SCDOT
South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Bridge Package 14
August 3, 8, 9, 10, 2022

Responsiveness	Palmetto/CTEA Yes/No	Palmetto/CTEA Comments	Reeves-United/RK&K Yes/No	Reeves-United/RK&K Comments	Lane/ICE Yes/No	Lane/ICE Comments	ESWagner/Holt Yes/No	ESWagner/Holt Comments	Dane/Neel-Schaffer Yes/No	Dane/Neel-Schaffer Comments	Lee/D&F Yes/No	Lee/D&F Comments	BDC/KCI Yes/No	BDC/KCI Comments
Is Proposer considered responsive?	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	

3.2 Introduction	Palmetto/CTEA Yes/No	Palmetto/CTEA Comments	Reeves-United/RK&K Yes/No	Reeves-United/RK&K Comments	Lane/ICE Yes/No	Lane/ICE Comments	ESWagner/Holt Yes/No	ESWagner/Holt Comments	Dane/Neel-Schaffer Yes/No	Dane/Neel-Schaffer Comments	Lee/D&F Yes/No	Lee/D&F Comments	BDC/KCI Yes/No	BDC/KCI Comments
3.2.1 Identify the entity with whom SCDOT will be contracting and if this will be a sole proprietorship, partnership, corporation, LLC, joint venture, or other structures. Partnerships, corporations, LLC, joint ventures, or other joint entities are collectively referred to herein as joint ventures. Identify any parent company of the entity that will be contracting with SCDOT. If a joint venture, identify the entities that comprise the joint venture and name the person who has authority to sign the contract on behalf of the joint venture. Provide contact name, mailing address, phone numbers, and e-mail address for contracting entity. Identify the office from which the Project will be managed.	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
3.2.2 Identify the two Proposer Points of Contact for the procurement for this Project including mailing addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses.	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
3.2.3 Identify the full legal name of both the Lead Contractor and Lead Designer for the Project. The Lead Contractor is defined as the Proposer that will serve as the prime/general contractor responsible for construction of the Project. The Lead Designer is defined as the prime design consulting firm responsible for the overall design of the Project.	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
3.2.4 Provide Dunique Entity ID for all firms or documentation indicating that an application was submitted in Appendix I.	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
3.2.5 Provide a statement confirming the commitment of Key Individuals identified in the submittal to the extent necessary to meet SCDOT's quality and schedule expectations, and that they are available for the duration of the Project. Key Individuals are those persons holding specific positions required by this RFQ.	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
3.2.6 Limit the Introduction to one page which counts towards the specified page limit in Section 5.2.2.	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Procurement Officer Initials	CW		CW		CW		CW		CW		CW		CW	

3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution	Point Weight	Palmetto/CTEA Points	Scale ID	Comments	Reeves-United/RK&K Points	Scale ID	Comments	Lane/ICE Points	Scale ID	Comments	ESWagner/Holt Points	Scale ID	Comments	Dane/Neel-Schaffer Points	Scale ID	Comments	Lee/D&F Points	Scale ID	Comments	BDC/KCI Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.3.1 Organizational Chart, Team Structure, and Team Integration		8		Use the Likert Scale	8		Use the Likert Scale	8		Use the Likert Scale	8		Use the Likert Scale	8		Use the Likert Scale	8		Use the Likert Scale	8		Use the Likert Scale
Provide an organizational chart showing the flow of the "chain of command" with lines identifying Key Individuals (by full legal name and firm) and any other disciplines (firm name only) the Proposer deems critical . The chart must show the functional structure of the organization down to the design discipline and construction superintendent level. Identify the critical support roles and relationships of project management, project administration, executive management, construction management, quality management, safety, environmental compliance, and subcontractor administration. The organizational chart shall be limited to one page and counts towards the specified page limit in **Section 5.2.2**.	2	1.0	Average - 3	The lower levels of the organizational chart underneath the Lead Designer and Construction Manager were clear. There was confusion with the direct reporting lines for both the Lead Designer and Construction Manager showing dual reporting roles going to both the Assistant Project Manager and the Project Manager.	1.3	Above Average - 4	The overall organizational chart and reporting structure is clear. Legend is shown highlighting direct reports and lines for communication. Project Engineer provides value to team showing communication with both design and construction.	1.0	Average - 3	The overall organizational chart and reporting structure is very clear. Legend could have been clearer to explain what solid versus dash lines meant. QC Team shows communication between PM and CM while reporting to SCDOT.	