



VISION ZERO
zero deaths
zero serious injuries

Montana Department of Transportation

2701 Prospect
PO Box 201001
Helena MT 59620-1001

Michael T. Tooley, Director

Steve Bullock, Governor

Date: September 23, 2020 **REVISED October 5, 2020 (revision on page 2)**

Subject: **Request for Proposals**
MT-200 Bridges – Lewistown Area
NHPB STWD(787)
UPN 9884000

To Whom It May Concern:

The Montana Department of Transportation (MDT) is accepting proposals from consulting firms interested in participating in MDT's fourth Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) project, including the preparation of the construction plans and specifications for the subject project. One firm will be selected to perform the work specified herein.

Teams may be established as necessary; however, it is expected that the prime consultant will be capable of completing the vast majority of the work, and the proposal must clearly identify the prime for this contract. As a rule, the prime consultant must complete at least 50% of the work for a specific project or assignment unless written exception is given.

Montana professional engineering licensure is required for this work and must be in-hand at the time your proposal is submitted. If this requirement is not met and clearly identified in the proposal, your proposal will be considered non-responsive.

If your firm is interested, please submit a proposal as described herein.

SCOPE OF WORK

MDT is proposing to replace eleven structures in the Lewistown area through a CM/GC contract. This solicitation is for the design consultant for the project. The Construction Manager will be procured through a different solicitation. The project scope is to replace aging and deteriorating timber bridges in fair and poor condition with new bridges or culverts. Rehabilitation is not practical due to the advanced deterioration of the structures and load posting restrictions. Work will include road and approach construction to tie the new structures into the existing alignment.

The consultant will be required to provide all services necessary for the project, including (but not limited to) bridge design; roadway design; geotechnical investigation, analysis, and design; surfacing design; survey; public involvement; environmental evaluation and permitting; hydraulics analysis and design; traffic analysis and design, cost estimating (**typical historic unit-based bid item estimate**) (~~production rate based construction cost estimate, also known as a "bottom-up estimate"~~), utilities investigation and analysis, right of way design, and potentially right of way acquisition. The selected consultant must work effectively and efficiently with MDT and a construction contractor to develop a final design. Effective communication skills and an openness to investigating design alternatives will be critical for this project.

MDT's intention at this time is to develop this project in phases. The project will likely be initially scoped through Alignment & Grade (AGR)-type activities. During this first phase, the design consultant will primarily gather and analyze data, and develop preliminary concepts. As MDT and the selected consultant work through this initial stage, MDT will select a contractor for CM services, as well as an Independent Cost Estimator (ICE). Once the Construction Manager (CM) and the ICE are on board, the contract will be amended to include final design activities. The entire design team (MDT, Design Consultant, CM, ICE) will work collaboratively to develop a design solution that maximizes effectiveness and minimizes risk. The selected design consultant will be ultimately responsible for the design solution and will be the Engineer-of-Record.

The selected design consultant will be required to effectively communicate and work with the selected CM and MDT throughout the design of the project, including facilitation of Contractor design reviews, participation in estimate calibration meetings, input on risk analysis and management, and support for value engineering studies. The intent is to seek information and best practices from the CM to look at possible solutions for the project. Such information could include: construction means and methods, sequencing, production rates with associated costs, modern equipment availability and costs, availability of materials and other resources, and help in assessment of feasible alternatives. The intent behind this collaboration is to develop and implement an innovative and effective design while still maintaining constructability. The CM/GC concept also allows input from the CM to use the latest advancements in technology in the construction industry.

