REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

FOR SERVICES TO CONDUCT THE

I-29 Exit 62 to Exit 73 Corridor Study

THE SOUTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

IN CONJUNCTION WITH

LINCOLN COUNTY

THE SIOUX FALLS MPO,

AND THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

FEBRUARY 10, 2017
The South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT) in conjunction with the Sioux Falls Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is soliciting proposals from consulting firms prequalified by the SDDOT for transportation planning to perform a corridor planning study for a portion of the Interstate Highway 29 (I-29) corridor in Lincoln County, South Dakota. A listing of firms prequalified for state transportation planning can be found at http://www.sddot.com/business/design/docs/StateTransPlan.pdf. Instructions on how to become prequalified for future studies can be found at http://www.sddot.com/business/design/consultant/Default.aspx.

Background:

The SDDOT’s pavement management system has identified the segment of I-29 from the Exit 62 to Exit 73 for either a major rehabilitation or reconstruction project within the next 8 years. Previous studies have indicated that this segment of I-29 may need capacity improvements sometime in the future. Most of the crossroad bridges in the corridor are also approaching the end of their service life and are coming due for either replacement or major rehabilitation. Interchanges within the corridor will also need to be brought up to current standards when the corresponding crossroad bridge is replaced, and may also need to be reconfigured to accommodate anticipated future traffic. It is thereby prudent to ensure that the correct typical section is provided for this segment of the I-29 corridor to accommodate the anticipated traffic volume for the duration of the service life of the rehabilitated or reconstructed mainline pavement by identifying any future improvements to any of the crossroad bridges and interchanges along the corridor so that those improvements can be accommodated.
Study Advisory Team:

A Study Advisory Team has been formed to guide the study through completion. The Study Advisory Team is comprised of representative parties of the SDDOT, Lincoln County, Sioux Falls MPO, and the FHWA. Members of the Study Advisory Team are:

- Jeff Brosz  SDDOT – Inventory Management  Amber Gibson  Sioux Falls MPO
- Toby Brown  Lincoln County - Planning & Zoning  Steve Gramm  SDDOT - Project Development
- Cary Cleland  SDDOT – Road Design  Mark Hoines  FHWA
- Dave Coley  SDDOT – Bridge Design  Dave Huft  SDDOT – Research
- Sonia Downs  SDDOT – Project Development  Paula Huizenga  SDDOT - Administration
- Travis Dressen  SDDOT – Sioux Falls Area  Brad Remmich  SDDOT – Project Development

Additional team members may be added as the study progresses.

Study Expectations:

The study will include determining the future traffic demand of the corridor and then developing conceptual improvements for the I-29 corridor and the interchanges along the corridor necessary to accommodate the projected traffic demand and performing a traffic evaluation analysis comparison for all of the options developed for I-29 corridor to determine a recommended option.

As such, the study is expected to fulfill the following objectives for the I-29 corridor:

1. Complete a list of transportation issues and needs facing the I-29 corridor within the designated limits.

2. Develop feasible solutions to address those issues and needs that meet current design standards and/or traffic level of service expectations under both the current and predicted future traffic conditions while promoting a livable community that will enhance the economic and social well-being of all users of the corridor.

3. Create final products as noted in Task 17, for use by the Sioux Falls MPO and the SDDOT which will provide guidance to implement recommended improvements and react to future development plans within the area.
Study Area:

The primary study corridor for the I-29 Exit 62 to Exit 73 Corridor Study will include:

- I-29 from Exit 62 (MRM 62.35) to Exit 73 (MRM 73.38), approximately 11.0 miles,

Interchanges to be evaluated include Exits 62, 64, 68, 71 and 73. The crossroad structure for 278th Street will also be evaluated for need and if needed, capacity.

This corridor is shown in red on the Figure 1 below.
Scope of Study:

The Study Advisory Team believes the study needs to include, but not be limited to, the following tasks:

1. **Kick Off Meeting:**

   The consultant shall facilitate a meeting with the Study Advisory Team to confirm expectations and to finalize the work plan.

2. **Methods & Assumptions:**

   The consultant shall facilitate a meeting to determine the assumptions to be used during the course of the study. Resulting from that meeting, the consultant shall develop a Methods and Assumptions Document in accordance with the Method and Assumptions Template for SDDOT Planning Studies.