1.0	Average - 3	The overall organizational chart and reporting structure is overall clear with communication and direct reporting lines shown with legend. Upper chain of command relationships are unclear. Design team shows reporting to both Lead Design Engineer and Assistant Project Manager which is confusing.	1.0	Average - 3	The overall organizational chart and reporting structure is clear. Communication and direct reporting lines shown and with legend. Confusion with upper level reporting roles.	1.7	Excellent - 5	The overall organizational chart and reporting structure is clear. Communication and reporting lines shown with legend. Chart is concise and to the point and clearly shows how the upper management of the team will function. Construction quality section broken out and clearly shows coordination and reporting. Chart shows Lead Designer and Construction Manager communicating directly.	1.3	Above Average - 4	The overall organizational chart and reporting structure is clear. Communication and reporting lines show a clear path of how team is structured. Organizational chart could benefit from communication line with design and construction.
Provide a brief, written description of significant functional relationships and how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team.	3	2.5	Excellent - 5	Team provided a detailed discussion of how the organizational chart will function and how they will function as an integrated team. PM/Lead Designer will co-locate during plan development and coordinate daily.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Very detailed table breaking down the functions of the team and individuals and how they will intergrate along with their specific responsibilities. Contractor notes being involved with design but design doesn't list what involvement they will have during construction.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Team has an understanding on how the roles will function overall as an intergrated team. Team shows PM/APM will be involved from RFQ/Pre-Construction all the way through construction but does not state the Lead Designer's involvement during construction.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Very detailed description of the team's relationships and daily expectations on the project. The PM is an executive level manager being able to make decisions for the team. APM will attend weekly meetings for both design and construction.	1.5	Average - 3	Roles for each key individual is provided but don't touch on integration or how they will be involved in pre-construction and construction activities.	1.5	Average - 3	Team provides detailed description of key individual roles and how they will communicate and report. Section lacks discussion on team integration.	1.5	Average - 3	Section was generic. Team provided how the key individuals will work integrally together but did not get into specifics.
Identify in tabular form if any of the firms and/or Key Individuals have worked together on the same team (not just on the same job) in the past. Describe the types of projects they worked on, the year(s) they worked together, the level of participation, and a reference contact name, email address, and phone number for that project.	3	2.0	Above Average - 4	Team shows past experience working together. Two projects were emergency SCDOT design-build procurements of bridge bundles over water ways. Two projects were VE study re-designs. Key Individuals were on all four project shown on table.	2.5	Excellent - 5	They show extensive experience working together on projects of similar scope and magnitude (CLRB 2020-1/2021-1) together as lead designer and lead contractor. Other projects show work together with with proposed JV. Significant key individual overlap.	1.0	Below Average - 2	Team only shows one project working together but the designer was CEI and not on the design-build team for the project. The rest of the table shows some key individual overlap on other projects.	1.0	Below Average - 2	Team has not worked together previously but acknowledges this and gives reasoning on why the relationship will be successful. Contractor has never been assessed LDs and have finished projects meeting schedule, quality, and service objectives. Table shows Lead Designer and sub consultant past working relationships.	1.0	Below Average - 2	Table provided in this section but shows Dane doesn't have any past working experience with any team members. Team gives examples of why teaming arrangment will work despite no past relationships.	1.5	Average - 3	Team has shown they haven't worked together previously but show past experience in a design-build pursuit and serving on a SCDOT/ACE/AGC DB sub-committee. Some past experience with sub-consultants noted. Team went into detail highlighting team collaborations despite no prior project work history.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Table provided with only one project (Panthers) where Lead Designer and Contractor are working together. Remaining list of projects are projects where entities were subsconsultant/contractors. Team has a good amount of history together.
