

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

PROJECT NO. MO0695172

Request for Information (RFI)

November 18, 2015

**IS 270 – Innovative Congestion
Management Project**

I. Introduction

The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) is issuing this Request for Information (RFI) to solicit comments on the Interstate 270 (IS 270) Innovative Congestion Management project's draft Technical Proposal evaluation criteria. This RFI is intended solely to obtain information to assist SHA with the ongoing development of the project's Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposals.

This RFI is intended to solicit responses from individuals, firms, teams, or organizations that have experience with projects that utilized innovative congestion management techniques and/or who are interested in pursuing the IS 270 Design-Build contract. This RFI:

- provides general background information related to the project;
- provides general information on the "Progressive" Design-Build project delivery approach;
- and solicits any questions or comments related to the project and the draft Technical Proposal evaluation criteria which may assist SHA in further developing the Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposals.

This RFI is an inquiry only. No contract or agreement will be entered into as a result of this process, nor does this RFI initiate a formal procurement or represent a commitment to issue a Request for Qualifications or Request for Proposals in the future. Those choosing to respond to this RFI will not, merely by virtue of submitting such response, be deemed to be "proposers" on the project in any sense, and no such respondent will have any preference, special designation, advantage or disadvantage whatsoever in any subsequent activities related to this project. Any response to this RFI is not a conflict of interest under MD Code, State Finance and Procurement, § 13-212.1 as comments are on a specification prepared by SHA and are being solicited publically from any person as part of this RFI. The information contained in the responses to this RFI, however, will help SHA to advance the development efforts for this project, which may result in the launch of a formal procurement for a contract.

II. Project Background

The project area is the IS 270 corridor from IS 495 (including the IS 270 spur) to IS 70. The study corridor is one of the most congested in Maryland with average daily traffic of approximately 240,000 in many segments. Over saturated conditions and extended peak periods greatly impact reliability.

The inside travel lane of IS 270 functions as a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane from 6:00 am to 9:00 am in the southbound directions from IS 370 to IS 495 and from 3:30 pm to 6:30 pm in the northbound direction from IS 495 to MD 121. It is expected that the HOV usage will be required to be maintained for any future project.

The SHA is developing a contract to solicit a Design-Builder to reduce congestion and improve reliability along the IS 270 corridor. The SHA has not developed any

preferred solutions, but is looking for the engineering and construction industries to provide implementable and innovative solutions to increase vehicle throughput, reduce delay and increase reliability along IS 270 within the project's budget. The current budget for the project is \$100,000,000. This includes all work for the project including design, right-of-way acquisition, utility relocations, construction services, and construction management services. The budget for the Design-Build contract has not been established, but is anticipated to be in the high-\$70 to low \$80 million range.

The SHA has developed goals for the project. The goals are as follows:

1. Mobility – Provide improvements that maximize vehicle throughput, minimize vehicle travel times, and create a more predictable commuter trip along I-270.
2. Safety – Provide for a safer I-270 corridor.
3. Operability/Maintainability/Adaptability – Provide improvements that minimize SHA operations and maintenance activities while being adaptable to future transportation technological advancements.
4. Well-Managed Project – Provide a Project Management and Work Plan that addresses communications, coordination and risk management, achieves a collaborative partnership with all members of the project team and stakeholders, and successfully advances the project goals.

III. “Progressive” Design-Build Project Delivery Approach

The SHA is developing a “Progressive” Design-Build (PDB) contract to select the Design-Builder and address the goals of this project. The PDB contract will be solicited under the Competitive Sealed Proposals process as defined in the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 21.05.03. It will be a two-step process whereas step one will establish a reduced candidate list of the most highly qualified Design-Build teams and step two will select the Design-Builder on the basis of Best-Value to SHA.

