



**IRA LIBANOFF, ESQUIRE**  
[ilibanoff@hinckleyallen.com](mailto:ilibanoff@hinckleyallen.com)

September 30, 2024

**VIA HAND DELIVERY**

Robert E. Gleason, Director  
Purchasing Division  
Broward County Florida  
115 South Andrews Avenue, Room 212  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301

Re: GLF Construction Corp.'s Notice of Protest of Award  
Project: PNC21263443P1 Design-Build: Sheridan St. Bridge over FL Turnpike

Dear Mr. Gleason:

As you are aware, the undersigned represents GLF Construction Corporation ("GLF"), the lowest responsive and responsible bidder / proposer in response for the Design-Build: Sheridan St. Bridge over FL Turnpike Project, Bid Nos. PNC2126443R1 and PNC2126443P1 (the "Subject Project"). On August 5, 2024, GLF submitted its objection to the Evaluation Committee's ("EC") proposed recommendation of ranking of the solicitation's Step Two bidders – GLF and Structural Technologies, LLC ("ST") – noting that ST's response to the solicitation was deficient in several respects, thereby rendering ST a non-responsive bidder and calling into question certain scores assigned to ST by the EC.

On September 19, 2024, the Broward County Purchasing Division ("Purchasing") submitted its written response denying GLF's objection and noting that the Recommendation of Ranking shall remain as originally indicated, *i.e.*, ST remains as the first ranked bidder and GLF remains as the second ranked bidder. Notwithstanding Purchasing's denial of GLF's objection, as discussed in detail below, GLF maintains that ST's response to the solicitation is deficient such that ST should not have been deemed a responsible bidder and the EC's Recommendation of Ranking of ST above GLF was arbitrary and capricious. Consequently, the EC's Recommendation of Ranking should be rejected and the Contract should be awarded to GLF.

## STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

### Step One RFQ

In July and August 2023, as step one of its two-step procurement process, the Broward County Board of County Commissioners (the “County”) solicited responses to its Request for Qualification (“RFQ”) for the Subject Project (Bid No. PNC2126443R1).

Section B of the RFQ’s Standard Instructions to Vendors, titled “Responsibility Criteria” provides:

A Responsible (Vendor) means a vendor who is determined to have the capability **in all respects** to perform fully the requirements of a solicitation, as well as the integrity and reliability that will ensure good faith performance.

(emphasis added). The section sets forth standard responsibility criteria and incorporates additional responsibility criteria found in the Special Instructions to Vendors. Specifically, it provides:

Below are standard responsibility criteria; refer to Special Instructions to Vendors for Additional Responsibility Criteria requirement(s).

Section B(1)(a) of the RFQ requires vendors to disclose all “material” cases filed, pending or resolved during the last three (3) years prior to the solicitation response due date. The section further provides:

A case is considered to be “material” if it relates, in whole or in part, to any of the following:

- i. A similar type of work that the vendor is seeking to perform for the County under the current solicitation;
- ii. An allegation of fraud, negligence, error or omissions, or malpractice against the vendor or any of its principals or agents who would be performing work under the current solicitation.

Further, subsection B(1)(f) of the RFQ provides that “[f]ailure to disclose any material case, including all requested information in connection with each such case . . . may result in the Vendor being deemed non-responsive.”

Section B(3) of the RFQ’s Special Instructions to Vendors required bidders to possess Florida Department of Transportation (“FDOT”) Certificate of Qualification for the “Minor” Bridges Work Class.

Section C of the RFQ's Special Instructions to Vendors incorporates the "Supplemental Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Requirements" into the solicitation. The Supplemental FDOT Requirements provides that:

An entity or affiliate who has had its FDOT issued certificate of qualification suspended, revoked, denied or have further been determined by FDOT to be a non-responsible contractor may not submit a bid or perform work for the construction or repair of a public building or public work on a contract with County

### Step Two RFP

Between March 19, 2024 and May 20, 2024, as step two of its two-step procurement process, the County solicited responses to its Request for Proposal ("RFP") for the Subject Project (Bid No. PNC2126443P1).