Subtotal:	8	5.5			5.8			4.0			4.0			3.5			4.7			4.8		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		

3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution	Point Weight	Palmetto/CTEA Points	Scale ID	Comments	Reeves-United/RK&K Points	Scale ID	Comments	Lane/ICE Points	Scale ID	Comments	ESWagner/Holt Points	Scale ID	Comments	Dane/Neel-Schaffer Points	Scale ID	Comments	Lee/D&F Points	Scale ID	Comments	BDC/KCI Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.3.2 Critical Risks		4		Use the Likert Scale	4		Use the Likert Scale	4		Use the Likert Scale	4		Use the Likert Scale	4		Use the Likert Scale	4		Use the Likert Scale	4		Use the Likert Scale
Kings Mountain State Park	1	0.7	Above Average - 4	The team understands the risk. Team mentions specific examples to avoid the right-of-way and listed it as a priorty. Minimal information provided on coordination efforts through design.	0.8	Excellent - 5	The team understands the risk. Project specific examples were provided to avoid or minimize right of way and mentioned shifting alignment to remove the risk all together as well as coordination with associated agencies.	0.5	Average - 3	The team understands the risk. The response was generic and did not give specific examples on how impacts would be minimized. No discussion provided on schedule impacts.	0.7	Above Average - 4	The team understands the risk. Team acknowledges the right of way acquisition to be a schedule risk and lists a few mitigation strategies.	0.7	Above Average - 4	The team understands the risk. Team acknowledges what SCDOT is already doing and gives detailed examples on how they plan to mitigate the risk and touch on alignment shift to avoid all together.	0.7	Above Average - 4	The team understands the risk. The response provided some discussion on schedule delays due to site being 4(f) and 6(f) and coordination needed. Also mentions shifting alignment to avoid the park if on-alignment creates impacts.	0.7	Above Average - 4	The team understands the risk. Team mentions avoidance and shifting the alignment as well as the potential schedule impacts.
Relocation of wet/dry utilities	1	0.5	Average - 3	The team understands the risk. The response was generic but will prioritize the bridges based on relocations if needed.	0.5	Average - 3	The team understands the risk. The response was generic and no site specific examples were listed.	0.7	Above Average - 4	The team understands the risk. Team will perform detailed SUE during pursuit. Project specific examples were provided on site prioritization including putting S-138 first due to the accelerated schedule.	0.7	Above Average - 4	The team understands the risk. The team demonstrated that preliminary investigations were conducted and listed this risk as high giving the examples why.	0.5	Average - 3	The team understands the risk but gives little information that is provided specific especially risks to the schedule.	0.7	Above Average - 4	The team understands the risk. Project specific examples were provided showing team conducted preliminary investigations for what utilities are out there and what potentaly needs relocating.	1.0	Outstanding - 6	The team understands the risk. Detailed project specifics including companies and utility types on each site. Team demonstrated a deep dive into preliminary investigations for the bridges and how they will handle avoidance or relocations.
Right of way impacts	1	0.3	Below Average - 2	The team understands part of the risk. The response provided states about avoiding or eliminating right-of-way but doesn't go in to discussion on right-of-way needed to cover permanent facilities.	0.5	Average - 3	The team understands the risk and give some general items towards minimizing right of way.	0.5	Average - 3	The team understands the risk. Team gives a few generic statements to minimize right of way at the sites.	0.3	Below Average - 2	The team slightly understands the risk. Team mentions permanent slope permissions which is not allowed.	0.5	Average - 3	The team understands the risk and schedule impacts but the response is very generic.	0.5	Average - 3	The team understands the risk. The response was generic and stated just to avoid and minimize right of way and did not get into specifics of mitigation.	0.5	Average - 3	The team understands the risk. The team gives examples of how right of way impacts can be avoided (design exceptions) though this strategy may not be approved.
