



**Proposal Evaluation**      **TH 65 Access Improvements**

Date: 3-24-2021

**Evaluation Summary**  
**Average Total**

<b>Kimley - Horn</b>	<b>SRF - SEH</b>	<b>TKDA - HDR</b>	<b>WSB</b>
<b>596</b>	<b>758</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>540</b>

Evaluator	Category	Kimley - Horn	SRF - SEH	TKDA - HDR	WSB
Evaluator 1	1. Work Plan - Schedule	150	210	210	120
	2. Qualifications/experience of personnel	150	210	240	120
	3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer	200	240	320	160
	<b>Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>660</b>	<b>770</b>	<b>400</b>
Evaluator 2	1. Work Plan - Schedule	210	210	240	240
	2. Qualifications/experience of personnel	210	270	240	210
	3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer	280	280	360	280
	<b>Total</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>730</b>
Evaluator 3	1. Work Plan - Schedule	210	210	240	180
	2. Qualifications/experience of personnel	180	240	240	180
	3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer	200	280	360	200
	<b>Total</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>730</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>560</b>
Evaluator 4	1. Work Plan - Schedule	150	240	270	150
	2. Qualifications/experience of personnel	180	270	270	210
	3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer	160	280	320	120
	<b>Total</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>860</b>	<b>480</b>
Evaluator 5	1. Work Plan - Schedule	180	270	270	150
	2. Qualifications/experience of personnel	240	300	270	180
	3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer	280	280	360	200
	<b>Total</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>850</b>	<b>900</b>	<b>530</b>



**Proposal  
Evaluation**

**TH 65 Access  
Improvements**

Consultant: **Kimley-Horn**

Date: 3-24-2021

**Average Score**

**596**

Proposals will be evaluated on the evaluation criteria as stated

Points	Guidance	Factor	Weight
10	Couldn't imagine a better response	Work Plan/Schedule	30%
8-9	Excellent, insightful response	Qualifications/experience of personnel	30%
6-7	More than adequate response	Understanding/Value to Taxpayer	40%
4-5	Adequate response, no special insights		
2-3	Inadequate response		
0-1	Totally inadequate response	Total	100%

**Evaluation Summary**

Evaluator 1		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b> 500		
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Good work plan. Frontage Road final design into construction will be tight. Very detailed project schedule. Good outreach and deliverables plan.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
5	30	150
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Excellent lead PM. Several interchange projects that have related issues.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
5	30	150
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: Understands the importance of the outreach and PEL to NEPA process Provided cost for prelim work at \$992k. Final design is a range of costs from \$2.38-\$4.01M (Hard to follow without hours information)		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
5	40	200

Evaluator 2		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b> 700		
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Plan and schedule meet requirements of the RFP. Also listed agency involvement (work plan spreadsheet).		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
7	30	210
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: 13 member team with 3 subs providing Geo tech, Surveying, and SUE. Project manager is also QA/QC.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
7	30	210
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: Proposal confirms their understanding of the project. Cost estimate does not include specific hours for Final design tasks. Provided range as final alternative has not been determined. Listed 8,556 work hours. Fees range from \$3.5M-\$5.2M		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
7	40	280

Evaluator 3		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b> 590		
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Work Plan identified main elements and signified familiarity with MnDOT process. Clear understanding of the environmental process and steps/tasks. Discussion of their public engagement mapping tool was interesting.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
7	30	210
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Other firms had direct PEL experience- but as a national firm could pull in necessary expertise. Strong experience on interchange design/projects. Less strong on environmental staff/qualifications.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
6	30	180
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: The budget was difficult to understand. Project understanding was there though.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
5	40	200

Evaluator 4		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b> 490		
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: 24 public (property owner, agency) meetings. 26 PMTs, 4 city council, 3 open houses. Environmental schedule seems short, stops after preliminary design (should extend several months into final design) Low level of detail in the provided schedule Generalized work plan, no insight on the project, as expected as they were not involved with the PEL study		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
5	30	150
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Very experienced with most project team members having over 20 years. Recent design experience on TH169/TH282/CR9 and I35W/CR H. Noise analysis has experience with FHWA, but none in MN. No team members were a part of the PEL. A few residents of Blaine on the team		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
6	30	180
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: Cost breakdown was confusing to read. No breakdown of rates (who is working on what) 11% of their work was in the environmental doc (compared to 3-6% for the others). This perhaps indicates not understanding a lot of the environmental work has already been set up in the PEL 25% of their time is in design, I feel this is too low and should be nearly 50% of the time. 2% of their time was in bridge design which is too low considering the number of bridges anticipated to be constructed		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
4	40	160