Additional information:

EA for the corridor: https://www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/docs/eis_ea/ea_grassrange.pdf

Adjacent project information:

Divide – West

- [Preliminary Field Review Report](#)

- [CRAVE Study](#)
 - [CRAVE Study response](#)
- Grass Range – West
- [Preliminary Field Review Report](#)

LOCATION

There are eleven structures currently included in this project in the greater Lewistown area. Specific bridges are described here: [Locations](#)

PROJECT SCHEDULE AND DELIVERABLES

The project schedule will be developed and negotiated prior to executing the contract agreement. At this time, it is anticipated that deliverables will generally follow those described in MDT's Consultant Activity Descriptions (as applicable):

http://www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/cdb/ACTIVITY_DESCRIPTIONS/CONSULTANT_DESIGN_2500_MU.PDF

STANDARDS, SPECIFICATIONS, AND POLICIES

Work is expected to follow MDT's various Manuals, Guides, and Policies. These items may be found on MDT's Design Consulting web page at: <http://www.mdt.mt.gov/business/consulting/>.

PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL

Submit one (1) electronic version (Adobe© PDF format) of the proposal. Hard copy proposals will not be accepted.

Submit the electronic version by uploading to the State of Montana File Transfer Service (ePass) site, which can be accessed at this link: <https://transfer.mt.gov>. To upload to ePass, an account must be created unless the person who is uploading already has an account. Uploading instructions can be accessed at <https://transfer.mt.gov/Home/Instructions>. When your proposal has been uploaded, the ePass system will prompt you for an email. Please send this email of your uploaded proposal to the following individuals:

Sheryl Tangen: stangen@mt.gov

Ryan Dahlke: rdahlke@mt.gov

Jason Senn: jasenn@mt.gov

The Department must receive the proposals for this RFP no later than 3:00 PM (Montana time), October 19, 2020.

Regardless of cause, late proposals will not be accepted and will automatically be disqualified from further consideration. It shall be solely the vendor's responsibility to assure delivery at the specified office by the specified time. Offeror may request the State return late proposals at vendor's expense or the State will dispose of late proposals if requested by the offeror. (See

Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) 2.5.509.). If no request is made, late proposals become the property of the Department. All proposals submitted on time become the property of the Department.

The costs for developing and delivering responses to this solicitation are entirely the responsibility of the offeror. The State is not liable for any expense incurred by the offeror in the preparation and presentation of this submittal.

TENTATIVE RFP/SELECTION SCHEDULE

The anticipated schedule for consultant solicitation and selection for this contract is as follows (subject to change):

September 23, 2020: RFP released

October 19, 2020: Proposals due to be submitted to MDT Consultant Design

October 28, 2020: Proposals reviewed, rated, and ranked by the evaluation committee

November 4, 2020: Consultant Selection Board meeting to select consultant

There are four (4) members on the evaluation committee for this RFP (subject to change):

1. MDT Billings District Preconstruction Manager
2. MDT Consultant Design Project Manager
3. MDT Bridge Bureau Design Manager
4. MDT Alternative Contracting Engineer/Manager

PROPOSAL CONTENTS

The proposal must contain the information listed in this section. The proposal is **limited to ten (10) pages**, not including the required Appendices. A single cover jacket/title page is allowed if desired and will not count in the page limit. Each page is defined as one side of a letter size sheet (no larger than 8 ½” x 11”), minimum font size of 10. Evaluation of information will begin with the first page immediately following the cover jacket/title page, and every page will be counted, in order, from that point forward, including any table of contents or divider pages the firm wishes to include. Once the page limit is reached, any information included thereafter will be removed and not considered or scored. Please organize your proposal in the same order and numbering format as shown below, which will assist MDT in reviewing your proposal:

Questions

1) Team Qualifications

Provide a discussion on how the team you propose to use for this project (including subconsultants, if used) is best qualified to respond to the requirements of this project. Discussion should focus on the requirements for this specific project, particularly your team’s expertise and experience, as it relates to the work described in the “Scope of Work” section above. Provide examples of previous related project experience as it relates to these services. Identify professional licensure of staff that satisfy the requirements for this contract. Include an organizational chart of your team for this project. Also briefly discuss your compatibility of systems, software, and equipment (i.e. CADD software, word processing software, etc.), and experience with these systems,

software, and equipment. While the Department's standard design software is Microstation GEOPAK SS10 with OpenRoads Technology (please note that MDT is not currently prepared to allow use of Bentley OpenRoads Designer CONNECT edition); the use of Autodesk is preferable for bridge design and bridge site layout so the CM/GC team can interactively collaborate on bridge layouts. Describe any special equipment or software you intend to use. Resumes may be considered as supplemental information for scoring this question.

