

**STATE PROJECT NO. 704-92-0036 and 704-92-0037
PERMANENT REPAIR TO FEDERAL AID ELIGIBLE ROADS
AS A RESULT OF DAMAGE DUE TO HURRICANE KATRINA IN 2005
JEFFERSON, ORLEANS, PLAQUEMINES, ST. BERNARD AND
ST. TAMMANY PARISHES**

ADDENDUM NO. 2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Consultant/Team will be required to provide program administration, management and other engineering services for the necessary repairs to federal aid eligible roadways for damages inflicted as a result of Hurricane Katrina and the subsequent inundation and overloading of these roadways. This contract will be for program administration which will include, but is not limited to, coordination with the DOTD, New Orleans MPO, N.O. Sewerage and Water Board, FEMA, local businesses, debris removal operations, and public and private utilities. Program administration shall also include coordination with special events/local festivals such as Mardi Gras, Jazz Fest, Super Bowls, etc. Administration under this contract will also include program fiscal monitoring and the establishment of program/project controls. Management services are to include design consultant management, providing for pavement distress data collection/analysis, typical section design, **video inspection** and providing construction project CE&I services necessary for the successful repair and rehabilitation of roadways damaged due to Hurricane Katrina. Phase A begins with an initial list of individual project segments which are contained herewith as Appendix A. Subsequent Phases (B, C, etc.) may be added in the future as additional FHWA approved DIR's become available, potentially totaling up to approximately five hundred (500) miles of roadways. A list of the individual project segments are contained herewith as Appendix A, as well as a copy of Technical Assistance Report No. 07-2TA (Impact of Hurricane Katrina on Roadways in New Orleans Area).

EVALUATION CRITERIA

A two Tiered evaluation process will be used in the selection or the Consultant/Team. The criteria to be used by DOTD in evaluating responses for the selection of a Consultant to perform these services are:

1. **Consultant's firm experience on similar programs:**
Administration/management, weighting factor of 6.
Distress data collection/analysis, weighting factor of 2.
Video Inspection, weighting factor of 2.
CE&I, weighting factor of 5.
2. **Consultant's personnel experience on similar programs:**
Administration/management, weighting factor of 6.
Distress data collection/analysis, weighting factor of 2.

Video Inspection, weighting factor of 2.

CE&I, weighting factor of 5.

3. **Consultant's firm size as related to the total estimated program cost:**

Administration/management, weighting factor of 2.

Distress data collection/analysis, weighting factor of 1.

Video Inspection, weighting factor of 1.

CE&I, weighting factor of 3.

4. **Consultant's past performance on similar DOTD projects:**

** Administration/management, weighting factor of 1.

** Distress data collection/analysis, weighting factor of 1.

****Video Inspection, weighting factor of 1.**

CE&I, weighting factor of 4.

5. **Consultant's current work load:**

Administration/management, weighting factor of 1.

Distress data collection/analysis, weighting factor of 1.

Video Inspection, weighting factor of 1.

CE&I, weighting factor of 2.

6. **Location where the work will be performed:**

Administration/management, weighting factor of 5;

Distress data collection/analysis, weighting factor of 2;

Video Inspection, weighting factor of 2.

CE&I, weighting factor of 6

7. **Consultant's Interview/Presentation.**

**** All Consultants/Teams will be given a score of 4 for this evaluation item.**

TIER 1 Evaluation: All Consultants/Team members will be evaluated as indicated in Items 1-6. The evaluation will be by means of a point-based rating system. Each of the above criteria will receive a rating on a scale of 0-4. The rating will then be multiplied by the corresponding weighting factor.

Administration/management accounts for 55% of the work.

Distress data collection/analysis accounts for 10% of the work.

Video Inspection accounts for 5% of the work.

CE&I accounts for 30% of the work.

Should a Prime or Sub-consultant significantly participate in performing the work under two or more of the above subcategories then they will receive a rating within each subcategory. Should more than one team member contribute significantly to work under an individual subcategory then the rating of each contributor will be averaged prior to multiplying the rating for that subcategory by the weighting factor for that subcategory.

TIER II Evaluation: The Consultants/Teams on the TIER I short-list of the three (if three are qualified) highest rated Consultant/Teams will be asked to attend an Interview/Presentation (Item 7) within three weeks of the announcement of the alphabetical TIER I short-list. The presentation will be made in Power-Point format, and the power point presentation of the selected Consultant/Team will, at DOTD's discretion, become part of the contract. During the presentations each Consultant/Team will be given 40 minutes for the Presentation/Interviews and an additional 20 minutes to answer any questions. The schedule of Presentation/Interviews will be announced at the time of the announcement of the alphabetical TIER I short-list.

The Consultant's Interviews/Presentations (Item 7) will be used to develop the ranked TIER II short-list. The TIER I ranking will not be a part of the ranking for the TIER II short-list. A ranked TIER II short-list of the three (if three are qualified) highest rated Consultant/Teams will be submitted to the Secretary of the DOTD. The Secretary will make the final selection. DOTD's Consultant Evaluation Committee will be responsible for performing the above described evaluation, and preparation of the TIER I and TIER II short-lists.

The presentation will include/outline the following points (Each item's weight to the overall presentation is shown in parentheses):

- 1) Proposers knowledge and understanding of the program (3).
- 2) Proposers concept of the scope of necessary program administrative and management requirements (3).
- 3) Proposers team qualities and attributes to be brought to bear on the program (3).
- 4) Proposers force requirements during the first two years of the program (2).
- 5) Proposers foresight as to the force requirements during years 3 through 6 (1).
- 6) Methods to measure/document distress and relate to rehabilitation strategies (1).
- 7) Methods to be used to control administrative and management costs (3).
- 8) Plan to be used to communicate and coordinate with DOTD and public and private stakeholders (2).
- 9) Concepts to control/manage project costs and schedule (3).
- 10) Concepts to be used to manage design consultants relative to plan quality (QA/QC) and schedule (3).
- 11) Concept to be utilized to control construction costs and lessen negative public impact (3).
- 12) Methods to perform, monitor and document video inspection and plan for scheduling and coordination (1).
- 13) Other points that the Proposers wishes to be considered in the evaluation (2).

The Tier II evaluation will be based on an adjectival rating process. Each member of the evaluation committee will individually rate each evaluation criterion listed above as weighted and assign intensity ratings as defined in the Table below. Plus (+) and Minus (-) signs can also be used to further separate firms within a rating class.

Intensity/Rating

Adjunctive/Description

- E** **Excellent** – Significantly exceeds the stated objectives/requirements and demonstrates an exceptional understanding of the goals and objectives of the project. Outstanding level of quality with no weaknesses.

- G** **Good** – Exceeds the stated objectives/requirements and demonstrates an understanding of the goals and objectives of the project. Strengths outbalance any minor weaknesses that exist.

- A** **Acceptable** – Proposal meets the stated objectives/requirements and demonstrates an understanding of the goals and objectives of the project. There are minor weaknesses that can be overcome.

- U** **Unacceptable** – Fails to meet the stated objectives/requirements or demonstrate an understanding of the goals and objectives of the project. There are significant weaknesses.

E +	12	A +	6
E	11	A	5
E -	10	A -	4
G +	9	U +	3
G	8	U	2
G -	7	U -	1

Once each board member completes evaluations for all factors, the process moves to group consensus. All members will meet as a group, under the direction of the chairperson to arrive at a consensus evaluation for each presentation. In consensus, members of the evaluation committee seek a mutually agreeable outcome that all members can support for each factor as listed above. The corresponding value will then be multiplied by the item’s weight then totaled for the final presentation score for that Consultant/Team.

