MONTANA
Department of Transportation

Christopher Dorrington, Director

2701 Prospect ▪ PO Box 201001
Helena MT 59620-1001

Date: January 10, 2025

Subject: **Request for Proposals**
2025-2029 Bridge Load Rating Term Contract

To Whom It May Concern:

The Montana Department of Transportation (MDT) is accepting proposals from consulting firms interested in a term contract for performing bridge load rating services at various locations throughout Montana.

MDT intends to establish term contract(s) to utilize consultants on an "as-needed" basis for the work described herein. At this time, the intention is to award four (4) agreements that will be approximately $1,000,000 each, for a four-year period from April 2025 through March 2029. MDT reserves the right to revise the number of term contracts, the contract values, or contract timeframes, depending on the responses received. Extension(s) of contracts, by mutual agreement of both parties, may be made at one (1) year intervals, or any interval that is advantageous to MDT. Contracts, including any renewals, may not exceed a total of five (5) years.

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. As a rule, the prime consultant must complete at least 50% of the work for a specific task 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.

Consultant Design Bureau
Phone: (406) 444–6209
Fax: (406) 444–6253

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Engineering Division
TTY: (800) 335–7592
Web Page: www.mdt.mt.gov

SCOPE OF WORK

1. General

   A. The consultant will provide necessary personnel, software, equipment, and expertise to determine the load rating of bridges across Montana.

   B. The types of bridges to be rated are variable. Any bridge type that is found in Montana may require load rating. This includes corrugated steel and reinforced concrete culverts.

   C. The consultant must be capable of performing various levels of load rating, including, but not limited to:
      a. Conventional load ratings for existing structures
      b. Complex load ratings or refined analyses for existing structures
      c. Load ratings for structures without plans, using approved methods such as field investigation, physical inspection, or destructive/non-destructive tests
      d. Load rating reviews and updates for existing structures

   D. All structures will be rated in accordance with:
      a. Chapter 8, "Bridge Load Rating and Posting" in the current version of the *MDT Bridge Inspection and Rating Manual* and interim guidance posted on the MDT website at https://www.mdt.mt.gov/business/contracting/bridge/loadrating/guidance.aspx
      b. The latest version of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) *Manual for Bridge Evaluation (MBE)*
      c. The AASHTO *Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges, 17th Edition (2002)*
      d. The latest version of the AASHTO *LRFD Bridge Design Specifications*

   E. The consultant will provide general support for the load rating program on an as-needed basis. Support tasks include, but are not limited to, providing review and feedback on load rating guidance, advising on load rating processes or procedures, and providing database review and data governance recommendations.

2. Personnel

   A. Consultant personnel must be qualified and have specific expertise in the work being performed. A qualified person will have the necessary education, registrations and licenses, skills, experience, and qualities to complete a particular task.

   B. All load ratings will be completed by, or under the direction of, a professional engineer licensed in Montana.

   C. Load raters and checkers must have a working knowledge of the AASHTO codes and the *MBE*.

D. Individuals performing load rating will have significant experience with AASHTOWare Bridge Rating (BrR) and any other software approved for use.

3. Coordination and Scheduling

A. Before load rating begins, the consultant will provide a tentative submittal schedule to the MDT Bridge Management Section so that MDT can anticipate workload and plan for review.

4. Field Investigation

A. In cases where there is not sufficient information available to load rate a structure (i.e. plan/measurement info is not available, discrepant or outdated measurements, structure or member conditions are unclear or not available), the consultant will provide equipment or personnel necessary to obtain measurements or conduct field reviews. Personnel conducting the field review must be qualified and have experience evaluating member conditions and/or determining structural capacity by engineering judgement.

B. The consultant will provide all necessary traffic control and ensure that the traffic control complies with the requirements in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

C. When obtaining structural measurements, the consultant will use MDT measurement forms posted at https://mdt.mt.gov/publications/forms.aspx#brg. In cases where the standardized measurement forms do not provide enough information to load rate the bridge, the consultant will also create and submit to MDT additional sketches of the bridge (or portions of the bridge) sufficient to define the bridge and perform the load rating. All measurements and sketches will be uploaded to MDT's Structure Management System (BrM).

5. Load Rating Software

A. BrR will be the primary software used for load rating. Use the same version as MDT's current version, which can be found on the MDT website at https://www.mdt.mt.gov/business/contracting/bridge/loadrating/brr.aspx.

B. BrR does not have the capability to load rate all structure types. In cases where BrR cannot rate a structure, another software may be used, but it must be approved in advance by MDT's Bridge Load Rating Engineer.

6. Deliverables

A. Deliverables will be defined in individual term assignments. In general, for each bridge load rating, the consultant will submit to MDT:

a. A load rating report (in PDF format) that meets requirements posted on the MDT website at https://www.mdt.mt.gov/business/contracting/bridge/loadrating/reports.aspx.
b. A bridge model/analysis file (in BrR, XML, or alternate file format)
c. Field investigation documentation (if applicable)

B. The consultant is responsible for quality control of all load ratings and submittals. MDT personnel will review submittals to verify compliance with guidance and requirements and to ensure that documentation is adequate. Load ratings that are deficient will be sent back for resubmittal.

C. Once a load rating has been approved by MDT personnel, the consultant will finalize (stamp) the load rating report, upload to and update BrM.