Section C of the RFP's Special Instructions to Vendors provides the following:

#### C. Revisions to Information Previously Submitted:

1. Responsiveness and Responsibility: Standard Instructions to Vendors, Section A. Responsiveness Criteria, and Section B. Responsibility Criteria are not required to be resubmitted as it was previously evaluated in Step One. Only new, revised, or updated information is required to be submitted (i.e. new "material" case, change of status on a previously disclosed case, etc.).
2. Evaluation Criteria: If there are changes to previously submitted qualifications (i.e. professional personnel, etc.) or firm information (ex. Vendor Questionnaire) updated information is required to be submitted.
3. The new, revised, or updated information may affect the previous determination of responsiveness, responsibility, or qualifications (as applicable) for the Design Build Firm, if the County determines that said revisions or changes are deemed material to the Project or to the Design Build Firm's submittal. Any new, revised, or updated information will be submitted to the Evaluation Committee for review and determination.
4. Failure of qualified Design Build Firm to inform the County of any material changes could affect Design Build Firm's determination of responsiveness, responsibility, and/or qualifications (as applicable), if the County determines that said revisions or changes are deemed material to the Project or to the Design Build Firm's submittal.
5. Design Build Firms shall submit in writing to County any revisions or changes, or new information, identifying previously submitted information

and the change or new information. If there are no changes or revisions, a Contractor Statement on company letterhead, signed by the owner or authorized company representative, affirming that there are no changes to the information submitted in response to Step One of RFQ No. PNC2126443R1. If not provided with submittal, the Design Build Firm must submit within three business days of County's request. Design Build Firm may be deemed non responsible for failure to fully comply within stated timeframes.

The Step Two RFP sets forth the Scope of Work for the Subject Project, including the Subject Project's Completion Date Requirement of 540 Calendar Days.

The Step Two RFP includes a Question & Answer section setting forth the vendor questions received during the solicitation period and the County's answers thereto. In response to Question No. 11, concerning vendors' Maintenance of Traffic ("MOT") proposals, the County represented that "MOT plans will require approval by the Florida Turnpike prior to implementation. If lane closures are required during construction or maintenance, the contractor must comply with the provisions outlined in the Florida Turnpike Enterprise (FTE) Lane Closure Policy and Guidelines." ST's FDOT Work Class Certifications

The FDOT issues Certificates of Qualification for various major classes of work. Each class is distinct, represents its own major class of work, and are categorized as either: Roadway Work Classes, Bridge Construction Work Classes, and Bridge Repair & Rehabilitation Work Classes. See <https://wbt.dot.state.fl.us/ois/WorkClassPercentageCBT/Resources.htm>, last accessed on September 27, 2024; see also **Composite Exhibit "A"**, FDOT Work Classes, identifying the various major work classes and the category to which they pertain.

The FDOT Work Class for "Minor Bridges" is found under the FDOT's "Bridge Construction Work Classes" and is separate and distinct from the "Repair & Rehabilitate ("R&R") Minor Bridges" Work Class which can be found under the FDOT's "Bridge Repair & Rehabilitation Work Classes."

ST submitted its response to the Step 1 RFQ, which response included ST's FDOT Certificate of Qualification for the Repair and Rehabilitate ("R&R") Minor Bridges Work Class, issued on January 27, 2024 with an expiration date of March 30, 2024. Notably, ST's Certificate of Qualification **did not** include certification for the "Minor Bridges" Work Class.

On August 14, 2024, the FDOT issued a Certificate of Qualification to ST for, *inter alia*, the R&R Minor Bridges Work Class. Notably, the August 14<sup>th</sup> Certificate of Qualification **does not** include certification for the "Minor Bridges" Work Class.

### ST's Litigation History

ST's submission in response to the Step One RFP indicated that there are no material cases for ST required to be disclosed on the RFP's Litigation History Form.

ST's submission in response to the Step Two RFQ identified a single material case in the Litigation History Form, namely, the case styled *Agri-Systems d/b/a ASI Industrial v. Structural Technologies, LLC*, Case No. 19-cv2238 in the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado.

ST's submission in response to the Step One RFP and Step Two RFQ **did not** identify the following material cases involving ST that were filed, pending, or resolved during the last three years prior to the respective solicitation's response due date:

- *Rolando Hernandez Cabrera v. Structural Technologies*, Case No. CACE-23-019983, in the 17<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit in and for Broward County, Florida;
- *Reece Bordelon v. Exxon Mobil Corp. et al*, Case No. 3:24-cv-00242-BAJ-SDJ, in the 19<sup>th</sup> Judicial District Court for the Parish of East Baton Rouge, Louisiana;
- *Wilson Oliva v. Board of Managers of the Edge Condominium, et al*, Index No. 34551/2020E, in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Bronx;
- *Messer Construction Co. v. CH2M Hill Engineers, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 1-80-20, in the Circuit Court for Knox County, Tennessee;
- *Chelsea L. Brownfield et al v. Munilla Construction Management LLC et al*, Case No. 2018-012424-CA-01, in the 11<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit in and for Miami-Dade County, Florida;
- *Eugenia Xiomara Alvarez v. Figg Bridge Engineers, Inc. et al*, Case No. 2018-018318-CA-01, in the 11<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit in and for Miami-Dade County, Florida;
- *Randy Hanson et al. v. Munilla Construction Management, LLC*, Case No. 2018-018390-CA-01, in the 11<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit in and for Miami-Dade County, Florida;
- *Pedro Cortes v. Figg Bridge Engineers, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 2019-009436-CA-01, in the 11<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit in and for Miami-Dade County, Florida; and
- *Ramoy Goulbourne v. Figg Bridge Engineers, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 2019-010597-CA-01, in the 11<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit in and for Miami-Dade County, Florida.

### ST's MOT Plan, Scheduling and Sequencing of Work, and Proposed Jacking Methodology

ST's submission in response to the Step Two RFP sets forth ST's MOT plan, its scheduling and sequencing of work, and its proposed jacking methodology.

Specifically, ST has proposed using traffic pacing to control traffic on the Turnpike during lifting operations in connection with the jacking or lifting of the bridge.

Furthermore, the schedule in ST's submission indicates a 505 calendar day duration to complete the Subject Project. The sequence of work set forth in ST's submission in support of its indicated 505 calendar day duration sequences the construction of the pedestals beneath the bridge beams before the bridge is lifted, provides for 50 days of pedestal work, and notes that pedestal work will be complete on the same day that bridge jacking is finished.

Notwithstanding the proposed sequencing set forth in ST's Step Two submission, during ST's presentation to the EC, ST represented that the pedestal work would commence **after** the bridge was jacked. Indeed, the sequencing proposed in ST's Step Two submission is a practical impossibility as the bridge beams are to sit on top of the newly constructed pedestals such that pedestal work cannot commence until **after** the bridge is jacked.

Furthermore, ST's proposed jacking methodology involves employing support brackets bolted to the caps with post-installed anchors drilled into the substructure, a methodology that carries an unnecessary risk of structural degradation.

## **GROUND FOR REVERSAL OF RECOMMENDATION OF RANKING**

### **I. The EC's Recommendation of Ranking was Arbitrary and Capricious**

The decision by Purchasing to rank ST's bid above GLF's bid was arbitrary and capricious due to its failure to consistently evaluate the bids based on the requirements of the Steps One and Two Solicitations. *See City of Pensacola v. Kirby*, 47 So. 2d 533 (Fla. 1950) (a public entity's rejection of bids is subject to some exercise of discretion and the standard by which that discretion is judged is that it should not be arbitrary, unreasonable, or capricious, but should be based upon facts reasonably tending to support the conclusions of the public entity.). First and foremost, ST's lack of FDOT Minor Bridge Work Class certification and its failure to identify all material cases in its litigation history submission render ST a non-responsible bidder. Furthermore, not only is ST a non-responsible bidder, ST should not have been scored higher than GLF with respect to its Project Approach, Proposed Time, and Project/Quality Management Plan, given the scheduling/sequencing, jacking methodology, and MOT plan deficiencies in ST's bid.

### **ST Does Not Meet the Solicitation's FDOT Qualification Requirements**

The Step One RFQ required ST to submit its Certificate of Qualification for the FDOT Minor Bridges Work class. As ST is not qualified in the FDOT Minor Bridges Work Class, it instead submitted its Certificate of Qualification for the FDOT R&R Minor Bridges Work Class. In accordance with the FDOT, the Minor Bridges Work Class is separate and distinct from the R&R Minor Bridges Work Class. Indeed, not only does each class have its own respective code number, the R&R Minor Bridges Work Class is found under an entirely different category than the Minor Bridges Work Class, namely the Bridge Repair and Rehabilitation Work Classes and the Bridge Construction Work Classes, respectively. *See Ex. "A"*.

The R&R Minor Bridges Work Class is intended to qualify a contractor for the resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation of existing minor bridge structures. However, the scope of work for this Project contemplates much more than simple resurfacing, restoration, or rehabilitation and involves, *inter alia*, utilizing a system to jack the bridge superstructure, construct bridge pedestals, and to reconstruct both roadway approaches. Accordingly, the scope of work for the Project necessitates a contractor qualified in the Minor Bridges Work Class, not the R&R Minor Bridges Work Class.