Environmental Permits/Mitigation	1	0.3	Below Average - 2	The team understands part of the risk. The response was very vague and gave no site specific examples or discussion on mitigation for the project.	0.7	Above Average - 4	The team understands the risk. Team goes into detail on mitigation bank credit availability or credit reservations if needed demonstrating their knowledge of preliminary investigations. Site specific details discussed on sites with parallel streams.	0.7	Above Average - 4	The team understands the risk. Project specific examples were provided including preliminary impacts and credits needed for sites. Team mentions specific options for minimizing the impacts discussed.	0.7	Above Average - 4	The team understands the risk. The team gives detailed notes and highlights the parallel features on the two specific sites showing preliminary investiagations have already been conducted. General mitigation strategies also listed.	0.7	Above Average - 4	The team understands the risk. Team provides information on wetland mitigation banks and reserving credits at time of NTP to avoid schedule delays or risks of credit shortages. Team also mentions evaluating design opportunities to avoid impacts.	0.7	Above Average - 4	The team understands the risk. Team touches on site specific details pertaining to S-226 potentially needing permits and mitigation. Team mentions making early reservations for bank credits or handling PRM sites if required.	0.7	Above Average - 4	The team understands the risk. Team highlights the potential need for mitigation and call out local banks within area. Also highlights bridge configuration/span set to avoid and/or minimize impacts and keep under permit thresholds.
Subtotal:	4	1.8			2.5			2.3			2.3			2.3			2.5			2.8		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		

3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution	Point Weight	Palmetto/CTEA Points	Scale ID	Comments	Reeves-United/RK&K Points	Scale ID	Comments	Lane/ICE Points	Scale ID	Comments	ESWagner/Holt Points	Scale ID	Comments	Dane/Neel-Schaffer Points	Scale ID	Comments	Lee/D&F Points	Scale ID	Comments	BDC/KCI Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.3.3 Project Resources, Strategies, and Execution		8		Use the Likert Scale	8		Use the Likert Scale	8		Use the Likert Scale	8		Use the Likert Scale	8		Use the Likert Scale	8		Use the Likert Scale	8		Use the Likert Scale
Demonstrate the team's capacity and available resources including personnel for this project.	2	1.3	Above Average - 4	Team shows that they have the personnel to complete the project highlighting two bridge and one grading crew for multiple site construction with additional crews if needed. Team did not go into detail on equipment needs and availability. Design resources were also listed for what is needed to complete the job with additional staff to assist.	1.3	Above Average - 4	Team shows that they have the equipment and personnel to complete the project and lists up to four superintendents to manage multiple sites at once. No current workload equipment/personnel usage is shown.	1.7	Excellent - 5	Team shows that they have all of the equipment and personnel necessary for the project. Team shows a commitment for 5 structures crews demonstrating the resources to have up to 5 sites under construction at once.	1.7	Excellent - 5	Team shows that they have the adequate equipment and personnel for the project and have listed it in tabular form for both design and construction but have also listed specific commitments to the project itself.	1.3	Above Average - 4	Team states ramping up for SCDOT bridge work and having availability. With no work backlog team can commit the resources as needed to complete the project with no other project schedule impacts. Section states overall numbers doesn't get into project specific needs for both personnel or equipment.	1.3	Above Average - 4	Team shows that they have the adequate equipment and personnel for the project and list the project specifics required to complete the project with the exception of the project specific personnel for D&F.	1.0	Average - 3	Team shows that they have the equipment and personnel for the project but did not get into specifics for contractor's equipment needs. KCI breaks down needs and additional resources that could be used.
