C" score had been more heavily weighted another contractor with a higher bid may have gotten the job and savings would not have been as high.

With prequalified contractors the State is first assured that all contractors can perform the work. Then total value can be further assessed with A + C bidding. Prequalification for specialty work should be seriously considered for use with A+C bidding. An advantage noted on this project, was the bidders had nearly complete plans and specifications for two months to plan their work prior to bid, as opposed to after award.

Major projects like the St. Johns Bridge are highly complex with many hidden issues. Preliminary engineering must be allowed time to flush out as many issues as possible and then the issues need to be shared with the contracting community through high quality plans and specifications.

ODOT conducted a detailed prebid meeting and walkthrough with prequalified contractors to explain expectations and answer questions. Potentially ODOT could have encouraged the Contractors to be more actively involved, and this might have lead to identification of problems and solutions much sooner.

Contractors have expressed an interest in having staging being a scored element that they provide, as opposed to an ODOT designed and required item. On the next project, ODOT is severely constrained on the staging, but did add a third component, Technical Approach, to enable recognizing the value to the public of better methods to accomplish the work required. If this proves valuable, ODOT may move to a three component Best Value Contracting method.

In all contracting for public work, there is an inherent responsibility to provide the "best value." The "project owner" is acting as an agent for the public, and should consider, to the extent possible, not just the expected contract price, but also, the probable final construction cost, the

cost of adequately administering the project, the life-cycle costs to operate and maintain the work after completion, and the functional, quality, aesthetic and "community" values the public may place on the work. Calculating these is neither easy nor uncontroversial. Best Value Contracting offers a flexible mechanism to take into account all that can be reasonably identified and determined important in selecting the Contractor. It also offers great flexibility in setting the relative weights of the factors used (A + C + D + ...) With this flexibility comes the responsibility to determine the appropriate weighting and scoring.

Exemption Number 2002-02

FINDINGS OF FACT
SUPPORTING AN EXEMPTION FROM COMPETITIVE BIDDING REQUIREMENTS AND THE USE OF THE "A PLUS C" COMPETITIVE SELECTION PROCESS

Before the Director of Transportation
Of the State of Oregon

In the Matter of the Exemption Request for St. Johns) (Portland) Bridge Section, Northeast Portland) Highway, U.S. Route 30 Bypass, Multnomah County) for the Oregon Department of Transportation)	FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

ORS 279.015 (1) requires, with certain exceptions, that all public contracts be based on competitive bidding and, under ORS 279.029, be awarded to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. ORS 279.015(2), as amended by the 2002 First Special Session, Oregon Laws 2002, Chapter 3 (HB 4010), permits the Director of Transportation to grant exemptions to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) from the requirement for competitive bidding upon the approval of specified findings. ORS 279.011(5) defines "Findings" and identifies specific information to be provided as part of the agency justification. Under ORS 279.015(3) a public hearing must be held before the findings are adopted, allowing an opportunity for interested parties to comment on the draft findings.

The hearing for review of these findings was held at 10AM on September 20, 2002, at the 1st Floor Public Meeting Room of the Oregon Department of Transportation, Region 1 Headquarters Building, 123 NW Flanders Street, Portland, Oregon. Neither written nor verbal comments were submitted for consideration.

ORS 184.610 to 184.733 describes the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the responsibilities of the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC), the Director of Transportation and Agency managers. ORS 366.400 authorizes ODOT to enter into all contracts deemed necessary for the construction, operation, maintenance, improvement, or betterment of highways. ORS 279.712(2)(c) provides ODOT with independent contracting authority for public improvement contracts relating to maintenance or construction of highways, bridges, parks or other transportation facilities. ORS 366.505 describes the composition and use of the Highway Fund, including Federal funds.

FINDINGS OF FACT

I.
BACKGROUND

1. Project Description: St. Johns (Portland) Bridge Section

   ODOT proposes to award a contract on, or about November 29, 2002, to accomplish this project. The estimated value of the contract is between $25 and $35 million dollars. The project is to be funded with a combination of funds provided by the Federal Highway Administration and matched by state funds. The contract will include the following major work components:

   - Replace the entire deck; sidewalks; and deck joints
   - Replace the roadway lighting with historically accurate lighting
   - Replace the electrical system
   - Replace the deck drainage system
   - Replace frozen truss bearings
   - Replace suspender cables as required after inspection

- Replace the lead based paint with new paint system
- Restore, strengthen, and reinstall historic rail
- and Over-wrap main cables with an elastomeric thermal set tape

The St. Johns Bridge is a long-span suspension bridge with steel towers, steel stiffening truss, and steel truss approach spans on concrete piers. It is the only suspension bridge on the State Highway system and is of historical and cultural significance. The bridge carries the U.S. Route 30 bypass, which connects the NW Portland Willamette Riverfront industrial area with the North Portland community of St. Johns. It is used by both commuter and commercial traffic and carries over 20,000 vehicles per day. This structure was built in the early 1930's and is over 70 years old. The structure is 1168.5 meters long with a roadway width of 12.2 meters.

This is the major traffic carrying facility in the area and carries both local and through traffic. After an ODOT Traffic Management Technical Advisory Committee investigated the issue, the ODOT Project Development Team decided traffic will be limited to one lane in each direction for the majority of the construction time, in order to keep this important transportation link open as much as viable. This introduces a complicated staging requirement for the contractor, which would not have been needed if the structure could have been closed to traffic.

2. Nature of Business

ODOT, formerly the Oregon State Highway Department, has been contracting for road improvement projects since 1914. In recent years, the average number of projects per year has been approximately 150 to 200, at a cost of approximately $200 to $300 million. The OTC is mandated to "encompass economic efficiency" (ORS 184.618), and therefore ODOT strives to continually improve its procurement and project delivery approaches. One of those approaches is the "A plus C" Method of Bidding described below.

3. Circumstances

This is a request to the Director of Transportation, on behalf of ODOT, for a contract specific exemption from competitive bidding requirements. The exemption would allow ODOT to solicit bids for the construction project described above using the "A plus C" Method of Bidding (also known as Price Plus Technical Qualifications Bidding or Best Value Contracting). The contract would also contain incentives and disincentives, although they are not related to the method of procurement.

The St. Johns Bridge Project involves a large variety of work items, some of which are significantly technical, specialized and complex. Replacing the deck and damaged suspender cables is a complex process and must be performed carefully so as not to damage the bridge. Only a small number of suspension bridges have had an elastomeric wrap applied in significant amounts on their main cables, as called for in this procurement. Strict rules on hazardous materials and environmental issues impact the project due to the removal of lead-based paint. There are extremely few historic suspension bridges nationwide and no known restoration projects which have included all of the work items in this contract. This puts the contractor in the position of bidding a one-of-a-kind project without the experience to include in their bid all the tasks necessary to perform the work. The consequences of relatively small errors in planning, fabrication, erection, and waterfront work could delay the project work, produce large cost overruns, and have the potential to damage the historic bridge.

Besides the technical complexity, number of work activities, and variety of work activities, the contractor must consider special requirements relating to peregrine falcons residing on the bridge, protected fish species in the Willamette River, nighttime construction noise, and general effects to the surrounding area when developing the intertwining and interdependent work plan.

4. Process

The "A plus C" Method of Bidding is an innovative contracting practice used by federal agencies, including the Department of Defense with generally good results. It is found in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) which provides a number of contracting methods to permit obtaining higher value in contracts. It is located in FAR Part 15 Contracting by Negotiation, Subpart 15.6 Source Selection. The process bases contract award on price and quality. Quality is addressed through one or more factors such as technical excellence, management capability, personnel qualifications, prior experience, past performance or schedule adherence.

While it does not meet the strict requirements of competitive bidding under Oregon law, the method is allowed under federal procurement practices (FHWA Contract Administration Core Curriculum Manual, FHWA, 2001). Oregon (ODOT) to date has used this method once with very positive results on the Lift Span Trunnion Replacement Project on the Columbia River (NB) Section of the Pacific Highway (I-5) in 1997. In "A plus C" bidding the contractor specifies a dollar bid for the work (the "A" component), and fills out a technical qualifications form relating to the factors ODOT will be using to measure quality (the "C" component). Incentives/disincentives have also been added to the resulting contract in seeking to reduce the duration of construction delays on critical major transportation facilities, but are available to all bidders and are not part of the evaluation and award process.

A Special Prequalification has been performed prior to the "A plus C" bidding to ensure that contractors bidding on the St. Johns Bridge Project have performed at least three bridge projects over $7 million dollars with the projects involving certain keys elements. Eight contractors, of ten submitting, have passed the special prequalification and will be allowed to bid.

Upon passing the special prequalification phase, contractors are permitted to enter the "A plus C" contracting phase. In the "A plus C" phase, instead of the pass/fail criteria used in prequalification, contractors are scored partially by their technical qualifications. A contractor who submits a completed project or personnel qualification which is closer to the desired experience for an item scored, receives a higher score for that item than one who submits a project or personnel farther from the desired experience. With this method of bidding, the contractor assembles a team of in-house staff and subcontractors which is as closely matched to the desired capabilities the State is seeking, while still keeping sight of the need to provide a competitive price. The bidding documents provided to the contractors will include the detailed scoring system of the technical qualifications. The technical items scored are considered by ODOT to be directly related to risk factors for project success

Contractors provide two separate sealed bids , the Technical Qualifications Bid and the Price Bid. Although not directly applicable to ODOT, the FAR requires that evaluation of the technical factors be done separately from price evaluation and is followed here as a sound procurement practice. The Technical Qualifications Evaluation Committee, appointed by ODOT to rank Technical Qualifications Bids, will be given only the sealed Technical Bids to score. The Technical Qualifications Evaluation Committee will consist of the ODOT Project Manager, ODOT Structural Designer of Record, ODOT Bridge Preservation Unit Member, ODOT Construction Contracts Unit Member, OBEC Consulting Engineer, and an AGC Member.

The sealed Price will be kept separate. A public bid opening will be held to open the price bids. As each price is announced, the technical qualifications score for the bidder is also announced. After all bids have been opened and announced, the price bids will be scored. The price bid score will be added to the technical qualifications bid score and a preliminary total score will be calculated, cross-checked and announced at the bid opening.

Price is evaluated in reference to the average of prices bid, rather than the original estimate. Logically, prices below the average are desirable, to a point. As price bids drop significantly below the average, they begin to represent a significant risk that the bidder will not be able to deliver the level of quality expected. Bid prices above the average are less desirable. As prices increase, they represent a risk that the public may be paying for greater service or quality than needed.

The average is assigned 50 of a possible 100 points. For this project, the expected range of bids, based on estimates for unusual work and bid history for paint, deck and similar work, is between $25 and $35 million. The actual range could be as much as double this. ODOT has elected to use the broader, $20 million range between probable high and probable low bids from fully knowledgable and experienced contractors faced with this unique project. If a contractor bid $10 million below the average of all bids, he would receive 100 points. If the bid was $10 million above the average, the score would be 0 points. Prices in between would be scaled linearly.

The recommendation will then be made to the Oregon Transportation Commission that award be made to the bidder with the highest final total of technical qualifications score and price score.

The contract provides an incentive payment for each day of early completion for the West End work phase of the project, and a similar disincentive (contractor cost) for each day of late completion. The Incentives/Disincentives amount per day is the Road User Cost and is assigned by ODOT to be $25,000 per day with a maximum incentive of $300,000 for 12days.

The purpose for using this Method of Bidding is to best serve the traveling public by having a knowledgeable and experienced contractor perform this highly technical and complex project with a bid price that will realistically deliver the level of quality required. This will reduce the potential for project work delays and large cost overruns. It will also encourage innovation, but only from the experienced contracting community.