3. **Baseline Conditions Analysis / Obtain Data:**

   The consultant is to obtain all data needed to perform the study and should prepare an approach to assess the existing transportation network within the study area. At a minimum, the study advisory team believes this task will need to:

   a) Obtain and review all applicable access ordinances and guidelines.
   b) Obtain applicable local agencies zoning regulations.
   c) Gather mapping data.
   d) Review existing traffic volume and turning movement data and determine traffic volume count and turning movement count data needs. At a minimum, the following data elements are believed to be collected by the consultant:

   - Turning movements at each of the intersections indicated in Figure 2 and listed in Task 4. Turning movement counts should be obtained for a minimum of 12 hours and also obtain separate bicycle and pedestrian counts. The timing of this collection should be coordinated with SDDOT’s traffic data collection group, who will collect 24 hour volume, vehicle classification and speed data along mainline I-29 during the same period.

   It should be anticipated that peak hour turning movement counts may need to be obtained at additional intersections to determine potential impacts of options. Other data elements may be available from SDDOT sources. A preliminary list, including an estimate of cost, of all traffic data anticipated to be needed to fulfill the study’s requirements is requested to be presented with the written proposal.
e) Identify traffic safety problems based on crash history and potential traffic safety areas based upon local knowledge. The five year history of reportable crashes within the study area will be provided.

f) Identify traffic issues that occur during special events and high traffic periods, such as the annual Sturgis Motorcycle Rally.

g) Verify and catalog changes to access locations along the corridor.

h) Identify bicycle / pedestrian facilities, connections and needs.

i) Identify transit issues and needs.

j) Review existing street / roadway design standards of all applicable agencies.

k) Determine and gather all other relevant data needed to fulfill the study’s requirements.

Much of the non-traffic data is available from the SDDOT’s GIS system or Lincoln County’s Interactive GIS. If data is not readily available from these sources, the consultant will be responsible for all other data collection necessary to conduct the study.

4. **Existing Traffic and Operations Analysis:**

The consultant is to conduct a traffic operations analysis using the current edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) along the study corridor for existing conditions. This will include determining the existing corridor level of service for segments of the I-29 corridor between Exit 62 and Exit 73. Segmentation of the corridor will be done in accordance to the current edition of the HCM methodology.

This will also include determining the existing intersection level of service for each intersection listed below:

- I-29 Exit 62 NB Ramp Terminal & US18 / 282nd Street
- I-29 Exit 62 SB Ramp Terminal & US18 / 282nd Street
- I-29 Exit 64 NB Ramp Terminal & 280th Street
- I-29 Exit 64 SB Ramp Terminal & SD44 / 280th Street
- I-29 Exit 68 NB Ramp Terminal & 276th Street
- I-29 Exit 68 SB Ramp Terminal & 276th Street
- I-29 Exit 71 NB Ramp Terminal & 273rd Street
- I-29 Exit 71 SB Ramp Terminal & 273rd Street
- I-29 Exit 73 Ramp Terminal & 271st Street

Additional intersections may be identified as the study progresses.

The crossroad at 278th Street (MRM 66.34) should also be evaluated for need and if needed, capacity. This analysis should include a traffic diversion study called for by SDDOT policy DOT-P&E-PD-4.0. The existing crossroad at 281st Street (MRM 63.34) is currently under study and does not need to be reevaluated by the consultant.
5. *Incident, Weather, and Special Event (Planned & Unplanned) Analysis:*

The consultant shall evaluate the I-29 corridor’s traffic performance on day(s) of incidents and events. Since many of these events are unplanned, needed data should be anticipated to be obtained via stakeholder debriefings, customer feedback, NPMRDS data, and analysis of available traffic and transit data from the day(s) of the incidents. Incidents shall include both weather and crash events that cause a noticeable change in travel delay along the I-29 corridor and/or travel dispersion away from the I-29 corridor. Analysis of planned special events shall include a determination of the most feasible methods to safely handle mainline traffic during construction or maintenance activities that require the closure of a complete directional set of lanes for each I-29 corridor link between interchanges and at each interchange.