Evaluator 5		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b> 700		
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Understood results of PEL – decision of freeway/fw-hybrid/fw interchange SUE – Determine cost? Provide a range of costs for final design vs positions & rates Total hours = 8556		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
6	30	180
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Preparation of legal desc/or ROW work Plan proposed (p14) Good presentation & descriptions of project done by KH team Provided detailed & good explanation of the past projects No info on MO/T2/Braun – not in resume section		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
8	30	240
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: Small business group meetings proposal – effective strategy (common interest mtgs) Proposed mobile scanner for survey work – limited to 200ft each way from Centerline Geotechnical @ 109th/117th/99th for bridges – Bridge Const at 109th & 99th Preliminary Layout at 117th for traffic studies Cost = \$1,237,240 +(2,380,000 or 4,012,000) = \$4,443,240 avg		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
7	40	280



**Proposal Evaluation**

**TH 65 Access Improvements**

Consultant: **SRF-SEH**

Date: 3-24-2021

Average Score

758

Proposals will be evaluated on the evaluation criteria as stated

Points	Guidance	Factor	Weight
10	Couldn't imagine a better response	Work Plan/Schedule	30%
8-9	Excellent, insightful response	Qualifications/experience of personnel	30%
6-7	More than adequate response	Understanding/Value to Taxpayer	40%
4-5	Adequate response, no special insights		
2-3	Inadequate response		
0-1	Totally inadequate response	Total	100%

**Evaluation Summary**

Evaluator 1		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>660</b>
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Identified critical remaining work. Schedule is achievable Detailed work plan with appropriate focus on the initial selection of preferred alternative.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
7	30	210
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Very experienced with interchange design and delivery between the two companies. Strong team with interchange and roundabout experience.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
7	30	210
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: Strong understanding of potential utility, wetland, and groundwater impacts. Interesting options being shown for various intersections. (-) Suggesting several tasks should be options offerings. Combined fees at \$4.83M		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
6	40	240

Evaluator 2		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>760</b>
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Proposal clearly defines work plan and schedule to meet the RFP. Listed funding aid, Mitch Rasmussen		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
7	30	210
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Veteran team with excellent experience. Teamed with multiple firms one of which is currently providing services to the city and performing well. 29 member team with 2 subs for Geotech and SUE. Project management lead and deputy. Also provides QA/QC by separate team member.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
9	30	270
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: Proposal confirms their understanding of the project. Cost proposal lists 31,902 hours and a fee of \$4.8M.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
7	40	280

Evaluator 3		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>730</b>
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Good work plan- but traffic/modeling heavy. There is no need for intensive regional modeling work here. Additionally- the outreach was a little heavy as well there may be a need to update the existing Public Involvement Plan, but it made it seem like they were starting from scratch. The 65 PEL established a good amount of outreach in the initial phases of the study.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
7	30	210
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Very experienced and qualified team. SEH has experience with PELs, and a pretty complicated PEL Process on 65/47. However, main experience is in the purpose and need stage. Overall, this team definitely has the experience and qualifications to complete this project. Experience with the traffic component of the team has been positive on past projects.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
8	30	240
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: The project understanding was there, however the value to the taxpayer piece wasn't. The hourly rate was higher than the other competing firm in a few areas. Yet both would be able to accomplish the work well.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
7	40	280

Evaluator 4		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>790</b>
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Schedule is adequate, easy to read, and detailed enough. The work plan is through and detailed and demonstrates a clear understanding. They mention they spent the last 6 months reviewing the PEL - which is good but TKDA had more involvement with the actual PEL as it happened. The result is a completely adequate response with less insight than TKDA.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
8	30	240
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Recent experience on MnDOT roads with TH10/CSAH 83 interchange (SRF) and I-694/Rice St interchange (SEH). Project team has a long resume that includes lots of projects of similar scale. This design team is easily qualified to deliver this project with minimal guidance. Probably the most likely team to be able to deliver the project with the least guidance from local staff.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
9	30	270
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: Cost is nearly at the top of the range of the proposals, \$6M higher than TKDA. However, the cost may be justified in that you pay for more but get more of a turnkey style of management. Percentage of work breakdown seems about right with most time invested in final design (58%), second is bridges (11%) and third into traffic related items (7%). Environmental time was minimal and the lowest of the ranges, maybe underestimated a		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
7	40	280