This request for exemption was advertised in the Oregonian on August 25, 2002, the Daily Journal of Commerce on August 27, 2002, August 28, 2002 and August 29, 2002, and the Skanner on August 28, 2002. Additionally, revised ad dates were published in the Daily Journal of Commerce on September 3, 2002, September 4, 2002, and September 5, 2002; and in the Skanner on September 4, 2002.

5. Advantage

The use of this contracting method has been accomplished once by ODOT ensuring very high quality work and an early completion of the Lift Span Trunnion Replacement Project on the Columbia River (NB) Section of the Pacific Highway (I-5). This project was a very difficult and complex project and was completed on a schedule much faster than anticipated. It is expected that similar results can be achieved on this project.

ODOT, and in particular Frank J. Nelson, Bridge Preservation Manager for ODOT, has the necessary capability and experience to ensure that the "A plus C" Bidding Method is successful for this project.

6. Pilot Project

Based upon the success of the Department of Defense with the "A plus C" contracting method, ODOT was allowed a competitive bidding exemption by the Oregon Department of Administrative Services to use it for the Lift Span Trunnion Replacement Project mentioned above. The project was completed September of 1997. An experimental features report on the contracting method used for the project was completed in April of 1998 for the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The results of both the project and the contracting method were deemed a success and subsequent evaluation of the bidding process showed that it can provide a number of benefits on transportation projects. The objective of using the "A plus C" contracting method was to select the construction contractor most likely to successfully deliver this difficult and unusual project with minimum delays, problems and rework, while ensuring a competitive price. All these objectives were met.

The Lift Span Trunnion project mentioned above replaced two of the trunnion assemblies and the cables which connect and support the North counterweight and the North end of the lift span. The trunnions are fracture critical components, and the Northeast trunnion shaft had a small, but growing, fracture. Washington and Oregon State Departments of Transportation agreed on the scope of work and the need to move quickly to replace the fractured trunnion. Both trunnions and all related components were planned to be replaced to reduce the risk of mismatched components and to reduce the total amount of time the bridge would be out of service to both Interstate 5 traffic and Columbia River traffic.

Extreme risks associated with the complexity, unusual fabrication and erection requirements, disruption of service, public safety, and tight scheduling demanded a more certain method than low bid to successfully contract for this work. Special prequalification was seriously considered, but the contract would ultimately still go to the contractor who would cut his cost to the minimum. The "A plus C" method of contracting was used to assure quality to this high risk, difficult and complex project.

The contract had an extremely aggressive schedule, requiring the Contractor to have all the components fabricated, approved and on-site by September 16, 1997, 105 days from award. The Contractor would then have 21 days to replace the components and make the bridge operational again. Finishing earlier than 21 days would result in a bonus of $4,000 per hour. Finishing later than 21 days would result in assessed damages of $4,000 per hour. The Contractor, by developing a radically different approach to support the counterweight and exchanging the components, along with careful selection and training with mock-ups, finished the work in less than seven days,

earning a bonus of $1.4 million. Estimates of savings to local businesses and the trucking industry were greater than this for each day the bridge was returned to service early.

The "A plus C" method of contracting for the Lift Span Trunnion project resulted in fewer traffic issues, fewer safety issues, and less impact on local jurisdictions and businesses than would have been expected from low bid work. The project was completed approximately 2 weeks earlier than the original schedule anticipated. The reduced construction time on this pilot project was extremely beneficial to the traveling public by reducing delays and safety issues. Through the trunnion project, ODOT has learned that quality can be sought and found through a competitive "A plus C" contracting method.

7. Form

ODOT will use its standard invitation to bid solicitation forms modified to facilitate the "A plus C" method. The contract form to be used will be the standard ODOT Construction Contract form, modified to facilitate the "A plus C" acquisition approach. Development of the modified contract has been coordinated with the Department of Justice (DOJ).

II.
FINDINGS REGARDING REQUIRED INFORMATION

ORS 279.011(5) states that: *"Findings" means the justification for an agency conclusion that includes, but is not limited to, information regarding: (a) Operational, budget and financial data. (b) Public benefits. (c) Value Engineering. (d) Specialized expertise required. (e) Public safety. (f) Market conditions. (g) Technical complexity. (h) Funding sources.*

Many of these criteria support the use of the "A plus C" contracting process, as is supported by the following facts:

1. Operational, Budget and Financial Data

The total project construction cost is estimated to be in the range of $25-35 million. Funding will be with federal funds matched by state funds. The "A plus C" method of contracting is a method of ensuring quality, minimizing construction time delays and ensuring critical scheduling is met while ensuring that ODOT will not incur additional costs beyond those budgeted for.

2. Public Benefits

Accurate restoration and effective preservation of a unique historic bridge highly valued by the public.

3. Value Engineering

Value Engineering is encouraged on all projects by ODOT. For this project the "A plus C" contracting method was selected for value engineering (VE) review. The VE Study, published November 2001, recommended ODOT use "A plus C" with a preliminary special prequalification. This method of contracting places a premium on quality, measured in this case by technical qualifications, and should result in more reliable and higher quality value engineering proposals produced for the project. Value engineering has resulted in both initial savings as well as long term savings for other ODOT projects.

4. Specialized Expertise Required

By using this contracting technique ODOT will ensure prospective general contractors have the necessary knowledge and experience to successfully complete the complex St. Johns (Portland) Suspension Bridge project. The contractor must have an excellent understanding of the project and the ability to perform. The majority of work is structural in nature and the final product must be capable of a long service life. The contractor's technical expertise is deemed highly important to the success of this project.

The St. Johns Bridge Project involves significantly technical, specialized and complex work items. The consequences of relatively small errors in erection and waterfront work could delay the project work, produce large cost overruns, and have the potential of damaging the historic bridge.

Due to the flexibility and load distribution of suspension bridges, many work activities on suspension bridges are considered specialized and difficult. The St. Johns Bridge Project contains some of these work activities, the main one is the replacement of the deck in three lengthwise stages. Another potentially risky activity includes the existing suspender cables, which will be removed, inspected and replaced as required due to damage. The main suspension cables will be over-wrapped with an elastomeric thermal set tape to increase corrosion protection. Only a small number of suspension bridges have had this applied, in a significant amount/length, on their main cables. These are complex activities and must be performed carefully so as not to damage the bridge. With relatively few suspension bridges in the nation and only one in Oregon most contractors have not done a project exactly like this, and would not have the experience to include in their bid all the tasks necessary to perform the work. They, or subcontractors, may have performed similar work, which might provide adequate experience, but that must be evaluated.

Other specialized work activities include the removal of the existing lead based paint, preparation of the surface, and the application of a new coating system. This will be performed on the towers, stiffening trusses, floor beams, stringers, suspender cables, cable clamps, and other members and fittings, excluding the main suspension cables which will be over wrapped and the east approach which had this work done in an earlier project. Strict environmental and worker safety regulations concerning the handling and disposal of hazardous materials impact the project due to the removal of the lead-based paint. These impacts include the use of a containment and ventilation system when removing the lead-based paint by abrasive blasting and applying the new coating system. Containment structures must be designed to contain all abrasive blasting debris and prevent overloading the bridge. The shape and orientation is also important since wind loads must be taken into account. The complexity increases if the contractor performs the surface preparation or application of the coating during deck work or inspection of the suspension cables, since loads on the bridge must be kept transversely symmetrical.

5. Public Safety

This project does deal with many of the safety concerns of the structure. As mentioned above, the structure is of importance but is not up to modern standards and is deteriorating. When roadways and structures fail to operate as designed, there is a much greater risk of rear end collisions on the fast moving portions of the bridge or other transportation facility. Also, there is a tendency for drivers to become impatient and make poor decisions. Using the "A plus C" type of contracting method encourages shortening of the project construction period, the period that motorists are exposed to work zone hazards and the potential for accidents due to the construction. This facility carries moderate volumes of high-speed traffic requiring technical expertise to provide safe staging, lane closures and detours during construction. Safe traffic flow must be maintained while construction proceeds. Another critical issue is the safety of the work zone for the public and construction workers. Both bridge users and the contractor's employees are at risk if ODOT cannot adequately separate and protect them. Full deck replacement requires that the current deck must be completely removed, leaving an open gap in the roadway with an 80-foot drop to the hillside below and up to a 200-foot drop at the center of the suspended span.

6. Market Conditions

ODOT does not anticipate any measurable difference in market conditions if this project is bid under the traditional low bid or the "A plus C" method. Unemployment in Oregon is currently much higher than experienced in the past several years. The Governor and the Legislature have encouraged ODOT to contract projects quickly to both take advantage of lower construction prices in the current market and to improve employment. Economic studies have shown that highway construction projects nationally create between 30 and 40 jobs per million dollars spent. ODOT conservatively estimates that highway construction jobs create more than 20 jobs in Oregon per million dollars of project cost. As mentioned, contractors have some experience with "A plus C" bidding in Oregon and have become more accepting of alternative contracting processes, assuring adequate competition.

7. Technical Complexity

For a contractor to be successful in profitably completing this project the contractor must be able to develop and follow an accurate work plan that incorporates the large variety of work items. This project will require

excellent coordination skills, parallel work scheduling, multi shift work, and innovative project management skills. The consequences of relatively small errors in planning, fabrication, erection, and waterfront work has the potential to delay the project work and produce large cost overruns. Integrating the following work activities will present a complex technical challenge: lengthwise deck replacement, lead abatement and paint work, historic lighting installation, rail work, extensive deck drainage system installation, main suspension cables over-wrapped with an elastomeric thermal set tape, suspender cable inspection and replacement in an intertwining and interdependent work plan and following that plan while maintaining two lanes of traffic for the majority of the work.

Besides the technical complexity, number of work activities, and variety of work activities, the contractor must consider special requirements relating to peregrine falcons residing on the bridge, state and federally protected fish species in the Willamette River, restrictions on nighttime construction noise, and general effects to the surrounding area.

8. Funding Sources

As mentioned earlier, this project will be funded with state and federal highway funds, the use of which has been approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission.

III.
FINDINGS ADDRESSING COMPETITION

ORS 279.015(2) requires that an agency make certain findings as a part of exempting public contracts or classes of public contracts from competitive bidding. ORS 279.015(2)(a) requires an agency to find that: *It is unlikely that such an exemption will encourage favoritism in the awarding of public contracts or substantially diminish competition for public contracts.* It is anticipated that competition will be similar to that expected in other projects of this type. ODOT has received early indications of interest and intent to participate from six major contractors, through direct industry contacts. ODOT finds that selecting a contractor through the "A plus C" (price plus technical qualifications) competitive bidding method will not inhibit competition or encourage favoritism. This finding is supported by the following:

1. The competition remains open to all currently qualified bidders. The contracting community is well aware of the winning Contractor's success on the pilot project. ODOT has eight specially prequalified general contractors who will be competing in the "A plus C" bid process, this is more than usual for a bridge rehabilitation project.

2. ODOT has been communicating regularly with both the construction contracting community as well as the engineering consulting community through direct contacts and at scheduled ODOT-AGC meetings about "A plus C" and other unique contracting methods.