6. *Project Future Conditions (2045):*

The consultant shall work with both the Sioux Falls MPO’s traffic model and the SDDOT’s traffic monitoring group to project future traffic conditions along the study corridor under a “No Build” (Do-nothing) Scenario to the year 2045. The entire corridor should be covered by the MPO’s traffic model.

At present, the majority of the corridor is currently classified rural by FHWA since it is outside of any FHWA approved urban boundary. However, the northern portion of the corridor (from 273rd Street north) is inside of the current FHWA approved Sioux Falls urbanized area and classified as urban. This urbanized boundary has been expanded to the south after each of the past three decennial US Censuses. As such, a determination will need to be made on how far south the Sioux Falls urban area may expand by 2045, and whether or not that expansion will incorporate any additional portions of the corridor or interchanges, as the SDDOT’s Level of Service criteria is different for urban areas.

The consultant is to conduct a traffic operations analysis using the current edition of the HCM along the study corridor for the projected conditions. This will include determining the future No-Build corridor level of service for segments of the I-29 corridor between Exit 62 and Exit 73. Segmentation of the corridor will be done in accordance to the current edition of the HCM methodology.

This will also include determining the No Build intersection level of service for each intersection listed below:

- I-29 Exit 62 NB Ramp Terminal & US18 / 282nd Street
- I-29 Exit 62 SB Ramp Terminal & US18 / 282nd Street
- I-29 Exit 64 NB Ramp Terminal & 280th Street
- I-29 Exit 64 SB Ramp Terminal & SD44 / 280th Street
- I-29 Exit 68 NB Ramp Terminal & 276th Street
- I-29 Exit 68 SB Ramp Terminal & 276th Street
- I-29 Exit 71 NB Ramp Terminal & 273rd Street
- I-29 Exit 71 SB Ramp Terminal & 273rd Street
- I-29 Exit 73 Ramp Terminal & 271st Street
Additional intersections may be identified as the study progresses.

The crossroad at 278th Street (MRM 66.34) should also be evaluated for future need and if needed, capacity.

7. **ITS Assessment:**

The consultant shall assess the capabilities and limitations of the existing ITS architecture and deployment within the study corridor’s area of influence. The consultant shall identify needs and opportunities to productively and cost-effectively deploy ITS technology to improve and maintain the operational function and safety of the corridor. The analysis shall address all applicable ITS Service Packages within the Service Areas (Advanced Data Management, Public Transportation, Traveler Information, Traffic Management, Vehicle Safety, Commercial Vehicle Operations, Emergency Management, and Maintenance and Construction Management) defined in the National ITS Architecture.

8. **Identification of Solutions:**

The consultant shall identify geometric, infrastructural, ITS, and operational solutions to address deficiencies identified along the primary study corridor’s area of influence. As part of this effort, the consultant shall conduct a brainstorming workshop with the Study Advisory Team and other SDDOT staff to determine other potential solutions for both mainline I-29 and the interchanges. The consultant shall analyze those solutions to develop a comparable list of benefits and shortcomings of each alternative solution, along with a cost estimate for each alternative solution. The safety impact of each solution should also be determined.

For any potential interchange concept, the consultant shall develop thick-line sketches of each alternative concept. The consultant shall then create a matrix to rate the performance of the conceptual options based on the initial concept drawings and generalized (planning level) measures of effectiveness, including traffic efficiency, relative construction cost, environmental impacts, and right-of-way impacts.

Solutions should include the removal of the crossroad structure at 281st Street (MRM 63.34) and a recommendation for the future of the crossroad at 278th Street (MRM 66.34).

All potential ITS solutions must be described consistently with the national and local ITS architecture. Upgrades to the area’s existing ITS architecture necessary to implement each ITS solution should also be determined.
9. **Conceptual Improvement Options for the I-29 corridor**

The consultant shall determine and investigate the list of corridor and interchange improvements, cost estimates, and determine conceptual improvement options. The options will try to minimize the amount of right of way purchase, and address any bicycle, pedestrian, and transit issues.