Discuss the Proposer's strategy for implementation of resources to execute the contract. Identify tasks that the lead contractor and lead designer will self-perform. If a joint venture, identify work items each entity will perform. If major tasks will be performed by others, identify those tasks as well as the firm/team members responsible.	2	1.0	Average - 3	Contractor is handling items with the exception of grading. Lead Designer is handling road and bridge but sub-consulting all other tasks. Table outlines the remaining work to be completed by their subs. Team's knowledge of the design review process and procedures will have plans at final stages for initial submittal if awarded project.	1.7	Excellent - 5	Contractors and Lead Designer are self-performing the majority of the work. Engineering has all the major design functions in house. Thorough knowledge of the design review process and procedures. Team lists strategy in detail from streamlining design to the strategic delivery of the bridge replacements.	1.0	Average - 3	Table provided shows breakdown for roles/self performing tasks but lacks discussion of the strategy to execute the contract. Team shows Lead Designer will self perform most all design components with minimal sub work which is a plus.	1.0	Average - 3	Contractor and Lead Designer are self-performing the majority of the work as shown in the organizational chart. Team provides schedule of work to show SC85 Construction wrapping up Q1 2023 (bridge crews) and shifting to this contract but not a very detailed strategy.	1.3	Above Average - 4	Table breaks down what Contractor and Lead Designer are self-performing. Contractor and Designer doing majority of the work. Team mentions using multiple crews to cut down on closure times. Additional resources including a PM, can be provided if needed.	1.7	Excellent - 5	Contractor and Lead Designer are self-performing the majority of the work. Table listed to break out strategy to complete the job showing site prioritization and mobilization of crews.	1.0	Average - 3	Contractor and Lead Designer are self-performing the majority of the work. Section provides a generic project strategy and execution to complete the project.
Discuss any innovative approaches or unique outreach or marketing concepts used successfully by the Proposer's team member to encourage DBE participation.	2	1.0	Average - 3	Write up was brief highlighting what DBEs are on the team and that the goal will be exceeded. No specific examples were provided on what unique and innovative approaches were done to build your team.	0.7	Below Average - 2	Team provides example of doubling DBE goals on a past project but it doesn't provide much relevance to detailing out innovative approaches or unique outreach for DBE participation. Team gives one example of increased DBE participation but nothing further.	2.0	Outstanding - 6	Provided specific examples of how team will attract and encourage participation. Key elements to their approach include offering guidance and mentoring to the companies. Team demonstrates their recognition and awards received from past experience.	1.0	Average - 3	Team states DBEs are already in place but do not describe any innovative approaches or unique outreach concepts on how team was formed.	0.3	Poor - 1	One bullet on this entire section that states one DBE on their team and it's listed under the geographical location heading. No discussion on innovative approaches or unique outreach concepts on how team was formed.	1.3	Above Average - 4	Provided the DBE firms already on the design-build team and gave a few examples of ways for intended outreach. Team mentions plan to meet or exceed the DBE goal.	0.7	Below Average - 2	Section write up is minimal. Team lists virtual meeting for outreach. No other specifics are provided.
Indicate how the geographical location of the firms will enhance integration, communication, issue resolution, and project execution.	2	1.7	Excellent - 5	Team plans to co-locate during plan development and be available to be on site to discuss issues and conduct meetings. Project offices located conveniently to the project sites.	1.0	Average - 3	Map provided showing offices and plants very close to project sites. RKK and United project offices are also conveniently located to be able to get to sites within the day. Team can be onsite for meetings on a same day notice but don't detail integration during design or construction.	1.7	Excellent - 5	Team is conveniently located around bridge sites out of the Blacksburg office. Lead Designer will also use Blacksburg field office as well as local Columbia office. Team gives specific examples of team integration with weekly design and field office meetings.	1.0	Average - 3	Contractor and Lead Designer offices are located conveniently to project sites. Team integration discussion was generic and did not go into detail on design/construction involvement during pre-construction phase.	0.7	Below Average - 2	Discussion was very weak. Distance to project sites given but no project specific details given. No discussion of enhanced integration.	1.0	Average - 3	Section provides company locations with some being conveniently located to the project sites. No mention of team integration during pre-construction or construction activities.	1.3	Above Average - 4	Team touches on integration and plans to co-locate as needed to KCI's Rock Hill office. Team members all located in close proximity to Cherokee County.