LOCATION

Various – Statewide

PROJECT/TASK SCHEDULE AND DELIVERABLES

The project schedule will be developed and negotiated separately for each individual term/task assignment. 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 (FTS) site, which can be accessed at this link: https://transfer.mt.gov. To upload to FTS, 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 FTS system will prompt you for an email address to send to. Please send this email of your uploaded proposal to the following individuals:

Sheryl Tangen: stangen@mt.gov
Kelly Williams: kwilliams@mt.gov
Shannon Gilskey: sgilskey@mt.gov

The Department must receive the proposals for this RFP no later than 3:00 PM MST, February 10, 2025.

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):

January 10, 2025:	RFP released
February 10, 2025:	Proposals due to be submitted to MDT Consultant Design
March 3, 2025:	Proposals reviewed, rated, and ranked by the evaluation committee
March 5, 2025:	Consultant Selection Board meeting to select consultant(s)

There are three (3) members on the evaluation committee for this RFP (subject to change):

1. MDT Bridge Bureau Load Rating Engineer
2. MDT Bridge Bureau Load Rating Engineer
3. MDT Consultant Design Bureau Term Contracts 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 8½" 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 contract (including subconsultants, if used) is best qualified to respond to the requirements of this contract. Discussion should focus on the requirements for this specific contract, 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 experience as it relates to these services. Identify professional licensure of staff that satisfy the requirements for this contract. Include an organization chart that indicates the staff identified for this contract, their area of expertise, registration, and office location(s). 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. The Department's standard design software is Autodesk® technology included in the Architecture, Engineering & Construction (AEC) Collection. Describe any special equipment or software you intend to use. Resumes may be considered as supplemental information for scoring this question.

2) **Approach to Task Assignments**
Transportation work has many challenging aspects, and the development and delivery of a successful work product that addresses and mitigates specific challenges is of utmost interest to MDT. Discuss the challenges you foresee as they relate to this type of work, your strategy for addressing these challenges, and your specific experience in implementing the strategies identified. Describe your quality assurance/quality control process. Provide a discussion on your overall strategy for delivering work in a timely manner, including fast-tracked or emergency tasks and changing priorities.

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 (100 points possible)**
2) **Approach to Task Assignments (50 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. Evaluations for Project Management & Overall Performance will also be included.

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 at the MDT Headquarters Building. At this time, the Consultant Selection Board will select the most qualified firm(s) for TERM CONTRACT(S). The Board may consider any proposal scoring within 2% of another proposal as equally qualified and take into account its knowledge of the firms' workload, past performance, and familiarity with the specific work to be performed in selecting the most-qualified consultant(s).

SELECTION OF CONSULTANTS FOR TASK ASSIGNMENTS

If multiple consultants are selected and multiple term contracts are awarded, task or work orders (term assignments) will be awarded through an additional qualifications-based selection procedure. This selection procedure will be comprised of selecting a firm in accordance with the following weighted factors:

1) **Qualifications for specific Task Assignment (60 points possible)**
   a) Using the proposals submitted in response to this RFP and work performed with MDT since the submittal of this proposal: an evaluation of the consultant's qualifications as related to the specific knowledge, skills, and abilities required for the individual task assignment, including familiarity with the region in which the task assignment is located. Firm office location is not the determining factor for this score. (50 points possible)
   b) As relating to this type of work, the firm's current workload and amount of recent work with MDT. (10 points possible)

COMPENSATION AND PAYMENT

This contract will be administered on a cost-plus-fixed-fee or specific-rates-of-compensation basis and MDT will make that determination on the assignment level. The contract will have a negotiated cost ceiling to ensure cost control. The cost ceiling does not ensure or imply that the

Consultant is entitled to that entire amount. Only actual incurred hours and costs are compensable.

Upon selection, certain financial information from the selected Consultant will be required as part of the contract agreement.

Specific Rates of Compensation

> When the specific-rates-of-compensation method is used for a term assignment, Consultant will be required to provide the specific rates of compensation for each staff member that will perform work for the project. Rates may be developed by the individual or by job classification. Each rate is built by assembling the known and documented actual elements of direct salary, indirect cost rate, and fee into an agreed upon hourly rate. Overtime is compensable, so long as it is in accordance with Firm policies, as well as state and federal regulations.
>
> All individuals working on the specific assignment must be listed in the term assignment proposal with individual specific rate of compensation. If additional staff are proposed to work on the assignment, prior authorization of the individual and their specific rate of compensation is required through a term assignment addendum.

Direct travel costs in accordance with GSA rates and rules are compensable.

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

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:

Kelly Williams
Consultant Design Engineer
Montana Department of Transportation
(406) 444-7964 (Direct Line)
kwilliams@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) 444-7964, or by email at kwilliams@mt.gov. I look forward to receiving your proposal.

Sincerely,

Kelly M Williams

Kelly Williams, P.E.
Consultant Design Engineer

Attachment

e-copies:

Mary Erchul, ACEC Executive Director-MT Chapter
Dustin Rouse, MDT Chief Engineer
Ryan Dahlke, MDT Preconstruction Engineer
Damian Krings, MDT Highways Engineer
Megan Handl, MDT Civil Rights Bureau Chief
Jason Senn, MDT Consultant Plans Engineer
Dave Holien, MDT TA Engineer
MDT Consultant Design Bureau file
Andy Cullison, MDT Bridge Engineer & Bridge Bureau Chief