3. The "A plus C" evaluation and selection process ODOT intends to employ is summarized above. It is open and impartial.

4. Pursuant to ORS 279.025, the solicitation will be advertised in the Daily Journal of Commerce.

IV.
FINDINGS REGARDING COST SAVINGS

ORS 279.015(2) requires that a public agency make certain findings as part of exempting public contracts or classes of public contracts from competitive bidding. ORS 279.015(2)(b) requires an agency to find that: *The awarding of public contracts pursuant to the exemption will result in substantial cost savings to the public contracting agency or the public for contracts for public improvements (such as this project) described in ORS 279.712(2)(c).* This finding is supported by the following;

ODOT experience with incentives have shown mixed results. Utilizing them without some mechanism to ensure the contractor is fully knowledgeable of the work expected and the level of quality expected can result in quickly, but poorly done, construction. On the other hand, using a contractor selection method, such as "A plus C", there is a

more likely probability that the highly qualified contractor selected can see how to effectively deliver both the level of quality desired and reduce the construction time.

It is anticipated that cost savings will be realized in two ways on the St. Johns Bridge project. First, there will be direct cost savings to ODOT and secondly there will be cost savings to the highway users (the public).

1. Direct Savings – Contractors who are most capable of handling specialized work such as this include in their bid a more comprehensive set of tasks and their costs, than a contractor less familiar with this work, and the necessary planning and quality assurance to avoid causing extra work for their customer. This added bid price is offset by the savings they provide the State in reduced change orders, inspection, and potential claims. While there is an incentive payment anticipated, due to the competition in bidding, only a minimal added direct cost is expected.

2. Indirect Savings – By awarding to a contractor who can realistically meet quality, schedule, and safety expectations, the State and the contractor jointly save motorists using the St. Johns Bridge significant inconvenience and costs for time and fuels approaching $34,000 per day for bridge closures and $6,000 per day for lane reductions. The small increase in price due to the incentive is expected to be significantly less than the savings realized by the public.

3. Total Savings – The potential for total savings to ODOT and the road users (the public) are in the millions of dollars. The cost to achieve these savings is expected to be minimal due to the competitive nature of selecting a contractor.

4. Evaluation Process – This project will be evaluated in accordance with the requirements of ORS 279.103. The "A plus C" contracting method will be evaluated based upon the accomplishment of ODOT's primary objectives, which have led ODOT to its use:

   - Did the project deliver the high level of quality expected of a contractor team especially experienced in the work items and overall supervision of such a complex project?
   - Was the project an environmental success minimizing environmental impact below stated requirements, in particular to peregrine falcons residing on the bridge?
   - Did the project meet schedule and budget with a minimum of modifications, in particular planning and scheduling based issues?
   - Did the Contracting Community generally accept use of best value contracting on this project and are they open to its future use on unusual projects highly dependent on Contractor skill and expertise?

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

An exemption from competitive bidding requirements is justified under the criteria outlined in ORS 279.011(5), findings have been developed in compliance with ORS 279.015(2) and 279.015(3), and ODOT will perform the post project evaluation required by ORS 279.103. Based upon the previously listed findings, ODOT concludes that:

1. **Following the described selection process, an exemption is unlikely to encourage favoritism in the awarding of public contracts or substantially diminish competition for public contracts; and**

2. **Award of a public contract pursuant to the exemption will result in substantial cost savings to ODOT and the public.**

ORDER OF DIRECTOR

An exemption from public competitive bidding requirements is hereby granted to the Oregon Department of Transportation to enter into a contract utilizing the "A plus C" Method of Bidding as described in the preceding findings for the St. Johns (Portland) Bridge Section, Northeast Portland Highway, U.S. Route 30 Bypass, Multnomah County Project. This order is subject to the following conditions:

1. To the extent possible and consistent with this Exemption, this procurement will follow the provisions of ORS Chapter 279 and 291; OAR Chapter 731, Divisions 5 (ODOT Public Contract Rules) and Division 7 (ODOT Public Improvement Contracts).

2. In concert with the Department of Justice (DOJ), objective standards for evaluating proposals shall be established and standards in making a contract award shall be followed.

3. ODOT shall work with DOJ to adapt standard contract language for the contract and shall incorporate into the contract such additional or substitute additional terms that DOJ may determine to be necessary for the protection of the State.

THE FINDINGS OF FACT SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF THIS REQUEST ARE HEREBY APPROVED

9-30-02
Date

Director of Transportation

REVIEWED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

9-30-02
Date

Assistant Attorney General

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

THE OREGON DIVISION
The Equitable Center, Suite 100
530 Center Street NE
Salem, Oregon 97301
503-399-5749
Fax: 503-399-5838

November 26, 2002
IN REPLY REFER TO
HEO.1-OR
BHF-MGS-S123(9)

Mr. Mark E. Hirota, P.E.
State Bridge Engineer
Oregon Department of Transportation
355 Capitol Street N.E., Room 301
Salem, Oregon 97301

RE: St. John's Bridge Special Experimental Program-14 Best Value Contracting

Dear Mr. Hirota:

We are pleased to advise you that your request to use the Best Value contracting concept under the Federal Highway Administration's Special Experimental Program-14 (SEP-14) for the upcoming St. John's Bridge project has been approved. Please note that the approval for the use of Best Value contracting is limited to the St. John's Bridge rehabilitation project.

A copy of our Headquarters Office approval letter is enclosed for your information. It recommends that only one SEP-14 evaluation report (an initial/final report) be prepared for this project given the Oregon Department of Transportation's past experience with this contracting method.

Sincerely,

Dave G. Reilly
Assistant Division Administrator

Enclosure
cc:
ODOT (Kevin Thiel, Tech Services)

JDG/ma

Memorandum

U.S. Department
of Transportation

Federal Highway Administration

Subject: **ACTION:** Design-Build Concept Approval under Special Experimental Project No. 14 Innovative Contracting Practices (SEP-14)

Date: October 4, 2002

From: Dwight A. Horne
Director of Program Administration

Reply to Attn. of: HIPA-30

To: Mr. David O. Cox
Division Administrator
Salem, Oregon

This is reference to Mr. Gernhauser's September 26, 2002, e-mail message that transmitted an SEP-14 work plan for the use of a best-value contracting method for the rehabilitation of the St. John's (Portland) Bridge.

The Oregon Department of Transportation's (ODOT) work plan is satisfactory and the use of the best-value concept for this project is approved. The ODOT's proposal to base the award on a combination of price and technical factors is satisfactory. The technical evaluation factors include experience in the following areas:

major project construction;
deck construction, replacement or rehabilitation;
protection of main suspension cable;
suspender cable rehabilitation;
removal of lead paint and recoating;
historic bridge detailing;
construction management team;

Due to the nature of this project and the past experience with the lift span trunion replacement project, we recommend that only one SEP-14 evaluation report (an initial/final report) be prepared for this best value project.

BUCKLE UP AMERICA

We prefer to keep the approval of SEP-14 best value projects in this office at the present time. Future ODOT projects similar to this will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Please provide this office with a copy of the evaluation report when it becomes available. Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this SEP-14 request. Should you have any questions, please contact Gerald Yakowenko at (202) 366-1562.

BHF · MGS-S123(9)

Oregon
John A. Kitzhaber, M.D., Governor

Department of Transportation
Transportation Building
355 Capitol St. NE
Salem Oregon 97301

FILE CODE:

September 26, 2002

John Gernhauser
Field Operations Engineer
Federal Highway Administration
Oregon Division
530 Center Street NE, Suite 100
Salem, OR 97301

Subject St. Johns Bridge Section
Willamette River & Highway 2 NB, Highway 123 (St. Johns)
Bridge Number 06497
Key Number 9393
Multnomah County

This complex project accomplishes a complete rehabilitation of this historic suspension bridge. In order to assure the success of the contractor undertaking this work, the State is obtaining an exemption, provided by its statutes on contracting, to award based on Price plus Technical Qualifications. The State is requesting Federal participation in this project, and is requesting under the Special Experimental Program-14, authorization to use this contracting method, also called "Best Value" and "A + C" Contracting

Additionally, Oregon is requesting as noted in the enclosed SEP-14 Workplan, approval to use this in subsequent projects which the State deems similarly complex and where the qualification and experience of potential contractors is critical to the success of the project. Our experience with the Trunnion Replacement project has shown that using this technique provides spectacular results with significantly reduced risks. We expect selected use of this technique will actually reduce total construction and ownership costs. At some point, the State would like to consider this a standard contracting method reserved for certain types of projects.

The State has already conducted a special prequalification round and has approved eight of ten firms submitting pass/fail experience for significant bridge projects. The scoring system to be used in the "A + C" round, enclosed in the excerpt from project specifications, is geared to favor contractors and subcontractors with experience directly related to this project. Unlike pass/fail criteria, contractors and subcontractors submitting experience different from this project, but related, can gain reduced points. Even an item scored at zero points does not exclude a contractor or subcontractor; it just makes it more difficult for that contractor team to be selected for award.

Mark E. Hirota, P.E.
State Bridge Engineer

Cc with Enclosures:
Kevin Thiel, ODOT Contracts

FJN/MEH/jah

SPECIAL EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT NO. 14 (SEP-14)
WORK PLAN

Best Value Contracting

For The

St. Johns (Portland) Bridge Rehabilitation Project

And

Subsequent Unusual Projects

Oregon Department of Transportation
Technical Services Branch
Salem, Oregon 97310

July 23, 2002

1.0 Purpose

Best Value Contracting, (also known as Price Plus Technical Qualifications and A + C contracting) is the innovative contracting practice that the Oregon Department of Transportation seeks permission to evaluate on the highly complex St Johns (Portland) Suspension Bridge Rehabilitation Project. ODOT also requests continuing authority to use it on future projects identified as "best-fit" for this process. Exemption to the low bid process shall still be obtained as provided for in Oregon Revised Statutes.

ODOT has used this contracting method once before in the Lift Span Trunnion Replacement Project. It was used to obtain highly specialized manufacturing and construction services to replace the counterweight cable sheaves, shafts, bearings and cable assemblies on the North tower of the historic, circa 1916, North Bound Interstate 5 crossing of the Columbia River (Bridge # 1377A). This project was deemed a success and subsequent evaluation of the bidding process showed that it can provide a number of benefits on transportation projects.

By using this contracting technique we will ensure prospective general contractors have the necessary knowledge and experience to successfully complete the complex St. Johns (Portland) Suspension Bridge project and other complex projects in the future.

2.0 Scope

Best Value Contracting will be used on the St. Johns Bridge Project and other future projects where a contractors technical expertise is deemed highly important to the success of the project.

The St. Johns Bridge is a long-span suspension bridge with steel towers, steel stiffening truss, and steel truss approach spans on concrete piers. It is the only suspension bridge on the State Highway system and is of historical and cultural significance. The bridge carries the U.S. Route 30 bypass, which connects the NW Portland Willamette Riverfront industrial area with the North Portland community of St. Johns. It is used by both commuter and commercial traffic and carries over 20,000 vehicles per day.

Due to the importance of this bridge, it was decided early on not to close the bridge to commuters during the project, introducing traffic staging issues for maintaining traffic on two lanes.

The major elements of the rehabilitation work are as follows:

- The existing bridge deck will be removed and a new concrete deck installed in 3 lengthwise stages.
- The existing suspender cables will be inspected and replaced as required.
- The main suspension cables will be over-wrapped with an elastomeric thermal set tape to increase corrosion protection.