These conceptual improvement options are to show:

- Preliminary profile of mainline I-29 and all crossroads affected by the option based upon available contour data.
- Conceptual structure type(s), length(s) & width(s).
- Typical section(s) of mainline I-29 and all roadways affected by the option.
- Lane requirements, including auxiliary lanes, of mainline I-29, on the crossroads, and through intersection areas necessary to maintain a mainline I-29 LOS of B or better for segments determined to remain classified as rural in 2045 and LOS of C or better for segments determined to be classified as urban in 2045.
- Turn lane requirements at crossroad intersections.
- Future intersection traffic control improvements such as turn lanes, traffic signals and/or roundabouts as necessary to achieve an intersection LOS of B or better at the I-29 ramp terminal intersections at interchanges determined to remain classified as rural in 2045 and LOS of C or better at interchanges determined to be classified as urban in 2045.
- Permanent signing, lane delineation and other traffic control items necessary.
- Local or other arterial connection modifications that may be needed as a result of implementing the option.
- Right of Way limits
- Utility impacts/needs
- Access locations that should be removed/consolidated/relocated with the project(s) to enhance traffic flow through the corridor and crossroads.
- Control of access limits for all interchange options
- Location of pedestrian and bicycle access and crossings.
- Desktop review of potential environmental impacts.

10. **Determination of Feasible Scenarios**

Using the list of corridor improvements determined in Task 9, the consultant shall work with the study advisory team to determine up to three potential build scenarios for the entire study corridor.
11. **Traffic and Operations Analysis of Feasible Scenarios:**

The consultant is to conduct a traffic operations analysis along the study corridor for the feasible scenarios for both the existing and the projected 2045 traffic conditions for all build scenarios brought forward from Task 9.

The consultant is to conduct a traffic operations analysis using the current edition of the HCM along the study corridor and study intersections for the projected conditions of the feasible scenarios. This will include determining the future corridor level of service for the segments of the I-29 corridor between Exit 62 and Exit 73. Segmentation of the corridor will be done in accordance to the current edition of the HCM methodology.

This will also include determining the intersection level of service for each intersection listed below:

- I-29 Exit 62 NB Ramp Terminal & US18 / 282nd Street
- I-29 Exit 62 SB Ramp Terminal & US18 / 282nd Street
- I-29 Exit 64 NB Ramp Terminal & 280th Street
- I-29 Exit 64 SB Ramp Terminal & SD44 / 280th Street
- I-29 Exit 68 NB Ramp Terminal & 276th Street
- I-29 Exit 68 SB Ramp Terminal & 276th Street
- I-29 Exit 71 NB Ramp Terminal & 273rd Street
- I-29 Exit 71 SB Ramp Terminal & 273rd Street
- I-29 Exit 73 Ramp Terminal & 271st Street

Additional intersections may be identified as the study progresses.
12. **Traffic Variables for Design**

The consultant shall determine the traffic design variables necessary to design the I-29 mainline for the build scenarios of this study. These variables include, but are not limited to:

- Average Annual Daily Traffic for the year of construction (AADT\textsubscript{2023}).
- Average Annual Daily Traffic for the future year (AADT\textsubscript{2045}).
- Design Hour Volume, 30\textsuperscript{th} highest hour of the year. (DHV);
- Direction Distribution in the predominate direction of travel (D).
- Truck Percentage of DHV (T DHV).
- Truck Percentage of AADT (T ADT).
- Design speed(s) (V).

Design variables are to be determined for all logical corridor segments as determined by the Feasible Scenarios brought forward from Task 9.

13. **Safety Analysis:**

The consultant shall identify existing and future safety issues (actual & perceived) along the I-29 corridor. Conduct a safety analysis for time period of 2024 (year of completion) to 2045 (planning horizon year) for all feasible scenarios developed by Task 10 using FHWA’s Interactive Highway Safety Design Model’s (IHSDM) Crash Prediction Module in accordance with the Highway Safety Manual.

14. **Environmental Overview:**

The study area for the environmental overview will be an approximately 500 foot buffer surrounding the study corridor except where noted below. The Consultant will collect, summarize, and provide the source of relevant existing data along the corridor, but will not develop an environmental finding document. The planning document should provide enough detail to document the project level environmental setting. The study should meet the regulatory criteria for use of a corridor or sub-area study in NEPA, as required by 23 CFR §§ 450.212(b) and 450.318(b).