Purchasing's contention that there is no material distinction between the FDOT Minor Bridges Work Class and the R&R Minor Bridges Work Class because neither Code No. 27 (Minor Bridges) nor Code No. 37 (R&R Minor Bridges) were specified in the RFQ is arbitrary and capricious. The Step One RFQ expressly specifies the requirement to submit FDOT Minor Bridges Work Class certification and makes no mention of the R&R Minor Bridges Work Class. Furthermore, the RFQ employs the phrase "Minor Bridges Work Class" in its singular form, implying that there is only one class certification that would suffice to meet this requirement, namely, the Minor Bridges Work Class. Accordingly, this language can only reasonably be interpreted as requiring the submission of FDOT Minor Bridges Work Class certification and not the separate and distinct R&R Minor Bridges Work Class certification, particularly in light of the intensive nature of the bridge jacking, pedestal construction, and roadway reconstruction required for the Project.

Furthermore, in its response to GLF's objection, Purchasing noted that ST's R&R Minor Bridges Work Class certification expired on March 30, 2024 and that ST was re-issued R&R Minor Bridges Work Class certification on August 14, 2024. Purchasing's response also noted that ST "will need to maintain its FDOT pre-qualification prior to execution and award of the contract, the start of any work, and through the term of the contract." Accordingly, by Purchasing's own admission, ST's certification has already lapsed, albeit temporarily, "prior to execution and award of the contract," which lapse ST failed to identify in its Step Two submission, despite its obligation to do so.

Purchasing's contention that ST was not required to apprise the EC of this lapse because the solicitation's continuing disclosure requirement applied only to the Step-One Standard Instructions to Vendor responsiveness and responsibility criteria is arbitrary and capricious. The Step-One standard instructions expressly note that a responsible vendor is one "determined to have the capability **in all respects** to perform fully the requirements of a solicitation" (emphasis added) and refers to and incorporates the Special Instructions to Vendors as Additional Responsibility Criteria. Furthermore, the solicitation's continuing disclosure requirement notes that "updated information may affect the previous determination of responsiveness, responsibility, or qualifications." Accordingly, pursuant to the solicitation, any new, changed, or updated information that relates to a ST's responsibility or qualifications, including changes to ST's qualification for FDOT Work Classes, was required to be submitted with ST's Step Two Submission. ST's failure to apprise the EC of its lapse of FDOT Work Class certification renders it a non-responsible bidder.

The EC's decision to deem ST as a responsible bidder, notwithstanding its lack of Minor Bridges Work Class certification and the lapse of its R&R Minor Bridges Work Class certification is arbitrary, capricious, and amounts to impermissible favoritism. *See Kirby, supra* (defining "arbitrary" and "capricious" as acts taken with improper motive, without reason, or for a reason which is merely pretextual); *see also City of Sweetwater v. Solo Construction Corp.*, 823 So. 2d 798 (Fla. 3d DCA 2002) (holding that a public body's actions affording one party an unfair advantage violates public policy and statutory law).

At the very least, Purchasing should perform an investigation to determine whether ST has ever had a FDOT Minor Bridges Work Class certification or any other FDOT Work Class certification that has been suspended, revoked, or denied. Pursuant to the solicitation's "Supplemental Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Requirements," if ST has ever had its FDOT Work Class certifications suspended, revoked, or denied, it is barred from bidding on the instant solicitation.

#### ST Failed to Identify Numerous Material Cases in Its Litigation History

The Step One RFQ required ST to submit its Litigation History identifying all material cases in which it has been involved that were filed, pending, or resolved during the three years prior to the Step One response deadline. The Step Two RFP requires ST to submit any updates to its litigation history. However, ST failed to identify any material cases in its Step One submission and identified only a single case in its Step Two submission.

As set forth above, there are at least nine (9) material cases that ST should have identified in its Step One and Two submissions. Each of the above cases involve: (1) a similar type of work to that contemplated in the solicitation's scope of work, and/or (2) allegations of negligence. Furthermore, each of the above cases were filed, pending, or resolved during the three years prior to the Steps One and Two response deadlines.

Notably, more than half of the cases identified above concern the FIU Pedestrian Bridge collapse. In its response to GLF's objection, Purchasing noted that ST "provided documentation showing that this case was resolved on December 9, 2019, which is more than three years prior to the Step-One or Step-Two response due dates." A review of the cases above clearly establish that the FIU Pedestrian Bridge collapse litigation was not fully resolved on or by December 9, 2019 as multiple related actions, including actions bringing claims against ST, remained pending thereafter.