- Removal of the existing lead based paint, preparation of the surface, and a new paint system applied on the towers, stiffening trusses, floor beams, stringers, suspender cables, cable clamps, and other members and fittings, excluding the main suspension cables and east approach.
- The existing sidewalk will be removed and a new sidewalk installed.
- Deck joints, not eliminated with replacement of deck, will be installed.
- The historic rail will be removed, refurbished, modified and replaced.
- The deck drainage system will be removed and an updated system installed.
- Replace frozen truss bearings.
- Replace roadway lighting from current "cobra-head" style to original historic replicas and upgrade the electrical system

Replacing the deck and damaged suspender cables is a complex process and must be performed carefully so as not to damage the bridge. Only a small number of suspension bridges have had an elastomeric wrap applied in significant amounts on their main cables. Strict rules on hazardous materials and environmental issues impact the project due to the removal of lead-based paint. With few suspension bridges and fewer major projects, most contractors have not done a project exactly like this, and would not have the experience to include in their bid all the tasks necessary to perform the work. The St. Johns Bridge Project involves a large variety of work items, some of which are significantly technical, specialized and complex. The consequences of relatively small errors in planning, fabrication, erection, and waterfront work could delay the project work, produce large cost overruns and may even damage the historic bridge.

Besides the technical complexity, number of work activities, and variety of work activities, the contractor must consider peregrine falcons nesting on the bridge, protected fish species in the Willamette River, nighttime construction noise, and general effects to the surrounding area when developing the intertwining and interdependent work plan.

3.0 Schedule

Notice to Contractors of Project Special PreQualification	Aug 20, 2002
Receipt of PreQualification Submittals	Sept 19, 2002
Notification to PreQualified Contractors	Oct 3, 2002
Mandatory On Site PreBid Meeting	Oct 7, 2002
Bids Received and Opened	Oct 31, 2002
Contract Award	Nov 29, 2002
Notice to Proceed	Dec 27, 2002
Project Complete	Jan, 2005
Submit SEP-14 Report	4 months after project completion

4.0 Measures

The success of this approach in executing the project is based upon the accomplishment of our primary objectives, which have led us to its use:

- Did the project deliver the high level of quality expected of a contractor team especially experienced in the work items and overall supervision of such a complex project?
- Was the project an environmental success minimizing environmental impact below stated requirements, in particular to peregrine falcons residing on the bridge?
- Did the project meet schedule and budget with a minimum of modifications, in particular planning and scheduling based issues?
- Did the Contracting Community generally accept use of best value contracting on this project and are they open to its future use on unusual projects highly dependent on Contractor skill and expertise?

5.0 Reporting

For this and subsequent projects using this SEP-14 authorization, ODOT will:
(1) Identify in programming request that best value contracting will be used.
(2) Submit an informal procurement summary within sixty (60) days of receipt of bids for each project.
(3) Provide annual status reports, and continue to invite FHWA involvement on all aspects of the projects.
(4) Provide final evaluation reports within 4 months after each Project Completion.

St. Johns Bridge (Portland) Section
Grading, Structures, Paving, Striping, Signing, Illumination & Signals

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

WORK TO BE DONE

The work to be done under this contract consists of the following on the St. Johns Bridge (Portland) Section of the Northeast Portland Highway in Portland:

1. Remove portions of existing structures
2. Install drainage facilities
3. Install new bridge bearing encasement and joint seals
4. Install new bridge joints and repair bridge joints
5. Place structural concrete
6. Replace suspension bridge components
7. Remove existing paint and repaint structure
8. Construct temporary work platforms
9. Perform cold-plane pavement removal
10. Construct HMAC pavement
11. Place doweled concrete pavement
12. Construct concrete curbs, walks and islands
13. Install traffic control, guidance and illumination devices
14. Perform additional and incidental work as called for by the specifications and plans.

APPLICABLE SPECIFICATIONS

The Specifications, which are applicable to the work on this project, are the 1996 edition of the "Standard Specifications for Highway Construction" and the 1998 edition of the "Supplemental Standard Specifications for Highway Construction".

All number references in these special provisions shall be understood to refer to the Sections and subsections of the Standard Specifications and Supplemental Standard Specifications bearing like numbers and to Sections and subsections contained herein in their entirety.

METRIC PROJECT

Use appropriate metric units only, for measurements, submittals, shop drawings, calculations, materials certifications, delivery tickets, and all other documents submitted for work performed under this contract.

CLASS OF PROJECT

This is a Federal-Aid Project.

SECTION 00110 - TERMS, ABBREVIATIONS, AND DEFINITIONS

Comply with Section 00110 of the Standard Specifications supplemented and/or modified as follows:

00110.30 Metrication - Add the following to the end of this subsection:

English dimensioned items may be substituted for specified metric items if they are equal to or greater in size than the metric dimensioned items. This applies to the following items:

- Luminaire and signal poles
- Anchor bolts
- Fasteners
- Steel plate thicknesses

SECTION 00120 - BIDDING REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES

Replace Section 00120 with the following:

SECTION 00120 - BIDDING REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES

Provisions and Requirements

00120.00 Prequalification of Bidders - The Oregon Department of Transportation (The Department) will prequalify bidders according to OAR 734, Division 10. A bidder shall file for prequalification and pay a fee. Prequalification shall be renewed March 1 of each year. Make application for prequalification on standard forms furnished by the Department's Construction Contracts Unit, Room 212 Transportation Building, 355 Capitol St. N.E., Salem, Oregon 97301-3871 (telephone (503) 986-3877). Return the completed application and fee to the Construction Contracts Unit.

Contracts will only be awarded to bidders who, at the time of bid opening, are prequalified in the Class of Work named in the special provisions, except that a bidder whose prequalification has been revoked or revised as provided in ORS 279.041(3) may also be eligible for award if the project was advertised prior to the revocation or revision. The Department will consider a bid from a bidder whose complete application for prequalification has been received by the Department's Construction Contracts Unit at least 10 calendar days before the opening of bids. Submit bids in the same company name used on the prequalification application.

The Department will regularly evaluate the performance of Contractors on its projects.

Add the following:

00120.01 Special Prequalification - Only those bidders who were notified that they were accepted and who meet the special prequalification requirements for this project may

submit bids. The special prequalification requirements were advertised on August 12, 2002. Any bid submitted by firms not accepted under this special prequalification will be rejected.

00120.02 Price Plus Technical Qualifications - This project will be awarded using the "Price plus Technical Qualifications" Method of Bidding (also known as A plus C Bidding and Best Value Contracting). Price plus Technical Qualifications Bidding takes into account price and the technical qualifications of the bidders. The bidder specifies a dollar bid for the work (the "A" component) and provides required information and documentation regarding technical qualifications used to measure quality/qualifications of the bidders (the "C" component). The bid used for award consideration is based on the highest combined Technical Qualifications Bid score and Price Bid score (see Sections 00125 and 00130).

This project has been exempted from competitive bidding requirements pursuant to an exemption granted under Oregon law by the Oregon Director of Transportation. Because this project is not subject to competitive bidding requirements, and due to the Price plus Technical Qualifications method of bidding/contracting used for this project, the solicitation for this project is in the nature of a request for proposal. Therefore, in the Standard Specifications, Supplemental Standard Specifications, Special Provisions, solicitation documents and other provisions, requirements and documents for this project, references to the terms "bid", "bids", "bidder" and "bidders" shall be deemed respectively to be references to and to have the meaning of the terms "proposal", "proposals", "proposer" and "proposers".

00120.05 Requests for Bidding Documents - Bidders shall obtain bidding documents from the Contractor Plans office, Room 28 Transportation Building, 355 Capitol St. N.E., Salem, Oregon 97301-3871; Phone (503) 986-3720. Each request shall include both the name of the person ordering or obtaining the bidding documents, and the name of the entity intending to use the bidding documents. (The name of the entity intending to use the bidding documents will be added by the Department to the list of holders of bidding plans.) Bidders are cautioned that only bidding documents obtained from the Department's Contractor Plans office may be used to submit bids.

Informational plans and specifications (not for bidding) and copies of the Oregon Standard Specifications may also be purchased at the Contractor Plans office.

The plans, which are applicable to the work to be performed under the contract, bear title and date as follows:

"Grading, *Structure*, Paving, *Striping,* Signing, *Illumination* & Signals
St. Johns Bridge (Portland) Section
Northeast Portland Highway
Multnomah County
November 2002"

00120.10 Bid Booklet - the bid booklet will be in two separately-bound parts, the Technical Bid part and the Price bid part, which together constitute the bid booklet. The bid booklet may include, but is not limited to:

- Bidder's checklist

- Bid section
- Appendix, which includes required time-sensitive forms, DBE information, sample forms, and other informational pages

The bid section includes all pages after the bidder's checklist and before the appendix. The bid section may include, but is not limited to:

- Description and location of the proposed project
- Time, date, and location for opening bids
- Project completion time
- Class of project (i.e., Federal-Aid or State)
- Class of Work
- Identification of applicable supplemental Standard Specifications and special provisions
- Bid statement
- Certificate of non-collusion
- Certificate of noninvolvement in any debarment and suspension (for Federal-Aid projects)
- Certificate regarding lobbying activities (for Federal-Aid projects)
- Certificate of residency (for State projects)
- Certificate of compliance with Oregon tax laws
- Bid schedule
- Identification of bidder(s) and sureties
- Limiting statements (see 00120.50)
- Bid signature page
- Bid bond form
- Technical Qualification Schedule of Items
- Technical Qualification Score Sheet

Depending on the class of project, other certificates or statements may be bound within the bid section. Plans, specifications, and other documents referred to in the bid section will be considered part of the bid.

00120.15 Examination of Work Site and Bidding Documents - Before submitting a bid, bidders shall carefully examine the site of the proposed work, the bid booklet, plans, and specifications. Submission of a bid will be considered proof that the bidder has examined the site and bidding documents and understands the conditions to be encountered in performing the work and all requirements of the contract.

The Department or its employees will not be responsible for loss or unanticipated costs suffered by the bidder because the bidder failed to become fully informed about all conditions of the work.

Any explanation or interpretation of plans and specifications needed by the bidder shall be requested in writing through the Engineer. The request shall be made in sufficient time for the Department's reply to reach all bidders before submission of the bidder's bid. Oral explanations or interpretations given before receiving bids for a project will not be binding. To be binding, interpretation of the plans and specifications by the Department shall be made by written addendum furnished to all holders of bidding plans according to 00120.30.

Both the prime contractor and painting subcontractor(s) shall have attended a previously-advertised mandatory pre-bid meeting held at the St. Johns Bridge on October 7, 2002.

00120.16 Material and Equipment Substitutions - When the contract specifies certain materials and equipment, the bidder shall include those materials or equipment in the bid unless the Engineer has granted approval to substitute through an addendum. The procedure for requesting approval is as follows:

(a) Written Request - If the bidder wishes to use materials or equipment other than those specified, send a written request to the Engineer, at least seven calendar days prior to opening of bids, including complete descriptive and technical information on the proposed materials and equipment.

(b) Functional Similarity - Materials and equipment proposed for substitution shall be similar in design and equal in quality and function to those specified.

(c) Manufacturer's Information - If manufacturers' brochures or information is needed, submit three copies of each with all pertinent information clearly marked.

(d) Differences - Specifically note all differences between the specified materials or equipment and the proposed substitute.

(e) Cost - Where a substitute will result in alteration of the design or space requirements, or any other modifications to the plans, include in the substitution request all items of cost for the revised design and construction.

(f) Notification of Holders of Bidding Plans - If the Engineer approves any proposed substitution, such approval, and any modifications necessitated to the design and construction by the substitution, will also be sent to all holders of bidding plans through an addendum. Unless the Engineer has approved substitutions of materials or equipment prior to opening of bids, be responsible to furnish the items specified in the contract. Substitution after award is addressed in 00180.31(b).

00120.17 Use of Department-Owned Land for Staging or Storage Areas - The Contractor may use Department-owned property for staging or storage areas, subject to the following limitations:

(a) Within Normal Right-of-Way Limits - If approved by the Engineer, the Contractor may use available property within the normal right-of-way limits for the purpose of constructing improvements under this contract. Where the Department owns, or has rights to, other adjacent properties in the project area, "normal right-of-way" is limited to a line drawn across that property connecting the normal right-of-way limits on either side of the property.