The following environmental resources are expected to be required for the environmental overview. This list is not all-inclusive and is subject to change based on meetings with project stakeholders as the study progresses. Modifications to the list may be necessary. The consultant will conduct a “windshield survey” of the study area and utilize existing data from previous studies conducted in the area and other agencies. No additional environmental information will be field collected nor will environmental clearances be obtained.

- The foundation for a purpose and needs statement that defines the goals and objectives or vision statement for the corridor and/or the recommended project(s).
- Local land Use, growth management, or development plans and projections of future land use, natural resource conservation areas, and development – This information should be available from the various local agencies.
• Consultation with resource and regulatory agencies for purposes of integrating interagency goals and plans into the corridor plan.
• Planning level evaluation of indirect and cumulative effects. This will need to include:
  o Defining the indirect and cumulative impact study area, this is assumed to be larger than the direct impact study area of the corridor study.
  o Creating a map of the study areas for direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts.
  o Identification of potential indirect impact causing activities of the build scenarios.
  o Identification of the potential direct and indirect impacts that may contribute to a cumulative impact.
• Environmental scans that produce preliminary identification of impacts and mitigation to environmental resources and environmentally sensitive areas:
  o Floodways and 100-year floodplain boundaries – The consultant shall obtain the FEMA FIRM designated floodplain areas within the Study Area.
  o Historic Preservation - The consultant will complete a records search, windshield survey, and prepare a memo summarizing the potential of the Area of Potential Effect (APE) to contain archaeological sites and built resources of significance (buildings/structures) based on the windshield survey and preliminary research and outline recommendations for further work for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended). The records search will include a review of archaeological sites, historic buildings and structures, and previous investigations known to be located in and within a one mile buffer of the APE. Using this information, the consultant will prepare an outline of the results of this preliminary research and windshield survey, identify potential effects and make recommendations for any further cultural resources work to be done during the design phase of any potential project(s).
  o Hazardous Substances – This information will be obtained from various resource agencies.
  o Wetlands and Other Waters of the US –This information will be obtained from various resource agencies and through desktop analysis.
  o Wildlife/Threatened and Endangered Species – This information will be obtained from various resource agencies, including FWS’ IPAC system.
  o Section 4(f) and 6(f) Resources— The consultant shall inventory and map the Study Area for Section 4(f) and/or 6(f) facilities. Determine any potential impacts or ROW acquisitions that may have potential to result in a use of Section 4(f) properties (for example publicly owned public parks, recreation areas, and wildlife or waterfowl refuges, or any publicly or privately owned historic site listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places) or Section 6(f) properties (those that have received Land and Water Conservation Funds). Using this information, the consultant will prepare recommendations for any further Section 4(f) or 6(f) work to be done during the design phase of any potential project(s).

The objective for the Environmental Overview is preparation for the initiation of the NEPA process for a proposed project action. The results and decisions of the planning process need to be documented in a way that is clear, suitable, and readily available for incorporation into a NEPA document.
15. **Recommendations:**

Based upon the results of the Traffic and Operations Analysis, public input received, and other needs determined by the study, the consultant team shall recommend a schedule of improvement projects for the I-29 corridor between Exit 62 and 73. Recommendations should include an estimate of costs and a general timeline for implementation of each project.

16. **Public Involvement:**

A. Support the "I-29 Corridor Study Advisory Team"

The Study Advisory Team is expected to meet 6 to 8 times (including teleconferences and/or videoconferences) during the project period for the consultant to provide regular progress reports and to solicit feedback from members regarding study progress and execution. Two (2) of these meetings are to be scheduled and held prior to each public meeting (can be held the same day) to gather the Study Advisory Team’s approval on the information being presented to the public and one (1) will include the workshop called for in Task 7. Other meetings will be held as deemed necessary. The Study Advisory Team may also meet at additional times without the consultant’s involvement during the study period. It should be accounted for in budgeting for these meetings that the majority of the SAT is located in Pierre.