Subtotal:	8	5.0			4.7			6.3			4.7			3.7			5.3			4.0		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Bridge Package 14
August 3, 8, 9, 10, 2022

	Palmetto/CTEA			Reeves-United/RK&K			Lane/ICE			ESWagner/Holt			Dane/Neel-Schaffer			Lee/D&F			BDC/KCI		
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals	Palmetto/CTEA			Reeves-United/RK&K			Lane/ICE			ESWagner/Holt			Dane/Neel-Schaffer			Lee/D&F			BDC/KCI		
	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.4.4 Project Management Team (Point Weight)	20	Use the Likert Scale		20	Use the Likert Scale		20	Use the Likert Scale		20	Use the Likert Scale		20	Use the Likert Scale		20	Use the Likert Scale		20	Use the Likert Scale	
> The Project Manager shall be the primary person in charge of and responsible for delivery of the Project in accordance with the contract requirements. The Project Manager should have full authority to make final decisions on behalf of the Proposer and have responsibility for communicating these decisions directly to SCDOT. After award of the Project, the Project Manager shall be the primary contact for communications with SCDOT. The SOQ must identify the Project Manager and the employing firm and, if the Project Manager does not have full authority, clearly define what authority the Project Manager has to finalize decisions, the role of the executive level in those decisions, and the role and responsibility of the Project Manager relative to the member firms. >The Project Manager must have a minimum of seven years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects; >The Project Manager shall provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar: o Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables; o Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project; o Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk.	10	10.0	Outstanding - 6	PM has 38 years of experience. Been with the current firm for 14 years. Previous company experience shows a progressive path. He is the President of his company giving him full authority to make all decisions. Was listed as the PM the projects on his resume which consists of SCDOT DB and Bid Build low volume bridge replacements. Responsibilities on the projects listed were similar to this project. References were above average to outstanding.	6.7	Above Average - 4	PM has 24 years of experience. Been with the current firm for nearly 19 years showing a progressive career working on over 70 bridge projects. Was listed as the PM and PM for structures on the projects listed in his resume. Projects include (1) SCDOT DB bridge package and (4) bid-build projects consisting of two projects with multiple bridges, one culvert, and a single bridge replacement. One reference received and it was outstanding.	8.3	Excellent - 5	PM has 21 years of experience all with Lane. Was listed as the PM on one project that was DB and greater magnitude demonstrating he's very capable of managing this bridge package. Other projects (4 out of 5 were Design-Build) were also more complex and listing him in various roles similar to the nature of a PM. PM has great references particularly with the Interstate 85 widening job.	6.7	Above Average - 4	PM has 20 years of experience all with ESW. Projects on resume list him as Sr. VP/General Manager. One project was DB and was similar scope and magnitude as this project. Other projects listed were multiple bridge bundles that were bid-build. References received were excellent.	3.3	Below Average - 2	PM has 9 years of experience and all with contractor. Was listed as the PM or Assistant PM on the projects listed in his resume. 1 project was DB but was not listed as PM and was not on the project for the full contract. The other two were bid-build (2 bridge bundle) replacements and he was listed as the PM. Two references provided; one average and one excellent.	10.0	Outstanding - 6	PM has 43 years of experience with 27 years with Lee. President of the company and has full authority for decision making. Was listed as the PM on the projects listed in his resume consisting of SCDOT DB projects and bid build bridge replacements. Reference received was above average.	6.7	Above Average - 4	PM has 27 years of experience. Been with the current firm for 8 years. Was listed as the Senior PM/PM on the projects listed in his resume. Projects mostly widening projects with some being deisgn-build. Projects listed are not of similar scope and magnitude. No references provided.