(b) Outside Normal Right-of-Way Limits - The Contractor may not use Department-owned property outside of normal right-of-way limits for this project without the approval of the Engineer.

If approval is obtained before submitting the bid, use of the property will be at no cost to the Contractor, or at a cost stated by the Engineer upon granting approval.

If approval is not obtained before submitting the bid and the Contractor wishes to use Department-owned property outside the normal right-of-way limits, use of the property may be approved by the Engineer, but the Contractor will be assessed fair market value, as determined by the Engineer, for use of the property.

(c) Restrictions on Use - Comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations pertaining to use of Department-owned property, and:

- Do not cause unreasonable impacts on traffic and other facility users.
- Clean up all hazardous materials deposited by, or resulting from, Contractor operations.
- Be responsible for all costs involved with use of the property.

00120.20 Interpretation of Quantities in Bid Schedule - Quantities appearing in the bid schedule are approximate and are provided only for comparison of bids. The Department does not warrant that the actual individual items, amount of work, or quantities will correspond to those shown in the bid schedule. Payment to the Contractor will be made only for actual quantities of work performed and accepted or materials furnished as required by the contract. Quantities of work to be done and materials to be furnished may each be increased, decreased, or omitted as provided in 00120.30 and 00140.30.

00120.25 Subsurface Investigations - If the Department or its consultant has conducted subsurface or geologic investigations of the proposed work site, the results of the investigations may be shown in written reports. If reports have been prepared, copies will be available at the Engineer's office. If the Department has retained subsurface samples, they will be available for inspection. Make arrangements for viewing the samples through the Engineer's office.

The availability of subsurface information from the Department is solely for the convenience of the bidder and shall not relieve the bidder or the Contractor of any risk, duty to make examinations and investigations as required by 00120.15, or other responsibility under the contract. It is mutually agreed to by all parties that:

- The written report(s) are not part of the contract.

- The subsurface investigations made by the Department are for the purpose of obtaining data for planning and design of the project.

- The boring data represents, with reasonable accuracy, conditions and materials found in specific borings at the time the borings were made.

00120.30 Changes to Plans, Specifications, or Quantities before Opening of Bids - The Department reserves the right to issue addenda making changes or corrections to the plans, specifications, or quantities. Only holders of bidding documents obtained from the Department's Contractor Plans office, who have been identified by the Department as holders of bidding plans, as required by 00120.05, will be notified of these addenda by mail, delivery service or electronic facsimile (FAX) sent to the bidder's address or FAX number as it appears in the Department's files. The Department will not be responsible for failure of bidders to receive addenda sent to the address or FAX number on file. Holders of informational plans will be notified by mail.

Bids may be rejected if opened and found by the Department not to be based on addenda issued before bids were opened.

00120.40 Preparation of Bid:

(a) General - Do not alter, in any manner, the documents bound within the bid section. Complete the certifications and statements included in the bid section of the bid booklet according to the instructions. When the bidder's authorized representative signs the bid signature page, the bidder agrees to all certifications and statements contained in the booklet. Entries on documents in the bid section shall be in ink or typed. Signatures and initials shall be in ink.

Submit two separate bids for this project. The first bid is identified as the "Technical Bid", and requires the completing of Department-supplied forms identified as "Technical Qualifications Schedule of Items". The "Technical Qualifications Schedule of Items" details project-specific qualifications and experience required of bidders.

The second is identified as the Price Bid and requires submittal of those items in 00120.10, with the exception of those identified as "Technical Bid". A bid bond is not required if another type of bid guaranty is given (see 00120.40(e)).

When the bid is assembled for submittal, properly complete and bind all documents in the bid section, as designated in 00120.10, between the front and back covers of the bid book, except the bid bond is not required if another type of bid guaranty is given (see 00120.40(e)).

(b) Bidding Considerations - Refer to the following subsections for requirements that may affect bidding considerations:

- 00120.80, Preference for Oregon Resident Bidders
- 00130.80, Restrictions on Commencement of Work
- 00160.20(a), Buy America
- 00160.20(b), Buy Oregon
- 00180.20, Subcontracting Limitations
- 00180.21, Subcontracting

(c) Bid Schedule Entries - Using figures, fill in all blank spaces on the bid schedule. For each bid item, enter unit price and the product of the unit price multiplied by the quantity given. Also enter total amount of the bid obtained by adding amounts for all bid items. Each erasure, change or correction of the bidder's entries in the bid shall be initialed.

(d) Bidder's Address and Signature Pages - Include in the bid the address to which all communications concerning the bid and contract should be sent. The bid shall be signed by:

- An individual
- One or more members of a partnership
- One or more officers of a corporation
- An agent of the bidder authorized by certified corporate minutes or power of attorney to execute contracts

- One or more members, officers, or agents (as identified above) of each firm participating in a joint venture

(e) Bid Guaranty - Accompany each Price Bid with a guaranty in the amount of 10% of the total amount of the Price Bid. The guaranty shall be either a surety bond or security in the form of a cashier's check or certified check made payable to the Department (see ORS 279.027(3)).

If a surety bond is submitted, use the Department's standard bid bond form, which is included with the bid booklet. Submit the original of the bond with the surety company's seal affixed.

Acceptable surety companies are limited to those authorized to do business in the state of Oregon.

Forfeiture of bid guaranties is covered by 00130.60, and return of guaranties is covered by 00130.70.

(f) Disclosure of First-Tier Subcontractors - Within four working hours of the time Price Bids are due to be *submitted* for a public improvement for which your bid exceeds $75,000, all bidders shall submit to the Department, on a form provided by the Department, a disclosure identifying any first-tier subcontractors that will furnish labor or labor and materials and whose contract value is equal to or greater than:

- 5% of the total project bid, but at least $15,000, or
- $350,000, regardless of the percentage of the total project bid.

For each subcontractor listed, state:

- Name of the subcontractor
- The category of work the subcontractor will be performing

If no subcontracts subject to the above disclosure requirements are anticipated, a bidder shall so indicate by entering "NONE" or by filling in the appropriate check box. For each subcontractor listed, bidders shall provide all requested information. An incomplete form will be cause for rejection of the bid.

The Subcontractor Disclosure Form may be submitted either:

- By filling out the Subcontractor Disclosure Form included in the bid booklet and submitting it together with the Price Bid at the time and place designated for receipt of Price Bids,
- By removing it from the bid booklet, filling it out and submitting it separately to Kevin Thiel, Construction Contracts Unit Manager, at the address or FAX number given in the bid booklet, within four working hours of the time designated for *receiving* Price Bids, or

- By e-mail using the form provided on the Department's web site named in the bid booklet, within four working hours of the time designated for *receiving* Price Bids.

Subcontractor Disclosure Forms submitted by any method will be considered late if not received by the Construction Contracts Unit within four working hours of the time designated for *receiving* Price Bids.

E-mail submissions shall be fully compatible with Word for Windows©. The Department is not responsible for partial, failed, illegible, or partially legible FAX transmissions or e-mail submissions, and such forms may be rejected.

Bids not in compliance with the requirements of this subsection will be considered non-responsive.

00120.45 Submittal of Bids - The Technical Bids may be submitted by mail or parcel delivery service to Kevin Thiel, Construction Contracts Unit Manager, at the address given in the bid booklet, in a sealed envelope provided by the Department or a reasonably similar envelope marked with the words "Technical Bid", the name of the project, and the words "To Be Opened Only by Authorized Personnel" on the outside. If a delivery or courier service is used, place the envelope containing the Technical Bid inside the delivery or courier service's envelope. Technical Bids shall be received at the address given in the bid booklet prior to *9:00 a.m.* local time on *December 3*, 2002.

The Price Bids may be submitted by mail or parcel delivery service to Kevin Thiel, Construction Contracts Unit Manager, at the address given in the bid booklet, in a sealed envelope provided by the Department, or a reasonably similar envelope marked with the words "Price Bid", the name of the project, and the words "To Be Opened Only by Authorized Personnel" on the outside. If a delivery or courier service is used, place the envelope containing the Price Bid inside the delivery or courier service's envelope. Price Bids shall be received at the address given in the bid booklet prior to *9:00 a.m.* local time on *December 3*, 2002.

Bids submitted after the times set for receiving bids, or bids that do not consist of both "Price Bids" and "Technical Bids" will not be opened or considered.

Only the information provided on or before *December 3rd* will be passed to the Technical Qualifications Evaluation Committee. The Department will use this information to score the Technical Bids according to Section 00125. The Department assumes no responsibility for the receipt and return of late bids.

00120.50 Submitting Bids for More than One Contract - A bidder who wants to submit bids for more than one contract at an opening of bids may fill in one of the "Limiting Statements" in the bid as follows:

- If the volume of work is to be limited by the number of contracts, fill in Limiting Statement No. 1.
- If the volume of work is to be limited by the total of the contract amounts, fill in Limiting Statement No. 2.

If a bidder makes a limiting statement on any bid, the statement will apply to all bids submitted by the bidder at that opening. Should limiting statements be made on more than one bid, and the statements differ, the lower limiting number or amount shall govern.

Make no qualifications of the bids which reserve the right to choose, from among two or more contracts, the contract or contracts that the bidder will accept. Selection of contracts will be made by the Department.

00120.60 Revision or Withdrawal of Bids - Information entered into the Price Bid booklet by the bidder may be changed after the Price Bid has been submitted, provided that:

- Changes are prepared in accordance with the instructions found in the bid booklet
- Changes are received by the Department's Construction Contracts Unit (Room 212) or Second Floor Business Unit (Room 200) before *5:00 p.m.* local time on *December 3, 2002*
- The bid number is included

These changes shall be submitted in writing or by electronic facsimile (FAX) transmission, and signed by an individual authorized to sign the bid.

A bidder may withdraw its bid after it has been delivered, if the written withdrawal request, submitted on the bidder's letterhead, including the bid number, and signed by an individual who is authorized to sign the bid, is received by the Construction Contracts Unit before 9 a.m. local time on *December 6*, 2002. Proof of authorization to sign the bid shall accompany the withdrawal request.

00120.65 Opening and Comparing Bids - The Technical Bid scores will not be publicly opened. The Technical Qualifications Evaluation Committee (see 00125.30) will open and score the Technical Qualifications submitted by the bidders using the Technical Qualifications Score Sheet contained in the bid booklet. This scoring will be completed and signed by the committee members prior to the date and time set for opening of Price Bids.

Price Bids will be opened and the total price for each Price bid will be read publicly on *December 6*, 2002. The Technical Bid scores will also be read publicly at the same time. Bidders and other interested parties are invited to be present.

Once all Price Bids have been opened and read, the Price Bids will be scored using the Price Criteria in Section 00125. The Price Bid Score will be added to the Technical Bid Score and a final preliminary total score obtained and announced. The final total score will be used to determine the successful bidder and award will be made subject to all the requirements herein and the concurrence of the Oregon Transportation Commission.

All preliminary scores will be published by the close of business on the next working day. The scoring will be done in accordance with Section 00125.