B. Conduct Two Public Meetings

There will be a minimum of 2 public meetings during the project period at which the consultant will make the lead public presentations regarding study methods, findings and recommendations of the study or its sub-elements, and to receive public input. These meetings are expected at the following intervals:

- Project Kickoff / Data Collection / Existing Conditions Analysis
- Recommendations (Draft Final Report Stage)

The consultant will organize and provide notice for these meetings. For each meeting, the consultant shall provide the SDDOT the public meeting notice for review and approval prior to its publication to ensure the notice meets SDDOT requirements. At a minimum, publication of the notice shall occur twice in each of the Sioux Falls Argus Leader, Lennox Independent, Tea Weekly and the Sioux Falls Shopping News newspapers, with the last notice published a minimum of 10 days prior to the meeting. The final proof from the publisher of the meeting notice shall be provided to SDDOT prior to publication. An Affidavit of Publication from the publisher will be required in the invoice for reimbursement. Packaging of advertising in both the printed newspaper and the newspaper’s website should be considered. The SDDOT and the Sioux Falls MPO shall all be allowed to issue press releases based upon the public notice and advertise the meeting on their websites.

The consultant is encouraged to use creative measures to inform commuters along the corridor of the public meetings. Direct invitation mailings to the immediate property and business owners along the study corridor and to residents in the neighborhoods adjacent
to I-29 corridor will be required. The consultant shall present and provide exhibits for the meeting.

C. MPO Meetings

The consultant shall prepare documents for inclusion in MPO committee packets, handouts and any presentation material needed for SDDOT or MPO staff to present updates on the study throughout the study period. When public meetings correspond with MPO meetings, the Consultant staff may make the presentation to the MPO committees.

D. Stakeholder Meetings

The consultant team shall hold two series of meetings with either individual or groups of stakeholders. Stakeholders will include representatives from the cities of Harrisburg, Lennox, Tea, and Worthing, land and/or business owners/managers for those parcels and businesses directly affected by potential changes caused by any of the options being analyzed. It is estimated that these meetings will take place in conjunction with the public meetings.

E. Website

The consultant team shall maintain a website dedicated to the study. The website should be organized in such a way that will help dispense information to the public regarding the status of the study, public meeting announcements, presentations, meeting summaries, and all reports. At a minimum, the website shall allow for public input into the study during the duration of the study. The website can be used to assist in data gathering through web surveys and for other public participation actions as deemed appropriate as long as adequate advertising is provided. The SDDOT and the Sioux Falls MPO shall be allowed to provide direct links to the study website from their websites. The website should be active at least ten (10) days prior to the first public meeting. The website shall remain active for a period of at least 6 months after completion of the study to allow public access to the final report. All public meeting notifications and public comment sheets should list the website address.
17. **Document Preparation:**

The consultant shall provide the following items to the SDDOT contact person:

- Study Updates in word processing format (Microsoft® Word) or as Portable Document Format (Adobe® .pdf) of the study’s progression due with each invoice submittal or every two months, whichever is less.
- An electronic copy for the Sioux Falls MPO and for the SDDOT, in word processing format (Microsoft® Word) or as Portable Document Format (Adobe® .pdf) of all draft reports and executive summary.
- Fifteen (15) printed copies of the final report and executive summary.
- An electronic copy for Lincoln County, the Sioux Falls MPO and for the SDDOT, in word processing format (Microsoft® Word) as well as Portable Document Format (Adobe® .pdf), of the complete final report, and the complete executive summary. The PDF file shall be bookmarked for quick navigation to logical sections of the document.
- CADD (Microstation) files for both conceptual improvement options and all approved standard typical sections.
- Copies of any pertinent working papers and electronic files created during the project.

Please note, as stated in the Master Agreement Contract:

“The CONSULTANT will furnish to the DEPARTMENT all design and check design computations. All documents furnished, including original drawings, software generated electronic files, design computations, and check design computations, will become and remain the property of the DEPARTMENT and may be used by the DEPARTMENT without restriction for any public purpose.

The CONSULTANT will provide survey documents for bench levels and for the checking of bench levels on standard loose-leaf transit field book sheets. The CONSULTANT will provide all other data collected in an electronic format and will include the following files: FWD file, DGN file, DTM file, ALG file, and the RAW data file. The FWD file, DGN file, DTM file and ALG file, will be compatible with the DEPARTMENT’S current version of InRoads. The RAW data file will be in ASCII format and will include the following information: point number, northing, easting, description, and any pertinent notes corresponding to a particular point.”