Evaluator 5		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>850</b>
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Understands the project complexities Provide quality in depth traffic forecasting/TMP/Analysis Provides an enormous amount of hours on project Concerned about soil borings as an additional services Total hours = 31,902		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
9	30	270
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: This team is a turn key team Team has experience on similar large projects – could also lead project Partnership with SEH understands Blaine & Water Quality /CCWD		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
10	30	300
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: \$4.8M/31902 = \$151/hr Construction will avoid substation – design around & avoid Priority w/in Blaine discussed. Address as proof of delivery (translation) Very detailed traffic analysis/tmp/FORECAST => SUCCESS Water Quality & understanding of MPCA & CCWD - partnership		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
7	40	280



**Proposal Evaluation**

**TH 65 Access Improvements**

Consultant: **TKDA-HDR**

Date: 3-24-2021

**Average Score**

**842**

Proposals will be evaluated on the evaluation criteria as stated

Points	Guidance	Factor	Weight
10	Couldn't imagine a better response	Work Plan/Schedule	30%
8-9	Excellent, insightful response	Qualifications/experience of personnel	30%
6-7	More than adequate response	Understanding/Value to Taxpayer	40%
4-5	Adequate response, no special insights		
2-3	Inadequate response		
0-1	Totally inadequate response	Total	100%

**Evaluation Summary**

Evaluator 1		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b> 770		
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Very detailed work plan and estimated hour needs estimating. Listed out all assumptions. Includes B/C analysis work.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
7	30	210
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Team approach. Continues PM by B. Popenhagen through Prelim design & NEPA. Transitions to J. Weaver TKDA for final design & construction. Detailed construction timelines with critical path.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
8	30	240
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: Best understanding as they continue the PEL team. Includes grant management and application services. Total team fee estimate \$3.85M		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
8	40	320

Evaluator 2		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b> 840		
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Proposal clearly defines work plan and schedule to meet the RFP. Listed funding aid, Doug Fischer, (Pg 2). Also listed agency involvement.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
8	30	240
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Veteran team with excellent experience. 34 team members listed with three subs Geotech, SUE, Surveying. HDR team members have led the PEL process. Team has been involved with several funding applications. Project management lead also listed as preliminary design. Also provides QA/QC by separate team member.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
8	30	240
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: Proposal clearly states project understanding. Cost proposal lists 23,332 hours and a fee of \$3.8M.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
9	40	360

Evaluator 3		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b> 840		
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: The work plan and schedule conveyed an understanding of the work that has already been completed- and the work left to be completed. I was glad to see reference to P6 and the B/C analysis. Good command of the schedule, MnDOT process, and environmental process will be key to successful outcomes for this project. This team demonstrates qualities of all three.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
8	30	240
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Two teams had relevant experience related to the Minnesota PEL process. However this phase of the process is new to everyone. This team has the most direct and/or relevant experience. The team also has experience managing and designing locally led projects on MnDOT's trunk highway system. Most teams had that experience as well.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
8	30	240
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: For the project understanding piece- this team had the best command of where we are in the process. However a quick analysis of cost/hours input also demonstrated a good value to the taxpayer.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
9	40	360

Evaluator 4		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b> 860		
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Schedule is adequate, easy to read, and detailed enough. The work plan touches on a lot of what was discussed in the PEL, and the work plan reads as a continuation of the PEL study. Loved how they mentioned how much of the environmental leg work was already completed in the PEL.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
9	30	270
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Project team has a long resume that includes lots of projects of similar scale. This design team is easily qualified to deliver this project with minimal guidance. Brandi P was very involved in the PEL and that shows in the work plan. Brandi P and Mark W work well together and compliment each other.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
9	30	270
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: Overall cost is not the lowest, however second only to WSB who I believe underestimated. Total hours invested are right in the middle of the ranges when compared to the others. The percentages of the hours seem about right with most of the time (42% going to design). Similarly, a slightly higher percentage of hours going to the traffic forecasts, studies, and TMP then the others which I also believe will require alot of attention.		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
8	40	320

Evaluator 5		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b> 900		
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Good understanding of scope/plan is comprehensive (proposal) Understands deliverables – well layed out Necessary to put project delivery w existing unknowns Total hours = 23,302		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
9	30	270
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Team is comprised of TKDA, HDR, CBS2, Rud, Braun All team & project members have constructed similar work per proposal		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
9	30	270
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: \$3.8M/23332 = \$164.80/hr Complex ideas for corridor proposed – substation is a concept Understands connections between E/W Blaine at 105th - overpass (p22) They understand Blaine's Utilities south of 109th		
Points Awarded (1-	Multiplier from above (done by	Total Points
9	40	360