The Design-Build contract will be a two-phase, fixed price contract. Phase one of the contract will be for the selected Design-Builder to provide design and preconstruction services to SHA to develop the project to approximately a sixty-five percent design. As part of the response to the Request for Proposals, the Design-Builder will provide its Technical Proposal and provide its Price Proposal. The Technical Proposal will address the draft Technical Proposal evaluation criteria detailed in Section IV. The Price Proposal will include the Design-Builder's design and preconstruction fee and its construction management fee, which will include indirect costs and profit related to construction services. As the aggregate amount of the contract is fixed, the value for construction services proposed by the Design-Builder will equal the fixed price minus the design and preconstruction fee and the construction management fee.

Stipends will be provided for those proposers on the reduced candidate list who are not selected for the contract.

The SHA will work collaboratively with the selected Design-Builder to develop the project. The Request for Proposals will define the services to be provided by the Administration and services expected from the Design-Builder for phase one of the contract. Requirements of phase two of the contract will be jointly developed by SHA and the Design-Builder. The project may be developed into multiple design and construction packages as long as each package is independent and can be implemented and open to traffic for beneficial use without the need of completing a future construction package. However, the SHA does have a fixed budget for this project. When right-of-way or utility relocations are required for a specific design and construction package, the SHA will deduct those values from the overall Design-Build contract value to maintain the project budget as the SHA has not established separate budgets for right-of-way or utilities.

Subsequent to completion of a sixty-five percent package, the SHA will attempt to reconcile a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) for the construction of the package. As multiple packages are allowed, multiple GMPs may be agreed upon as long as the overall sum of all GMPs does not exceed the project budget. If the SHA agrees to a GMP, then notice to proceed for phase two construction services would be issued for that package. The SHA reserves the right to not proceed with phase two of the contract and bid a package competitively if a GMP is not reached.

IV. Draft Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria

The following is the draft Technical Proposal evaluation criteria which proposers on the reduced candidate list would address in its Technical Proposal:

Mobility – CRITICAL

Goal: Provide improvements that maximize vehicle throughput, minimize vehicle travel times and create a more predictable commuter trip along I-270.

Value Statement: Effective and reliable traffic flow along I-270 is necessary for its function as a primary commuter route and for the vitality of economic development. Provide your approach to address and manage congestion along I-270 while reducing delay and increasing reliability.

- A. Provide the Design-Builder's approach for maximizing vehicle throughput and minimizing vehicle travel times. Specifically, discuss how the Design-Builder's plan will reduce recurring congestion in terms of travel time, vehicle throughput, density, intersection operations, queues and vehicle network performance, both along I-270 and on the connecting ramps and

arterial roadways. – **CRITICAL**

- B. Discuss how the Design-Builder’s approach will provide a more predictable commuter trip, including innovative technologies or techniques that will be provided. – **SIGNIFICANT**
- C. Discuss the performance life of the proposed improvements; that is, the time it will take for congestion levels to return to pre-construction levels and the basis for the Design-Builder’s assessment of performance. – **IMPORTANT**

Safety – IMPORTANT

Goal: Provide for a safer I-270 corridor.

Value Statement: Safer flow of traffic will increase mobility along I-270 by reducing incidents that increase delay and reduce travel time reliability. Discuss your approach for improving safety along I-270.

- A. Discuss how the Design-Builder’s approach will reduce the number, duration and severity of incidents and how the Design-Builder’s approach will facilitate the management of incidents after construction is completed. – **CRITICAL**
- B. Discuss any innovative technologies or techniques that the Design-Builder would propose to implement and how they will address the project’s safety goal. – **SIGNIFICANT**
- C. Discuss techniques that Design-Builder will utilize to mitigate any conditions in its approach which may not meet typical design standards and how the mitigation will provide for a safer I-270 corridor after construction is completed. – **IMPORTANT**

Operability/Maintainability/Adaptability – IMPORTANT

Goal: Provide improvements that minimize SHA operations and maintenance activities while being adaptable to future transportation technological advancements.