To aid in the SDDOT’s future use, all planning level design necessary for completion of this study shall be done in accordance with SDDOT design procedures. As such, the Consultant shall utilize the SDDOT webpage www.sddot.com/business/design/Default to obtain the SDDOT design standards (Road Design Manual), the proper file naming convention and formats necessary (CADD Procedures Manual) and other downloadable Files (i.e. Form Letters, Microstation and InRoads files, Plan Notes, etc.) and other info as necessary so that the electronic files created by this study can be easily adapted by SDDOT for future design purposes.

Files to be transferred to the SDDOT upon completion of the study may include:

- Topography, Right of Way and Design graphics (dgn)
• Digital Terrain Model of original and final surfaces (dtm)
• Original Geometry files (alg)

After the Study Advisory Team’s review of the draft reports, the SDDOT’s contact person will advise the consultant as to its acceptability and will request any changes that may be desired. It should be anticipated that multiple drafts of the final report documents may be needed before final acceptance. The electronic versions of the executive summary and final report documents shall be due to SDDOT’s contact person ten (10) days prior to the study’s completion date.

Available Information:

The following will be made available to aid the selected consultant in performing the study if the consultant deems them needed:

♦ Existing vehicular traffic data.
♦ Existing structure condition data
♦ SDDOT Road Design Manual
♦ Available previous construction plans
♦ Available GIS data, including aerial photography, parcel information, existing land use and crash locations
♦ Current scoping and/or design documents for nearby planned projects, including:
  ♦ IM 0292(81)061 PCN 05TK
♦ Available data and reports from previously completed and on-going studies. Examples of these include:
  ▪ South Dakota Decennial Interstate Corridor Study
  ▪ Sioux Falls MPO Long Range Plan
  ▪ Lincoln County Comprehensive Plan

Many of these documents are available on the SDDOT’s website, www.sddot.com for review during proposal preparation. Information regarding the availability of specific GIS and/or traffic data from the state can be obtained from Mr. Rocky Hook at 605-773-4404 or rocky.hook@state.sd.us. Information regarding the availability of specific data from the MPO can be obtained from Ms. Amber Gibson at 605-367-5390 or amber@secog.org.
Proposal Deadline:

Proposals are to be submitted to:

Steven Gramm, P.E.
SDDOT – Project Development
700 East Broadway Avenue
Pierre, SD  57501-2586,

Proposals must be received no later than **12:00 pm CDT on March 3, 2017**. The deadline is firm. Extensions will not be granted. The consultant must submit twelve (12) printed copies. The chosen consultant will be required to provide their proposal, with modifications as needed for the work order, in a Portable Document Format (Adobe® .pdf) to be included as part of the work order.

Proposals must remain valid for at least 29 days after the deadline. The SDDOT will not acknowledge receipt of proposals unless a stamped, self-addressed post card is included in the proposal package.

**Anticipated Start Date:**

April 1, 2017

**Anticipated End Date:**

March 31, 2018

**Funds Available:**

$ 450,000
Proposal Guidelines and Requirements:

Each proposer must demonstrate in their proposal that they have the professional capabilities needed to accomplish this study. The proposal should contain all information relevant to indicate the consultant team’s abilities to successfully complete this study and give the study advisory team a better understanding of the consultant team’s qualifications.

At a minimum, the proposal should contain the following:

- **Statement of Study Approach:** Describe the approach the consultant proposes to accomplish the study.

- **Proposed Study Team Members:** Provide a written description of the consultant team composition, including disciplines, primary role in regards to the study, and relevant experience. The information provided must clearly indicate the consultant team’s point of contact, the team leader for the study (if different) and the responsible party in each firm who will be providing the required professional experience.

  Provide a table showing the number of person-hours (not percentages of time) that will be devoted to each task by consultant team members. List the names of principal investigators and other key professionals who will be involved. Support personnel may be identified by classification. If subcontracting is necessary, include subcontractors' key personnel and support staff in a separate table. Clearly identify subcontractors' involvement.