2) Project Approach

Transportation work has many challenging aspects, and the development and delivery of a successful project that addresses and mitigates specific project challenges is of utmost interest to MDT. Discuss the challenges you foresee as they relate to this project and its requirements, your strategy for addressing these challenges, and your specific experience in implementing the strategies identified. Describe your quality assurance/quality control process. Include a discussion on the current and projected workload of key personnel, the effects that workload would have on your ability to successfully deliver this project, and your overall plan for delivering this project in a timely manner.

Appendix A: Resumes

Include brief resumes for the key personnel to be assigned to the contract. **Resumes are limited to one (1) page per person.**

Appendix B: Cover Page Form

Include a completed version of MDT's standard cover page form, available at the following location:

http://www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/cdb/MDT_CDB_002_Proposal_SOQ_Cover_Sheet.pdf

Information presented in the cover page form will not be considered in proposal scoring.

Appendix C: References

Submit references that includes a minimum of five (5) separate contracts from the past three (3) years. If applicable, you may submit multiple contracts for a single client. Each contract must pertain to work similar to the proposed scope of services. Include client name, a currently employed primary contact person, an alternative contact person, corresponding valid phone numbers and emails for both contacts, a range of contract value, and a brief description of the work performed. If MDT needs to use these references for the Past Performance Score (as described in the "Evaluation of Proposals" section below) and is unable to contact the required number of references after a reasonable effort, the firm will receive a zero for the missing reference(s).

EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

All proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the following factors:

1) Team Qualifications (50 points possible)

2) Project Approach (100 points possible)

3) Record of past performance (30 points possible)

- a) If two (2) or more MDT evaluations specific to the discipline for this contract are available for the consultant, the average score of these evaluations will be used.
- b) If fewer than two (2) MDT evaluations specific to the discipline for this contract are available for the consultant, but there are two (2) or more MDT evaluations are available for other work disciplines, the consultant's current overall past performance score from MDT evaluations will be used.
- c) If there is only one (1) MDT evaluation available for the consultant, the record of past performance score will be an average of the MDT evaluation and one (1) reference check from the references provided in the unbound attachment.
- d) If no MDT evaluations are available, the average score of two (2) reference checks from the references provided in the unbound attachment will be used for this score.

Regardless of partnership/teaming relationships, the past performance of the prime consultant will be the past performance scored that will be used for this score.

All Proposals will be evaluated using the following basic scoring methodology:

- Outstanding/Exceptional response: 90-100% of the available points
- Good response: 70-90% of the available points
- Average response: 50-70% of the available points
- Poor response: 30-50% of the available points
- Qualifications not clearly met: 0-30% of the available points

Following the review, evaluation, and rating of all proposals, the final results will be presented to the Consultant Selection Board (Board) at the MDT Headquarters Building. At this time, the Board will select the most qualified firm(s) to perform the work. The Board may consider any proposal scoring within 2% of the highest-scoring proposal as equally qualified and take into account its knowledge of the firms' workload, past performance, and familiarity with the project area and local entities in selecting the most-qualified consultant. In the event that a firm cannot be identified as the most qualified through an evaluation of these proposals, MDT reserves the right to narrow down the list of responding firms to an appropriate short list. Short-listed firms will either be asked to provide a supplemental proposal or asked to be interviewed or provide a presentation. Scores from the proposals, supplement project proposals (if used), and interviews (if used) will be carried forward to determine final consultant score. Consultant selection is finalized by MDT at the Consultant Selection Board meeting.