Value Statement: The Administration values a project which will provide for ease of operations and maintenance that will also minimize impacts to the efficient flow of traffic on I-270. Provide an approach that minimizes operations and maintenance to the Administration while being adaptable to future transportation technological advancements.

- A. Discuss the maintenance requirements of the Design-Builder’s proposed improvements, focusing separately on the pavement and non-pavement elements of the plan. Address the personnel and equipment requirements after construction is completed. – **CRITICAL**
- B. Discuss the compatibility and integration of the Design-Builder’s proposed improvements with current transportation infrastructure, including CHART’s system. – **SIGNIFICANT**

- C. Discuss any innovative technologies or techniques that the Design-Builder would propose to implement and the proposed plan and requirements for maintenance and operations and adaptability to future transportation technological advancements. How will the Design-Builder ensure that the newest innovations are incorporated into the design prior to agreement of a Guaranteed Maximum Price for construction? – **IMPORTANT**

Well-Managed Project – IMPORTANT

Goal: Provide a Project Management and Work Plan that addresses communications, coordination and risk management, achieves a collaborative partnership with all members of the project team and stakeholders, and successfully advances the project goals.

Value Statement: For this project to be a success, a Project Management and Work Plan that fosters communication, partnering, and a problem solving relationship between the Design-Builder, Administration, and project stakeholders will be necessary. Provide a Project Management Plan that will result in a well-managed and collaborative project. Discuss the Design-Builder’s Work Plan to develop the project to the required level and achieve its goals.

- A. Discuss the following key elements of the Design-Builder’s Project Management Plan: Communications, Coordination and Risk Management. – **CRITICAL**
- B. Discuss how the Design-Builder’s Work Plan will develop the project design internally within the Design-Builder and collaboratively with the Administration and other stakeholders to advance the project goals. Discuss the services to be provided by the Design-Builder. Discuss how the Design-Builder will provide quality control and quality assurance of the design. – **SIGNIFICANT**
- C. Discuss how the Design-Builder will minimize environmental impacts (water resources, forest/trees, air, noise, etc.), right-of-way impacts, and utility impacts to ensure the project can be implemented and constructed in a time efficient manner. – **SIGNIFICANT**
- D. Discuss the Design-Builder’s approach to achieve timely implementation of its proposed improvements, including a discussion of anticipated design and construction packages. – **IMPORTANT**

The relative importance of the technical evaluation factors and subfactors, when noted, will be weighted based on the following criteria:

- Critical – Factors or subfactors weighted as Critical are approximately three times the relative importance of Important.
- Significant – Factors or subfactors weighted as Significant are approximately two times the relative importance of Important.

V. Possible Future Milestones

This RFI is an inquiry only and the possible future milestones are for informational purposes only:

- RFI for review of the draft Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposals – January 2016
- Industry Informational Meeting – week of January 11-15, 2016
- Issuance of Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposals – March 2016

VI. Instructions to Responders

Questions and comments related to this RFI should be submitted in writing in letter format via email. No verbal comments or personal visits will be accepted. All written contacts should be addressed to and sent to following:

Mr. Jason A. Ridgway
Director, Office of Highway Development
State Highway Administration
e-mail address: MO069IS270@sha.state.md.us

Responses are requested by December 21, 2015 by 4:00 pm. Responses must include the name and address of the respondent in the written response. The SHA welcomes feedback on the project and understands that a variety of individuals, firms, teams, and organizations may respond to this RFI. Please provide any question or comment that you or your organization deems relevant. Thank you in advance for your participation.

VII. Public Information Act Notice

All responses to this RFI will be handled in accordance with the Public Information Act. Respondents should give specific attention to the identification of those portions of their responses that they deem to be confidential, proprietary information or trade secrets and provide any justification why such materials, upon request, should not be disclosed by the State under the Access to Public Records Act, State Government Article, Title 10, Subtitle 6, Annotated Code of Maryland.