00120.70 Rejection of Bids - A bid will be considered irregular and may be rejected if:

- The bid section provided is not used or is altered

- The bid is incomplete or incorrectly completed
- The bid has unauthorized additions, deletions, alternate bids, or conditions
- The bid is submitted on documents not obtained directly from the Contractor Plans office, or is submitted by a bidder who has not been identified by the Department as a holder of bidding plans, as required by 00120.05
- A member of a joint venture and the joint venture submit bids for the same project. Both bids may be rejected.
- The bid has entries not typed or in ink, or has signatures or initials not in ink
- Each erasure, change, or correction is not initialed
- The price per unit cannot be determined
- The Department finds that it is in the public interest to do so (ORS 279.035)
- The bid guaranty is insufficient or improper
- The standard bid bond form is not used or is altered
- The Oregon Construction Contractors Board registration number and expiration date are not shown on the bid if required by the bid document. This requirement applies to State-funded projects, with the exception of aggregate production and landscape projects. (Not required on Federal-Aid projects.)
- A disclosure of first-tier subcontractors, if required under 00120.40(f), is not received within four working hours of the time bids are due to be submitted, or the disclosure form is not complete.
- The Department determines that any of the unit bid prices are significantly unbalanced to the potential detriment of the Department.
- A bidder did not submit both Price Bid and Technical Bid.

00120.80 Reciprocal Preference for Oregon Resident Bidders - This subsection applies only to contracts for projects financed without federal funds.

Complete the certificate of residency provided by the Department in the bid booklet. Failure to properly complete the form will be cause to reject the bid.

As used in the certificate of residency and this subsection, "Resident bidder" means a bidder who has:

- Paid unemployment taxes or income taxes in the state of Oregon during any of the 12 calendar months immediately preceding submission of the bid,
- A business address in the state of Oregon, and

- Certified in the bid that the bidder qualifies as a resident bidder

"Nonresident bidder" means a bidder who is not a resident bidder as defined above.

In determining the lowest responsible bidder, the Department will, for the purpose of awarding the contract, add a percentage increase to the bid of a nonresident bidder equal to the percentage, if any, of the preference given to that bidder in the state in which the bidder resides (ORS 279.029(2)). The percentage increase applied in each state will be published on or before January 1 of each year by the Oregon Department of Administrative Services. The Department may rely on these percentages without incurring liability to any bidder (ORS 279.029(3)).

It is understood that this increase will be applied to determine the lowest responsible bidder only and will not cause an increase in payment to the Contractor after award of the contract.

00120.90 Disqualification of Bidders - Any of the following reasons may be sufficient to disqualify a bidder and cause its bid(s) to be rejected:

- More than one bid for the same work from an individual, partnership, corporation, or joint venture under the same or different name

- Evidence of collusion among bidders. Participants in collusion will be found not responsible, and may be subject to criminal prosecution.

- The reasons cited in ORS 279.037

A bidder will be disqualified if the bidder has:

- Not been prequalified as required by 00120.00 and 00120.01

- Been declared ineligible by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor and Industries under ORS 279.361

- Not registered with the Oregon Construction Contractors Board or been licensed by State Landscape Contractors Board before submitting a bid (ORS 279.025(2)(k) and 671.530). The bidder's registration number and expiration date shall be shown in the bid form, if requested. Failure to furnish the registration number, if requested, will render the bid non-responsive and subject to rejection. (Not required on Federal-Aid projects.)

SECTION 00125 - SCORING OF BIDS

Section 00125 which is not part of the Standard Specifications is included in this project by special provision.

St. Johns Bridge (Portland) Section
Grading, Structures, Paving, Striping, Signing, Illumination & Signals

00125.00 Scope - This project will be awarded to the bidder who meets the requirements of Section 00120 and receives the highest combined Technical Qualification Bid *score* and Price Bid score based on the criteria contained in this section.

00125.02 Submittals - Using Department-supplied forms, submit documentation for two successfully-completed projects where the scope included rehabilitation or construction of a 600 m long, two-lane or larger highway bridge, including the coordination of subcontractors. Verify successful project completion. Scoring will be according to the following:

Major project construction experience

Projects 1 and 2:

Bridge Type	Score
Suspension with span > 125 m	3
Movable span or cable stay and span > 125 m	2
Steel superstructure and span > 50 m	1

Total Project Amount at Completion	Score
Greater than or equal to $ 20,000,000	2
$7,000,000 - $20,000,000	1

Subcontractors coordinated (with names and functions)	Score
More than five	1

Maximum total score for each project: 6

Maximum total for this portion: 12

Deck Construction, Replacement or Rehabilitation Experience

Using Department-provided forms, submit documentation for two successfully-completed projects where the scope of work included construction of a two-lane or larger highway bridge; deck replacement for a two-lane or larger bridge; or placement of a structural overlay on a two-lane or larger bridge. Verify successful project completion.

Projects 1 and 2:

Bridge Type	Score
Suspension highway bridge and span > 125 m	3
Cable stay highway bridge and span > 125 m	2
Steel superstructure highway bridge and span > 50 m	1

Traffic and Staging	Score
Replace deck while maintaining traffic on ext'g bridge	3
Structural overlay while maintaining traffic	2
New deck on new bridge while maintaining traffic on extg. bridge	1

St. Johns Bridge (Portland) Section
Grading, Structures, Paving, Striping, Signing, Illumination & Signals

Deck Surface Area	Score
Equal to or greater than 10 000 m^2	2
Between 5 000 m^2 and 10 000 m^2	1

Concrete Type	Score
Deck or Overlay Microsilica Concrete	1

Incentives	Score
Incentive for Early Completion (documentation attached)	1

Maximum score for each project: 10

Maximum total for this portion: 20

Protection of Main Suspension Cable Experience

Using Department-supplied forms, submit documentation for two successfully-completed projects where the main suspension cables were overwrapped using either the specified system or a similar one; were partially rewrapped or overwrapped with the system specified for this project; were unwrapped and conventionally rewrapped with galvanized wire. Provide documentation of successful project completion.

Projects 1 and 2:

Type of Cable Protection	Score
Complete elastomeric overwrap of main cables	3
Complete wire rewrap and recoat of main cables	2
Partial elastomeric overwrap or rewrap	1

Cable Length Protected	Score
Greater than or equal to 2000 m	2
Between 500 and 2000 m	1

Work Platform Responsibility	Score
Contractor responsibility, PE designed	2
Contractor responsibility, non-PE designed	1

Quality Assurance Plan	Score
Complete QC/QA plan attached with weather moisture, temperature and wind monitoring	2
Supplier-recommended QC/QA plan attached	1

Maximum score for each project: 9

Maximum score for this portion: 18

Suspender Cable Rehabilitation Experience

Using Department-supplied forms, submit documentation for two successfully-completed highway bridge projects where suspension bridge suspender cables, stay cables, counter-weight cables or other bridge wire cables were inspected and replaced. Documentation shall show the method used to support the bridge during changeout. Submit documentation showing successful project completion.

Projects 1 and 2

Cable Type Inspected and Replaced	Score
Suspension bridge suspender cables and span > 125 m	3
Cable stay and span > 125 m or movable bridge counterweight bridge cables	2
Other bridge wire cables	1

Rigging, Temporary Support and Replacement Procedure	Score
Designed by PE for contractor or subcontractor	1

QC-QA Plan for Replacement	Score
Complete project-specific QC/QA plan attached	2
Company generic QC/QA plan attached	1

Maximum score for each project: 6

Maximum score for this portion: 12

Removal of Lead Paint and Recoating Experience

Using Department-supplied forms, submit documentation for two successfully-completed highway bridge coating projects where the scope of work included complete removal of existing lead paint and recoating with a three-coat, *single-component* moisture-cured urethane or similar coating system on a surface area of 23 000 m^2 or greater. Verify successful project completion.

Projects 1 and 2:

Containment (Enclosure) Requirement	Score
Project required SSPC Class 1A containment	2
Project required similar, owner-specified containment	1

Surface Area Prepared and Coated	Score
Greater than or equal to 37 000 m^2	2
Between 9000 m^2 and 37 000 m^2	1

Required Level of Surface Preparation	Score
SSPC 6 commercial blast or SSPC 10 near white with inspection by third party NACE-certified inspectors	2
SSPC 6 commercial blast or SSPC 10 near white with inspection by owner	1

Abrasive System Used	Score
Recyclable steel grit abrasive and/or mineral slag abrasive with additive to render non-hazardous	1

Coating System	Score
Three-coat moisture-cured urethane	1

Bridge Remains Open to Traffic During Lead Removal and Coating	Score
Project required bridge to remain open	1

Spill Prevention and Environmental Protection	Score
Project-specific Plan Attached	1

Maximum score for each project: 10

Maximum points for this portion: 20

Historic Bridge Detailing Experience

Using Department-supplied forms, submit two projects - one involving historically-correct, detailed in-kind rehabilitation of intricate metal and concrete bridge railing and/or rehabilitation/in-kind replacement of historic bridge structural components and a second involving refurbishment or replacement of historic lighting fixtures and poles (to current electrical codes). Verify successful project completion.

Project 1:

Historic Bridge Railing	Score
Rehabilitate in-kind intricate historic metal bridge or pedestrian rail	1

Historic Bridge Railing	Score
Rehabilitate in-kind intricate historic concrete bridge or pedestrian rail	1

Structural Restoration	Score
Rehabilitate historic structural detailing	1

St. Johns Bridge (Portland) Section
Grading, Structures, Paving, Striping, Signing, Illumination & Signals

Structural Replication	Score
Replicate historic structural detailing	1

Maximum score for this project: 4

Project 2

Historic Lighting	Score
Refurbish or replace-in-kind intricate historic light standards and fixtures	1

Maximum score for this project: 1

Maximum score for this section: 5

Construction Management Team Proposed for This Project

Using Department-supplied forms, submit a list of key players, including subcontractors, who have worked on the projects submitted for technical qualification. Resumes may also be attached. Submit a high-level organization chart showing the lines of authority for the required members. The Prime Contractor shall be held to the members and lines of authority shown and submitted. Additional members may be shown, but will not be scored and are not required to be part of the Prime Contractor's management team.

Member 1:

Project Manager/Project Sponsor at Headquarters	Score
Project manager/project sponsor for major project construction experience	1
Superintendent/project manager for deck reconstruction, replacement or rehabilitation experience	1

Maximum points for Member 1 score: 2

Member 2:

On-Site Overall Project Superintendent	Score
Supervisor/superintendent for first project in major project construction experience or deck construction, replacement or rehabilitation experience	1
Supervisor/superintendent for second project in major construction experience or deck construction, replacement or rehabilitation experience	1

Maximum points for Member 2 score: 2

Member 3:

Paint Superintendent	Score
Supervisor/superintendent for removal of lead paint and recoating experience	1
Lead-competent person as defined by SSPC	1

Maximum points for Member 3 score: 2

Member 4:

Cable Replacement Superintendent	Score
Supervisor/superintendent for first project for suspender cable rehabilitation experience	1
Supervisor/superintendent for second project for suspender cable rehabilitation experience	1

Maximum points for Member 4 score: 2

Member 5:

On-site Safety Manager	Score
Supervisor or safety manager for one project submitted for major project construction; deck construction, replacement or rehabilitation; protection of main suspension cables; suspender cable rehabilitation; or removal of lead paint and recoating qualification	1
Safety manager for at least three years	1

Maximum score for Member 5: 2

Member 6

Quality Control Manager	Score
Quality control manager for one project submitted for major project construction, deck construction, replacement or rehabilitation; protection of main suspension cables, suspender cable rehabilitation, or removal of lead paint and recoating qualification	1

Maximum score for Member 6: 1

Member 7

Environmental Compliance Officer	Score
Attached resume shows experience reviewing, checking or investigating construction activities for compliance	1

Maximum score for Member 7: 1

Chart:

Organization Chart	Score
Attached chart shows key subcontractors and authority of QC, Safety and Environmental managers or officials	1

Maximum chart score: 1

Maximum Team Score: 13

Total Possible Technical Qualifications Score 100

00125.30 Technical Qualifications Evaluation Committee - The Technical Qualifications Evaluation Committee shall consist of two technical experts from ODOT Bridge Engineering Section, the ODOT Project Manager, the Design Consultant, a contract expert from ODOT Construction Contracts Unit, and a representative appointed by the Associated General Contractors, Oregon-Columbia Chapter,

00125.75 Criteria for Scoring Bids - The following criteria will be used to score the proposals to determine which proposal is most advantageous to the Department and the general public, as provided by ODOT Exemption Number 2002-02:

(a) Technical Qualification Bid Criteria - The maximum score for technical qualifications is 100 points. This Technical Score is the sum of the following as detailed in the Technical Qualifications Schedule of Items and the Technical Qualifications Score Sheet in the bid booklet:

- Major Project Construction Experience: up to 12
- Deck Construction, Replacement or Rehabilitation Experience: up to 20
- Protection of Main Suspension Cable Experience: up to 18
- Suspender Cable Rehabilitation Experience: up to 12
- Removal of Lead Paint and Recoating Experience: up to 20
- Historic Bridge Detailing Experience: up to 5
- Construction Management Team proposed for this project: up to 13

(b) Price Bid Criteria - The maximum score for the price bid is 100 points. The price bid score will be determined as follows:

Each bidder shall start with a base price score of 50 points.