ST's failure to identify even one of these material cases should render it a non-responsible bidder. Its omission of no less than nine material cases should leave no doubt as to whether ST should be deemed a non-responsible bidder. Purchasing's decision to reject GLF's objection, accept ST's cursory documentation of its Litigation History, and qualify ST as a responsible bidder ranked above GLF is arbitrary, capricious, and amounts to impermissible favoritism. *See Kirby, supra; see also Solo, supra*. Accordingly, ST should be deemed a non-responsible bidder and disqualified from being awarded the instant solicitation.

ST Should Have Been Scored Lower than GLF Due to Its MOT Plan, Scheduling and Sequencing of Work, and Proposed Jacking Methodology

ST's Step Two submission contains significant deficiencies in its proposed MOT Plan, its scheduling and sequencing of work, and its proposed jacking methodology. Each of these deficiencies reflect ST's lack of qualification/responsibility to perform the work and further call into question the scores assigned to ST by the EC pursuant to the solicitation's evaluation criteria. The EC's decision to score ST higher than GLF with respect to its Project Approach, Proposed Time, and Project/Quality Management Plan in spite of these deficiencies is arbitrary and capricious.

Specifically, ST's MOT Plan employs traffic pacing to control traffic on the Turnpike during lifting operations. However, the Florida Turnpike Enterprise Lane Closure Policy (the "Policy") provides that traffic pacing can only be employed when detours for traffic control are not possible. Pursuant to GLF's MOT Plan, as set forth in its Step Two Submission, detours are a viable means of traffic control during lifting operations. Detours are also employed in Step 1 bidders Cone & Graham and Strongcore, LLC's MOT plans. Therefore, ST's MOT Plan does not comply with the Policy and ST should have been deemed a non-responsible bidder.

Purchasing's response to GLF's objection regarding ST's MOT Plan notes that ST's plan "ultimately will need to be approved by the Florida Turnpike before implementing, to ensure it meets the safety requirements and avoids any safety concerns." However, as the Policy provides that traffic pacing can only be employed when detours for traffic control are not possible, and as GLF has already established that alternative means such as detours are a viable means of traffic control, ST's MOT Plan is certain to be rejected by the Florida Turnpike. The EC's decision to reject GLF's objection to ST's proposed MOT Plan, deem ST a responsible bidder, and to score ST higher than GLF for its Project Approach, notwithstanding its deficient MOT Plan that will be rejected by the Florida Turnpike, is arbitrary and capricious. *See Kirby, supra.*

Furthermore, ST's scheduling and sequencing of work presents issues that will result in a calendar day duration of at least 555 days, beyond the maximum duration provided by the solicitation documents. Specifically, ST's submission indicates that construction of the pedestals beneath the bridge beams is to commence before the bridge is lifted and will be complete on the same day that bridge jacking is finished, taking a total of 50 days. This sequencing of work presents a practical impossibility as the bridge beams are to sit on top of newly constructed pedestals such that pedestal work can only commence **after** the bridge is lifted. Accordingly, ST represented during its presentation to the EC that pedestal work is to commence **after** the bridge is lifted, notwithstanding that this sequence of work is not reflected in its written submission. Needless to say, a change in ST's sequencing of work will also result in changes to its proposed schedule. Therefore, as ST intends to commence pedestal work after the bridge is lifted, its projected calendar day duration must also be extended by at least 50 days for a total of 555 days, which is beyond the maximum duration of 540 calendar days specified in the solicitation. It is not

reasonable for the EC to rely only on the proposed schedule in ST's written submission alone in evaluating ST and disregard the sequencing issues raised in ST's presentation and GLF's objection. Not only does the deficiency in ST's scheduling and sequencing of work call into question whether ST is a qualified and responsible bidder, it evidences that the EC's decision to score ST higher than GLF for its Project Approach and Proposed Time is arbitrary and capricious. *See Kirby, supra.*

Finally, ST's proposed jacking methodology carries unnecessary risk of structural degradation. ST proposes employing support brackets bolted to the caps with post-installed anchors drilled into the substructure. However, the post-install bolting of support brackets to the substructure is typically disfavored and considered a means of last resort because this method carries a greater risk of degrading the structural integrity of the structure. On the other hand, GLF proposed investigating the diaphragms to confirm if the diaphragms are structurally adequate for jacking and, in the event the diaphragms were found to be incapable of supporting the jacking loads, employing alternative means of support such as saddles on the caps, shoring towers, or brackets attached to the substructure. GLF's proposed jacking methodology minimizes, if not eliminates, any risk to degrading the structural integrity and is the safest and most reasonable approach to jacking the bridge. Accordingly, the EC's decision to score ST higher than GLF in its Project Approach and Project/Quality Management Plan is arbitrary and capricious. *See Kirby, supra.*