**Proposal  
Evaluation**

**TH 65 Access  
Improvements**

Consultant: **WSB**

Date: 3-24-2021

**Average Score**

**540**

Proposals will be evaluated on the evaluation criteria as stated

Points	Guidance	Factor	Weight
10	Couldn't imagine a better response	Work Plan/Schedule	30%
8-9	Excellent, insightful response	Qualifications/experience of personnel	30%
6-7	More than adequate response	Understanding/Value to Taxpayer	40%
4-5	Adequate response, no special insights		
2-3	Inadequate response		
0-1	Totally inadequate response	Total	100%

**Evaluation Summary**

Evaluator 1		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>400</b>
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Schedule and work plan meets the requirements of the grants so far. Suggesting different traffic modeling.		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
4	30	120
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Several projects for interchanges. Qualified staff		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
4	30	120
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: Decent understanding of the final construction needs. Missed that we had several more grants lined up. Geared toward the design and construction components. Very minimal discussion on the importance and critical nature of the NEPA process on the front end. Provided 3 costs based on final alternative selection. \$2.13M-\$2.81M		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
4	40	160

Evaluator 2		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>730</b>
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Work plan and schedule meet the requirements of the RFP. Listed funding aid, Jody Martinson (pg2) Also listed agency involvement per task (appendix A)		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
8	30	240
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Project manager have worked with on past projects, has performed well. 31 members team listed with 2 subs for Geotech and SUE. Project members all have the required qualifications and project experience. TH 65 PEL involvement?		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
7	30	210
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: Proposal outlines clear understanding to the project.  Provided three separate cost estimates for the three alternatives. Hours ranged between Option 1 at 13,885 to Option 3 at 19,098. Fees also ranged from Option 1 at \$2.0M to Option 3 at \$2.6M. Hours seem a bit light in comparison with the other proposals.		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
7	40	280

Evaluator 3		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>560</b>
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Work plan addressed main elements, but didn't include much detail as it related to the specific issues for TH 65 and the PEL process.		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
6	30	180
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Qualifications and experience of personnel was there for the Design elements and layout experience. However, there was less direct PEL experience for the team versus the other teams represented.		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
6	30	180
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: There didn't seem to be a thorough understanding of the project. There was discussion of an intersection at 99th. However most intersections along the corridor- especially 99th- are expected to be grade separated. However the pricing was very competitive for all elements.		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
5	40	200

Evaluator 4		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>480</b>
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Schedule is adequate, easy to read, and detailed enough. In the work plan there is some confusion at 99th Avenue, they show a RAB on option 1 but no overpass over TH 65. There is little mention of any of the considerations / work completed in the PEL study, which is surprising considering Nic listed as being involved with the PEL and should have tons of unique insight about the project. The work plan seems overly simplified.		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
5	30	150
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Some of the team worked on the TH 65 PEL Study. Each key personnel has over 10 years of experience with most having more than 20. Recent experience working on projects with multiple project partners (TH47/CSAH 116, I-494/CR 9). Project Manager has proven himself to be a competent and solid leader on smaller projects but I don't see a track record with projects of this scale. I think Nic might be capable of leading this project, but it would be a leap of faith with no proven experience on this scale.		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
7	30	210
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: Project team developed the TH 65 PEL Study so should have a good understanding of project. Evaluating the most expensive cost proposal (alt 3) is still nearly half of the next lowest proposal which means either they know something the others don't, or they simply underestimated. With the lack of experience on projects of this scale I would tend to believe they simply don't understand how large the scope of this project is. The number of hours seems low by about 30%, which could be that not only are they underestimating time they may be paying lower team members more hours. Hourly breakdown into each task seems correct, design may be a little low, along with traffic forecasting which I believe will be more labor intensive than most projects considering the reach of		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
3	40	120

Evaluator 5		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>530</b>
<b>1. Work Plan - Schedule</b>		
Notes: Propose intersection improvements at 99th & TH65 – No interchange? Roundabout – HSIP @ TH65 & 99th discussed Scope of proposal is not detailed and does not demonstrate project and potential issues Page 4 shows layout at 99th & Baltimore w roundabout. Total hours Alt 3 = 19098		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
5	30	150
<b>2. Qualifications/experience of personnel</b>		
Notes: Missing Tony Heppleman in resumes – discussed he is on team Demonstration of similar projects although lacking in detail Not entire team's resumes in proposal		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
6	30	180
<b>3. Project Understanding/Value to Taxpayer</b>		
Notes: \$2.68M/19098 = \$140.5/hr Cost missing for Interchange at 99th? Costs seem low Did not demonstrate complexities of substation or other project issues Did not understand \$10M grant for intersection of 99th/TH65 105th Continues to have access on TH65		
Points Awarded (1-10)	Multiplier from above (done by)	Total Points
5	40	200