After reading all Price Bids, the average of all Price Bids submitted will be calculated. *Each bidder's Price Bid shall be compared to this calculated average. If the Price Bid is less than the calculated average plus $200,000.00 and is greater than the calculated average minus $200,000.00, the bid score shall be 50 points.*

Each bidder submitting a Price Bid less than the calculated average price will receive an additional 1 point for each $200,000.00 by which the Price Bid is less than the calculated average price bid up to a maximum of *100* points. Bids $10,000,000 or more below the calculated average price bids will receive the maximum *price* score of 100 points.

Each bidder submitting a Price Bid more than the calculated average price will have one point subtracted for each $200,000.00 by which the Price Bid exceeds the calculated average price *down* to a *minimum* of 0 points. Bids $10,000,000 or more over the average price bid will receive the minimum score of 0.

Any subsequent disqualification or rejection for cause of any bidder will not change the calculated average price.

(c) Combining Price plus Technical Qualifications - To determine the highest combined score, each bidder's Technical Bid Score (0 to 100 points) will be added to his or her Price Bid score (also 0 to 100 points). The final score (0 to 200 points) will be the basis for award.

In the event the highest final score is the same for two or more bidders, the bidder with the highest Technical Bid score among those bidders who tied as provided in this sentence will be deemed to have the highest final score for the purpose of awarding the contract. If two or more bidders have the highest final score as well as the same Technical Bid and Price Bid scores, the bidder with the highest Removal of Lead Paint and Recoating Experience score among those bidders who tied as provided in this sentence will be deemed to have the highest final score for the purposes of awarding the contract. If two or more bidders have the highest final score, the same Technical Bid score, Price Bid score, and the Removal of Lead Paint and Recoating Experience score, the bidder with the highest Deck Construction, Replacement or Rehabilitation Experience score among those bidders who tied as provided in this sentence shall be deemed to have the highest Final Score for contract award.

SECTION 00130 - AWARD AND EXECUTION OF CONTRACT

Replace Section 00130 with the following:

SECTION 00130 - AWARD AND EXECUTION OF CONTRACT

Provisions and Requirements

00130.00 Consideration of Bids - After opening and reading bids, the Department will check them for correctness of extensions of the prices per unit and the total price (see 00120.65). The total of extensions, corrected where necessary, will be used by the Department for award purposes.

5-4 St Johns Bridge Technical Score Summary

Evaluator:	1	2	3	4	5	6	Average	Technical Score
Kiewit Pacific								
Major Project Experience	7	6	6	6	6	6	6.166666667	
Deck Construction Experience	9	8	8	10	9	8	8.666666667	
Suspension Cable Protection	14	11	10	13	9	11	11.33333333	
Suspender Cable Rehabilitation	9	7	6	6	5	4	6.166666667	
Bridge Coating Experience	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	
Historic Detailing Experience	4	3	3	3	5	5	3.833333333	
Construction Management Team	10	7	6	7	9	9	8	
Total Score							62.16666667	**63**
Mowat								
Major Project Experience	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
Deck Construction Experience	13	13	13	14	14	13	13.33333333	
Suspension Cable Protection	14	11	10	13	9	10	11.16666667	
Suspender Cable Rehabilitation	9	7	6	6	5	6	6.5	
Bridge Coating Experience	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	
Historic Detailing Experience	4	2	3	4	2	2	2.833333333	
Construction Management Team	11	11	10	11	11	10	10.66666667	
Total Score							68.5	**69**
Max J Kuney								
Major Project Experience	7	7	7	7	7	8	7.166666667	
Deck Construction Experience	12	11	12	10	11	11	11.16666667	
Suspension Cable Protection	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.666666667	
Suspender Cable Rehabilitation	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.666666667	
Bridge Coating Experience	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	
Historic Detailing Experience	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Construction Management Team	9	9	9	9	7	8	8.5	
Total Score							46.16666667	**47**
Traylor Pacific								
Major Project Experience	11	11	11	10	11	11	10.83333333	
Deck Construction Experience	14	10	11	10	11	10	11	
Suspension Cable Protection	14	11	10	13	9	10	11.16666667	
Suspender Cable Rehabilitation	9	7	6	6	5	5	6.333333333	
Bridge Coating Experience	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	
Historic Detailing Experience	4	2	3	2	3	2	2.666666667	
Construction Management Team	11	10	9	8	12	9	9.833333333	
Total Score							69.83333333	**70**

5-5.1 Technical Score Detail Sheet for Kiewit Pacific, St Johns Bridge A+C

Contractor: Kiewit Pacific																			
Evaluator			1			2			3			4			5			6	
St. John's Bridge Scoring Sheet 12-02	Max Points	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	0	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score
Total Possible FIRM Exp Pts	**46**																		
Major Prjct Constr. Exper.	**6**																		
Project 1																			
Bridge Type	3	1			0			0			0			0			0		
Total Project $ At Completion	2	2	4		2	3		2	3		2	3		2	3		2	3	
Subcontractors Coordinated	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				7			6			6			6	0		6			6
Bridge Type	3	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Total Project $ At Completion	2	2	3		2	3		2	3		2	3		2	3		2	3	
Subcontractors Coordinated	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Deck Constr, Rehab, Replc	**10**																		
Project 1																			
Bridge Type	3	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Traffic and Staging	3	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Deck Surface Area	2	2	4		2	4		2	4		2	5		2	5		2	4	
Concrete Type	1	0			0			0			1			1			0		
Incentives	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				9			8			8			10			9			8
Bridge Type	3	1			1			1			1			0			1		
Traffic and Staging	3	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Deck Surface Area	2	2	5		2	4		2	4		2	5		2	4		2	4	
Concrete Type	1	1			0			0			1			1			0		
Incentives	1	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Protect Mn Susp. Cable Exp	**9**																		
Project 1																			
Type Cable Protection	3	2			0			0			3			0			0		
Cable Length Protected	2	2			2			2			2			2			0		
Work Platform Responsibility	2	2	7		1	4		1	4		1	7		1	4		2	3	
Quality Assurance Plan	2	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				14			11			10			13			9			11
Type Cable Protection	3	3			3			3			3			3			3		
Cable Length Protected	2	1			2			1			1			1			2		
Work Platform Responsibility	2	2	7		1	7		1	6		1	6		1	5		2	8	
Quality Assurance Plan	2	1			1			1			1			0			1		
Suspension Cable Reh Exp	**6**																		
Project 1																			
Cable Type Inspect. & Replac.	3	1			0			0			0			0			0		
Rig, Temp Suppt & Replac Pr.	1	1	4		1	3		0	1		0	1		0	1		0	0	
QC-QA Plan for Replacement	2	2			2			1			1			1			0		
Project 2				9			7			6			6			5			4
Cable Type Inspect. & Replac.	3	3			3			3			3			3			3		
Rig, Temp Suppt & Replac Pr.	1	1	5		1	4		1	5		1	5		1	4		1	4	
QC-QA Plan for Replacement	2	1			0			1			1			0			0		
Remov. Ld Paint & Recoat Exp.	**10**																		
Project 1																			
Containment (Encl.) Require.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Surface Area Prepar. & Coat.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Required Level Surface Prep.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Abrasive System Used	1	1	10		1	10		1	10		1	10		1	10		1	10	
Coating System	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Br Remain Open During Remov	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Spill Prevent. & Env. Protect.	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				18			18			18			18			18			18
Containment (Encl.) Require.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Surface Area Prepar. & Coat.	2	0			1			1			1			1			1		
Required Level Surface Prep.	2	2			1			1			1			1			1		
Abrasive System Used	1	1	8		1	8		1	8		1	8		1	8		1	8	
Coating System	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Br Remain Open During Remov	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Spill Prevent. & Env. Protect.	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 1																			
Historic Br Rail-metal	1	1			0			0			0			1			1		
Historic Br Rail-Cncrt Br	1	1			0			0			0			1			1		
Struct. Restor. Detail	1	0	3		1	2		1	2		1	2		1	4		1	4	
Structural Replication	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				4			3			3			3			5			5
Historic Lighting-**Project 2**	1	1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1	
Subtotal	**42**		**28**	**61**		**22**	**53**		**20**	**51**		**23**	**56**		**22**	**52**		**20**	**52**
CONSTR. MANAGE. TEAM	**13**																		
M1-Pjct Mngr/Pjct Spnsr @ HQ	2	1			0			0			1			0			0		
M2-On-Site Overall Pjct Super	2	2			1			1			1			2			2		
M3-Paint Superintendent	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
M4-Cable Replace Super	2	2			2			1			1			2			2		
M5-On-Site Safety Manager	2	1	10	**10**	1	7	**7**	1	6	**6**	1	7	**7**	1	9	**9**	1	9	**9**
M6-Quality Control Manager	1	1			0			0			0			1			0		
M7-Env. Compliance Officer	1	1			1			1			0			1			1		
Organization Chart	1	0			0			0			1			0			1		
Total Score				**71**			**60**			**57**			**63**			**61**			**61**