In conclusion, given the numerous deficiencies and omissions in ST's Steps One and Two submissions, ST should not have been deemed a responsible bidder and should not have been ranked above GLF. ST's lack of proper FDOT Work Class Certification and failure to identify its litigation history are significant shortcomings with respect to the solicitation's responsibility criteria and render ST a non-responsible bidder. Furthermore, ST's lack of responsibility/qualification is further evidenced by the significant deficiencies in its proposed MOT Plan, scheduling and sequencing of work, and jacking methodology, which proposals do not meet the solicitation's requirements. Not only do these deficiencies disqualify ST as a responsible bidder, they call into question the scores ST received for its Project Approach, Proposed Time, and Project/Quality Management Plan, which scores were higher than those received by GLF, notwithstanding the absence of any deficiencies with GLF's proposals, and which scores ultimately resulted in ST being ranked higher than GLF.

In light of the foregoing, GLF respectfully requests that the County rescind its recommendation of ranking for the instant solicitation and should instead rank GLF above ST and recommend the award of the contract to GLF as the lowest responsible and responsive bidder.

Should you have any questions with respect to the foregoing or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Ira L. Libanoff, Esq.

Ira L. Libanoff, Esquire  
*Florida Bar Board Certified Construction Attorney*

IL/dmw

# EXHIBIT A

## ***ROADWAY WORK CLASSES***

<b>03</b>	Grading
<b>04</b>	Flexible Paving
<b>05</b>	Portland Cement Concrete
<b>06</b>	Hot Plant Mix-Bituminous Course
<b>09</b>	Drainage
<b>30A</b>	Electrical Work
<b>30B</b>	Fencing
<b>30C</b>	Guardrail
<b>30D</b>	Grassing, Seeding, Sodding
<b>30E</b>	Landscaping

## ***ROADWAY WORK CLASSES (CONTINUED)***

<b>30G</b>	Pavement Markings
<b>30H</b>	Roadway Signing
<b>30J</b>	Traffic Signals
<b>30K</b>	Computerized Traffic Control
<b>30T</b>	Intelligent Transportation System
<b>30U</b>	Cathodic Protection
<b>30V</b>	Debris Removal
<b>30W</b>	Hot In Place Resurfacing
<b>30X</b>	Sidewalk
<b>30Z</b>	Other
<b>MT</b>	Maintenance of Traffic

## ***BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION WORK CLASSES***

<b>01A</b>	Major Bridge – Bascule Spans
<b>01B</b>	Major Bridge – Curved Steel Girders
<b>01C</b>	Major Bridge – Multi-Level Roadways
<b>01D</b>	Major Bridge – Concrete Segmental Construction
<b>01E</b>	Major Bridge – Steel Truss Construction
<b>01F</b>	Major Bridge – Cable Stayed Construction
<b>01G</b>	Major Bridge – Bridges of conventional construction which are over a water opening of 1,000 feet or more
<b>01H</b>	Major Bridge – Cast in Place/Post-Tensioned/Super-Structure
<b>02</b>	Minor Bridges (have span lengths not exceeding 50 feet center to center of cap and total length not exceeding 300 feet) (includes Concrete Box Culverts with a span length 20 feet or greater)
<b>07</b>	Intermediate Bridges (contain none of the types of construction listed under Major Bridges and have span lengths exceeding 50 feet center to center of cap)

## ***BRIDGE REPAIR and REHABILITATION WORK CLASSES***

<b>08</b>	Bascule Bridge Rehabilitation
<b>30F</b>	Bridge Painting
<b>30L</b>	R&R Minor Bridges
<b>30M</b>	R&R Intermediate Bridges
<b>30N</b>	R&R Major Bridge – Multi-Level Roadways
<b>30O</b>	R&R Major Bridge – Concrete Segmental Construction
<b>30P</b>	R&R Major Bridge – Steel Truss Construction
<b>30Q</b>	R&R Major Bridge – Cable Stayed Construction
<b>30R</b>	R&R Major Bridge – Bridges of conventional construction which are over a water opening of 1,000 feet or more
<b>30S</b>	R&R Major Bridge – Curved Steel Girders
<b>30Y</b>	Bridge Deck Overlay