>The Assistant Project Manager shall be the person in charge of and responsible for daily coordination of the design-build Project under direction of the Project Manager. After award of the Project, the Assistant Project Manager will be the daily contact for communications with SCDOT, with primary Project contact remaining the responsibility of the Project Manager. >The Assistant Project Manager must have a minimum of 5 years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects; o The Assistant Project Manager shall provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar: o Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables; o Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project; o Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk. >For the duration of the contract, the Assistant Project Manager shall be dedicated solely to assisting in managing this Project, shall have no other assigned Project responsibilities, and shall not be utilized on any other projects.	10	8.3	Excellent - 5	APM has 31 years of experience. Been with the current firm for 11 years. He is listed as the Assistant PM on the projects on his resume which consists of SCDOT DB and Bid Build low volume bridge replacements. Responsibilities on the projects listed were similar to this project. References were above average.	5.0	Average - 3	APM has 10 years of experience. Been with the current firm for nearly 9 years. Was listed as the PM on two projects with the remaining projects listed as a Project Engineer. Only one of his projects listed was DB. Previous work history shows projects of different scope and magnitude where the majority of his role was a Project Engineer and not the PM. Two references received: one being satisfactory and the other outstanding.	6.7	Above Average - 4	APM has 12 years of experience and all with Lane. Resume shows progressive career with company. Was listed as the PM or Assistant PM on the projects listed. 4 projects listed were DB and more complex and larger magnitude. References received were very good.	6.7	Above Average - 4	APM has 11 years of experience, all with the company. Was listed as the PM on all projects on resume which all have been within the last few years. Projects include bridges, bridge bundles, design build, and bid build. References received were excellent.	5.0	Average - 3	APM has 10 years of experience, all with Dane.. Was listed as the Assistant PM on the projects listed on his resume. 1 DB and 2 bid-build bridge replacements. References are barely above average.	10.0	Outstanding - 6	Team elected to not use an Assistant Project Manager and points in this category will go to the Project Manager.	3.3	Below Average - 2	APM has 21 years of experience. Been with the current firm for only 1 year. Resume lists experience only to 2016. His resume lists a pedestrian bridge, a bundle of pedestrian trail bridges, and a roadway RR project. Reference received was excellent.
Subtotal:	20	18.3		11.7			15.0			13.3			8.3			20.0			10.0		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.4.5 Design Engineering Team (Point Weight)	10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale	
> The Lead Design Engineer shall be in charge of and responsible for all aspects of the design of the Project, subject to oversight of the Project Manager. > The Lead Design Engineer shall have a minimum of 7 years of experience and expertise in managing the design of highway transportation projects after acquiring a professional engineering registration, and must include experience and expertise in the design of projects of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity. > For the duration of the design phase, the Lead Design Engineer will attend all routine project meetings in person, be primarily dedicated to design of the Project, and be available as needed by SCDOT. > The Lead Design Engineer shall be a full time employee of the lead design firm.	10	8.3	Excellent - 5	He has 30 years of experience and 6 with his current company. President of company. Lead design engineer on 3 of 4 projects listed on his resume and structures design manager on the other project listed. Projects were SCDOT design-build, bid build low volume, bridge packages over waterways. Project reference was outstanding.	6.7	Above Average - 4	He has 30 years of experience and 4 with RKK. Listed as assistant design manager on both CLRB 2020-1 and CLRB 2021-1. The other projects he's listed as a PM from his SCDOT program management experience with single bridge replacements. Project references were overall outstanding to excellent.	6.7	Above Average - 4	He has 18 years of experience with 3 being with ICE. Resume shows projects of similar scope and magnitude including SCDOT emergency DB work. Has not previously been a Lead Designer on past projects. Project references were overall excellent.	6.7	Above Average - 4	He has 15 years of experience and 6.5 years with HOLT. Listed as Lead Roadway and PM on projects that were bridges both design-build and bid build of similar scope and magnitude. No experience as Lead Designer on design-build jobs. Project references were overall outstanding to excellent.	6.7	Above Average - 4	He has 36 years of experience and 1.6 years with NS. Listed in various roles in design of both design-build and bid build bridge replacement projects. Only completed 2 of the 5 projects listed on his resume. Project references were excellent.	8.3	Excellent - 5	He has 25 years all with D&F. Lead Designer role only on one project which was bridge replacement over RR. Other role on resume list him as Project Manager on SCDOT DB (Port Access) and other bridge replacement projects. Project reference was above average to excellent.	10.0	Outstanding - 6	He has 20 years of experience all with KCI. Listed as Lead Design/Structures Manager on 3/4 projects listed on resume. Structures Lead on the other project. Projects consist of SCDOT DB, NCDOT DB, DB bridge bundles with low volume criteria. Project references were excellent.