5-5.2 Technical Score Detail Sheet for Mowat, St Johns Bridge A+C

Contractor: MOWAT																			
Evaluator			1			2			3			4			5			6	
St. John's Bridge Scoring Sheet 12-02	Max Points	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score
Total Possible FIRM Exp Pts	**46**																		
Major Prjct Constr. Exper.	**6**																		
Project 1																			
Bridge Type	3	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Total Project $ At Completion	2	1	3		1	3		1	3		1	3		1	3		1	3	
Subcontractors Coordinated	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				6			6			6			6	0		6			6
Bridge Type	3	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Total Project $ At Completion	2	1	3		1	3		1	3		1	3		1	3		1	3	
Subcontractors Coordinated	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Deck Constr, Rehab, Replc	**10**																		
Project 1																			
Bridge Type	3	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Traffic and Staging	3	2			2			2			3			3			2		
Deck Surface Area	2	2	6		2	6		2	6		2	7		2	7		2	6	
Concrete Type	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Incentives	1	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Project 2				13			13			13			14			14			13
Bridge Type	3	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Traffic and Staging	3	3			3			3			3			3			3		
Deck Surface Area	2	2	7		2	7		2	7		2	7		2	7		2	7	
Concrete Type	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Incentives	1	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Protect Mn Susp. Cable Exp	**9**																		
Project 1																			
Type Cable Protection	3	2			0			0			3			0			0		
Cable Length Protected	2	2			2			2			2			2			0		
Work Platform Responsibility	2	2	7		1	4		1	4		1	7		1	4		2	3	
Quality Assurance Plan	2	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				14			11			10			13			9			10
Type Cable Protection	3	3			3			3			3			3			3		
Cable Length Protected	2	1			2			1			1			1			2		
Work Platform Responsibility	2	2	7		1	7		1	6		1	6		1	5		1	7	
Quality Assurance Plan	2	1			1			1			1			0			1		
Suspension Cable Reh Exp	**6**																		
Project 1																			
Cable Type Inspect. & Replac.	3	1			0			0			0			0			0		
Rig, Temp Suppt & Replac Pr.	1	1	4		1	3		0	1		0	1		0	1		1	2	
QC-QA Plan for Replacement	2	2			2			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				9			7			6			6			5			6
Cable Type Inspect. & Replac.	3	3			3			3			3			3			3		
Rig, Temp Suppt & Replac Pr.	1	1	5		1	4		1	5		1	5		1	4		1	4	
QC-QA Plan for Replacement	2	1			0			1			1			0			0		
Remov. Ld Paint & Recoat Exp.	**10**																		
Project 1																			
Containment (Encl.) Require.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Surface Area Prepar. & Coat.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Required Level Surface Prep.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Abrasive System Used	1	1	10		1	10		1	10		1	10		1	10		1	10	
Coating System	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Br Remain Open During Remov	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Spill Prevent. & Env. Protect.	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				18			18			18			18			18			18
Containment (Encl.) Require.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Surface Area Prepar. & Coat.	2	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Required Level Surface Prep.	2	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Abrasive System Used	1	1	8		1	8		1	8		1	8		1	8		1	8	
Coating System	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Br Remain Open During Remov	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Spill Prevent. & Env. Protect.	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 1																			
Historic Br Rail-metal	1	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Historic Br Rail-Cncrt Br	1	1			0			1			1			1			1		
Struct. Restor. Detail	1	1	3		0	1		1	2		1	3		0	1		0	1	
Structural Replication	1	1			1			0			1			0			0		
Project 2				4			2			3			4			2			2
Historic Lighting-**Project 2**	1	1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1	
Subtotal	**42**		**27**	**64**		**21**	**57**		**20**	**56**		**24**	**61**		**19**	**54**		**19**	**55**
CONSTR. MANAGE. TEAM	**13**																		
M1-Pjct Mngr/Pjct Spnsr @ HQ	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
M2-On-Site Overall Pjct Super	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
M3-Paint Superintendent	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
M4-Cable Replace Super	2	2			2			1			2			2			1		
M5-On-Site Safety Manager	2	2	11	**11**	2	11	**11**	2	10	**10**	2	11	**11**	2	11	**11**	2	10	**10**
M6-Quality Control Manager	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
M7-Env. Compliance Officer	1	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Organization Chart	1	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Total Score				**75**			**68**			**66**			**72**			**65**			**65**

5-5.3 Technical Score Detail Sheet for Max J Kuney, St Johns Bridge A+C

Contractor: Max J. Kuney																			
Evaluator			1			2			3			4			5			6	
St. John's Bridge Scoring Sheet 12-02	Max Points	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score
Total Possible FIRM Exp Pts	**46**																		
Major Prjct Constr. Exper.	**6**																		
Project 1																			
Bridge Type	3	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Total Project $ At Completion	2	2	4		2	4		2	4		2	4		2	4		2	4	
Subcontractors Coordinated	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				7			7	1		7			7	0		7			8
Bridge Type	3	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Total Project $ At Completion	2	1	3		1	3		1	3		1	3		1	3		2	4	
Subcontractors Coordinated	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Deck Constr, Rehab, Replc	**10**																		
Project 1																			
Bridge Type	3	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Traffic and Staging	3	3			2			3			2			2			2		
Deck Surface Area	2	2	6		2	5		2	6		1	4		2	5		2	5	
Concrete Type	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Incentives	1	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Project 2				12			11			12			10			11			11
Bridge Type	3	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Traffic and Staging	3	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Deck Surface Area	2	2	6		2	6		2	6		2	6		2	6		2	6	
Concrete Type	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Incentives	1	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Protect Mn Susp. Cable Exp	**9**																		
Project 1																			
Type Cable Protection	3	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Cable Length Protected	2	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Work Platform Responsibility	2	1	2		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
Quality Assurance Plan	2	1			0			0			0			0			0		
Project 2				4			0			0			0			0			0
Type Cable Protection	3	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Cable Length Protected	2	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Work Platform Responsibility	2	1	2		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
Quality Assurance Plan	2	1			0			0			0			0			0		
Suspension Cable Reh Exp	**6**																		
Project 1																			
Cable Type Inspect. & Replac.	3	1			0			0			0			0			0		
Rig, Temp Suppt & Replac Pr.	1	0	2		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
QC-QA Plan for Replacement	2	1			0			0			0			0			0		
Project 2				4			0			0			0			0			0
Cable Type Inspect. & Replac.	3	1			0			0			0			0			0		
Rig, Temp Suppt & Replac Pr.	1	0	2		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
QC-QA Plan for Replacement	2	1			0			0			0			0			0		
Remov. Ld Paint & Recoat Exp.	**10**																		
Project 1																			
Containment (Encl.) Require.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Surface Area Prepar. & Coat.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Required Level Surface Prep.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Abrasive System Used	1	1	10		1	10		1	10		1	10		1	10		1	10	
Coating System	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Br Remain Open During Remov	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Spill Prevent. & Env. Protect.	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				18			18			18			18			18			18
Containment (Encl.) Require.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Surface Area Prepar. & Coat.	2	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Required Level Surface Prep.	2	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Abrasive System Used	1	1	8		1	8		1	8		1	8		1	8		1	8	
Coating System	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Br Remain Open During Remov	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Spill Prevent. & Env. Protect.	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 1																			
Historic Br Rail-metal	1	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Historic Br Rail-Cncrt Br	1	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Struct. Restor. Detail	1	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
Structural Replication	1	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Project 2				0			0			0			0			0			0
Historic Lighting-**Project 2**	1	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
Subtotal	**42**		**18**	**45**		**14**	**36**		**14**	**37**		**14**	**35**		**14**	**36**		**14**	**37**
CONSTR. MANAGE. TEAM	**13**																		
M1-Pjct Mngr/Pjct Spnsr @ HQ	2	2			2			2			2			1			1		
M2-On-Site Overall Pjct Super	2	1			1			1			1			1			1		
M3-Paint Superintendent	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
M4-Cable Replace Super	2	0			0			0			0			0			0		
M5-On-Site Safety Manager	2	2	9	**9**	2	9	**9**	2	9	**9**	2	9	**9**	1	7	**7**	2	8	**8**
M6-Quality Control Manager	1	0			0			0			0			0			0		
M7-Env. Compliance Officer	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Organization Chart	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Total Score				**54**			**45**			**46**			**44**			**43**			**45**

5-5.4 Technical Score Detail Sheet for Traylor Pacific, St Johns Bridge A+C

Contractor: Traylor Pacific																			
Evaluator			1			2			3			4			5			6	
St. John's Bridge Scoring Sheet 12-02	Max Points	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score	Score	Category Score	Prjcts 1 & 2 Combined Score
Total Possible FIRM Exp Pts	**46**																		
Major Prjct Constr. Exper.	**6**																		
Project 1																			
Bridge Type	3	3			3			3			3			3			3		
Total Project $ At Completion	2	2	6		2	6		2	6		2	6		2	6		2	6	
Subcontractors Coordinated	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				11			11			11			10	0		11			11
Bridge Type	3	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Total Project $ At Completion	2	2	5		2	5		2	5		2	4		2	5		2	5	
Subcontractors Coordinated	1	1			1			1			0			1			1		
Deck Constr, Rehab, Replc	**10**																		
Project 1																			
Bridge Type	3	3			3			3			3			3			3		
Traffic and Staging	3	3			0			0			0			0			0		
Deck Surface Area	2	0	7		0	3		0	3		0	3		0	3		0	3	
Concrete Type	1	1			0			0			0			0			0		
Incentives	1	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Project 2				14			10			11			10			11			10
Bridge Type	3	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Traffic and Staging	3	3			3			3			3			3			3		
Deck Surface Area	2	2	7		2	7		2	8		2	7		2	8		2	7	
Concrete Type	1	0			0			1			0			1			0		
Incentives	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Protect Mn Susp. Cable Exp	**9**																		
Project 1																			
Type Cable Protection	3	2			0			0			3			0			0		
Cable Length Protected	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Work Platform Responsibility	2	2	7		1	4		1	4		1	7		1	4		1	4	
Quality Assurance Plan	2	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				14			11			10			13			9			10
Type Cable Protection	3	3			3			3			3			3			3		
Cable Length Protected	2	1			2			1			1			1			1		
Work Platform Responsibility	2	2	7		1	7		1	6		1	6		1	5		1	6	
Quality Assurance Plan	2	1			1			1			1			0			1		
Suspension Cable Reh Exp	**6**																		
Project 1																			
Cable Type Inspect. & Replac.	3	1			0			0			0			0			0		
Rig, Temp Suppt & Replac Pr.	1	1	4		1	3		0	1		0	1		0	1		0	1	
QC-QA Plan for Replacement	2	2			2			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				9			7			6			6			5			5
Cable Type Inspect. & Replac.	3	3			3			3			3			3			3		
Rig, Temp Suppt & Replac Pr.	1	1	5		1	4		1	5		1	5		1	4		1	4	
QC-QA Plan for Replacement	2	1			0			1			1			0			0		
Remov. Ld Paint & Recoat Exp.	**10**																		
Project 1																			
Containment (Encl.) Require.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Surface Area Prepar. & Coat.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Required Level Surface Prep.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Abrasive System Used	1	1	10		1	10		1	10		1	10		1	10		1	10	
Coating System	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Br Remain Open During Remov	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Spill Prevent. & Env. Protect.	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 2				18			18			18			18			18			18
Containment (Encl.) Require.	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
Surface Area Prepar. & Coat.	2	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Required Level Surface Prep.	2	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Abrasive System Used	1	1	8		1	8		1	8		1	8		1	8		1	8	
Coating System	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Br Remain Open During Remov	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Spill Prevent. & Env. Protect.	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Project 1																			
Historic Br Rail-metal	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Historic Br Rail-Cncrt Br	1	0			0			0			0			0			0		
Struct. Restor. Detail	1	1	3		0	1		0	2		0	1		0	2		0	1	
Structural Replication	1	1			0			1			0			1			0		
Project 2				4			2			3			2			3			2
Historic Lighting-**Project 2**	1	1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1	
Subtotal	**42**		**30**	**70**		**24**	**59**		**23**	**59**		**25**	**59**		**23**	**57**		**22**	**56**
CONSTR. MANAGE. TEAM	**13**																		
M1-Pjct Mngr/Pjct Spnsr @ HQ	2	1			1			1			2			1			1		
M2-On-Site Overall Pjct Super	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
M3-Paint Superintendent	2	2			2			2			2			2			2		
M4-Cable Replace Super	2	2			2			1			0			2			1		
M5-On-Site Safety Manager	2	1	11	**11**	1	10	**10**	1	9	**9**	1	8	**8**	2	12	**12**	1	9	**9**
M6-Quality Control Manager	1	1			0			0			0			1			0		
M7-Env. Compliance Officer	1	1			1			1			0			1			1		
Organization Chart	1	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Total Score				**81**			**69**			**68**			**67**			**69**			**65**