  Describe current commitments to other work in sufficient detail to permit assessment of each consultant team member's ability to meet the proposal's commitments. Include a statement that the level of effort proposed for principal and professional members of the study team will not be changed without written consent of SDDOT.

- **Individual Experience:** Provide a description of the background of key members of the consultant team and their specific participation in previous projects that would directly relate to the work planned to be done for this study. This may be done in descriptive text or in resume format.

- **Study Schedule:** Provide a graphic or text calendar to define the proposed study schedule for tasks and set milestone dates.
• Budget: Show the estimated cost for the entire study by SDDOT fiscal year. SDDOT's fiscal years run from July 1 through June 30. A sample budget is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Total Estimate Hours</td>
<td>Total Estimated Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name - Title or ID#</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name - Title or ID#</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$810.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name - Title or ID#</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name - Title or ID#</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name - Title or ID#</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td>$3,317.50</td>
<td>$4,349.18</td>
<td>$7,666.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$829.00</td>
<td>$1,087.00</td>
<td>$1,916.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead / Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$2,654.00</td>
<td>$3,479.00</td>
<td>$6,133.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Fee</td>
<td>$880.00</td>
<td>$892.00</td>
<td>$1,772.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Travel</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Travel</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Supplies</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$710.00</td>
<td>$1,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracts</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Time</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Publication</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$9,080.50</td>
<td>$14,917.18</td>
<td>$23,997.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. May be included with Overhead / Indirect Costs. Must be in accordance with 48CFR Part 31
2. Must be in accordance with 49CFR Part 1B
3. Only if normally treated as a direct cost

If the proposal includes effort by subcontractors, a similar budget table should be included for each subcontractor.

Out-of-state travel, which is defined as travel between the consultant's base and destinations other than South Dakota, must be identified separately. All travel between the consultant’s home base and South Dakota should be recorded as in-state travel.

Indirect costs listed in the budget must be substantiated if and when the proposal is selected. Prior to the first contract payment, the successful proposer must submit documentation supporting the bases and rates used to calculate indirect costs by the prime contractor and each of the subcontractors. Examples of indirect cost schedule formats can be found in Chapter 9 of the AASHTO Uniform Audit & Accounting Guide located at: http://audit.transportation.org/.

Total funding should not exceed the amount indicated as "Funds Available" on the Request for Proposal. This amount represents what SDDOT feels the study merits and what level of funding should be necessary to complete the work. Proposers should set the scope and depth of study accordingly. Because of budget constraints, additional funding is highly unlikely. No budget expansions should be anticipated.
Proposal Evaluation:

Proposals will be evaluated by the Study Advisory Team. Selection will be made by the advisory team in consideration of:

- the proposer’s demonstrated understanding of the issues;
- the merit of the proposed approach to the study;
- the probability of success in the achieving the study’s objectives;
- the proposer’s record of accomplishments in related areas;
- the adequacy of the proposer’s staff and facilities;

Upon review of the received proposals, the Study Advisory Team may invite the proposers to a one hour presentation/interview with the Study Advisory Team. The selected proposers will appear for an oral presentation and evaluation by the study advisory team at the proposer’s expense. If needed, these proposer presentations/ interviews will be held the week of March 20, 2017.

The SDDOT will afford equal opportunity to all those who submit proposals and will not discriminate in its selection of consultants on the grounds of race, sex, color, physical handicap or national origin.

Proposers should anticipate being notified of the results of the selection process in writing no later than April 31, 2017.

Ownership of Proposals:

All proposals submitted become the property of the South Dakota Department of Transportation. SDDOT has the right to use all information presented in any proposal, unless it is annotated as being proprietary. SDDOT considers all information contained in proposals as privileged and reserves the right to maintain its confidentiality. Selection or rejection of a proposal does not affect these rights. SDDOT reserves the right to reject any and all proposals submitted. SDDOT may, under certain conditions, negotiate with the proposer to address specific weaknesses in a submitted proposal.

SDDOT is not responsible for any costs incurred by proposers, including proposal preparation, prior to execution of a work order or contract.

Questions should be submitted to:

Steve Gramm, P.E.
SDDOT – Project Development
700 East Broadway Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501-2586
Phone (605) 773-6641
Email steve.gramm@state.sd.us.