INDIRECT COST RATE REQUIREMENTS

Proof of the firm's Indirect Cost Rate (overhead rate) is *not required* with this proposal submittal. However, an Indirect Cost Rate may be required prior to executing a contract according to MDT's Indirect Cost Rate Requirements:

All submitted indirect cost rates must be calculated in accordance with 23 CFR 172 for the cost principles of 48 CFR part 31 and include the required items identified in the MDT Indirect Cost Rate Policy located in Appendix A of the Consultant Services Manual on the MDT Internet website.

http://www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/cdb/consultant_manual/consultant-design-manual_combined.pdf

Do not show any actual numerical financial information such as the overhead rate or personnel rates within your proposal. Specific cost information of the firm or team should not be part of the proposal.

AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS

Contract agreements will generally be administered on a cost-plus fixed fee basis. The contracts will have negotiated cost ceilings. If a consulting firm is selected for a specific project and a contract agreement is successfully negotiated, certain financial information will be required as part of the contract agreement. As described in the Indirect Cost Rate Requirements section above, all Consultants and subconsultants must provide the Department with an Indirect Cost Rate (as applicable) audited (when applicable) in accordance with 23 CFR 172 for the cost principles of 48 CFR Part 31 and based on the firm's latest completed fiscal year's costs. Personnel rates, profit, and direct expenses must be clearly outlined and provided to the Department. The standard MDT agreement can be found at the following address:

<http://www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/cdb/forms/pdf/General-Terms-and-Conditions.pdf>

Do not submit actual numerical financial information within this proposal.

STATE OPTION TO AWARD

While the State has every intention to award a contract resulting from this RFP, issuance of the RFP in no way constitutes a commitment by the State to award and execute a contract. Upon a determination such actions would be in its best interest, the State, in its sole discretion, reserves the right to:

- Cancel or terminate this RFP (18-4-307, MCA);
- Reject any or all proposals received in response to this RFP (ARM 2.5.602);
- Waive any undesirable, inconsequential, or inconsistent provisions of this RFP that would not have significant impact on any proposal (ARM 2.5.505);
- Not award a contract, if it is in the State's best interest not to proceed with contract execution (ARM 2.5.602); or
- If awarded, terminate any contract if the State determines adequate funds are not available (18-4-313, MCA).

SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT

From the date this solicitation is issued until the consultant selection is finalized by MDT at the Consultant Selection Board meeting, offerors are not allowed to communicate with any state staff or officials regarding this solicitation, except at the direction of the Consultant Design Engineer. If unauthorized contact is made and the Consultant Design Engineer determines the context of the contact gives the firm an unfair advantage, the firm will be disqualified from the solicitation. Contact information for the single point of contact is as follows:

Ryan Dahlke
Consultant Design Engineer
Montana Department of Transportation
(406) 444-7292 (Direct Line)
rdahlke@mt.gov

DBE GOALS

There are no DBE goals for this work, but firms are strongly encouraged to utilize DBE firms if applicable. A Montana certified DBE list is available and can be found on the MDT web page, <http://www.mdt.mt.gov/business/contracting/civil/dbe.shtml>.

NONDISCRIMINATION COMPLIANCE

Consultants will be subject to Federal and Montana nondiscrimination laws and regulations (see attached notice titled "MDT NONDISCRIMINATION AND DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION NOTICE").

If you have any questions, please contact me at (406) 444-7292, or by email at rdahlke@mt.gov. I look forward to receiving your proposal.

Sincerely,



Ryan Dahlke, P.E.
Consultant Design Engineer

Attachment

e-copies:

MDT Consultant Design Bureau file
Jay Skoog, ACEC Executive Director-Montana Chapter
Dwane Kailey, MDT Chief Engineer
Dustin Rouse, MDT Preconstruction Engineer
Damian Krings, MDT Highways Engineer (Acting)
Lynn Zanto, MDT Planning Division Administrator

Patricia Schwinden, MDT Civil Rights Bureau Chief
Bryan Miller, MDT Consultant Plans Engineer
Dave Holien, MDT TA Engineer
Rod Nelson, Billings District Administrator-MDT
Stephanie Brandenberger, MDT Bridge Engineer