Subtotal:	10	8.3		6.7			6.7			6.7			6.7			8.3			10.0		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.4.6 Construction Management Team (Point Weight)	10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale	
> The Construction Manager shall be responsible for all aspects of the construction of the Project, subject to oversight of the Project Manager. >The Construction Manager must have a minimum of five years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of the construction of highway transportation projects; >The Construction Manager must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of the construction of projects with similar: o Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables; o Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project; o Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk. >For the duration of construction, the Construction Manager shall have a construction super	10	6.7	Above Average - 4	32 years experience and 12 of those years with Palmetto. Resume shows progressive growth with career. Previous roles show CM/Superintendent and/or crane operator on projects that were SCDOT and Design-Build of similar magnitude. Reference received was above average.	6.7	Above Average - 4	31 years experience and 8 of those years with Reeves. Progressive career movement. Projects on resume consist of 2 design-build, 1 alternative delivery method (PPP), and bid build projects. Current CM on CLRB 2020-1. Reference received was excellent to outstanding.	6.7	Above Average - 4	30 years experience and 20 of those years with Lane. Projects shown are mostly design-build and showing roles of superintendent on projects of a much larger scale. References were above average to outstanding.	6.7	Above Average - 4	39 years experience and 4 of those years with ESW. Projects listed are all bid-build bridge replacement projects in the roles of structural operations manager. No design-build experience shown. References were outstanding to perfect.	3.3	Below Average - 2	6 years with Dane. All projects listed on resume have him listed as leadman/foreman. Resume leaves out what work was done by him and only project descriptions are provided. Reference provided was average.	8.3	Excellent - 5	24 years experience and 10 of those years with Lee. Resume shows a progressive career in projects listed as a Project Manager which shows he is more than capable of handling the role of Construction Manager. Projects consist of DB projects, emergency bridge replacements, and other bridge projects of similar scope and magnitude. References received were above average to excellent.	5.0	Average - 3	24 years experience and 5 of those years with BDC. Projects on resume list 1 DB and 2 DBB projects with role of superintendent. Resume only shows work from 2009 to present. Reference received is above average to outstanding.
Subtotal:	10	6.7		6.7			6.7			6.7			3.3			8.3			5.0		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		
3.5 Past Performance of Team	Palmetto/CTEA			Reeves-United/RK&K			Lane/ICE			ESWagner/Holt			Dane/Neel-Schaffer			Lee/D&F			BDC/KCI		
	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.5.1 Experience of Proposer's Team (Point Weight)	10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale	
Provide no more than 3 projects awarded within the last 10 calendar years that identify the previous work experience by the Lead Contractor or any Major Subcontractors using the Work History and Quality Form o Contractor/Designer, Sections a through g. Projects that have reached substantial completion are preferred.																					
Project 1	1.666666667	1.4	Excellent - 5	EBP 2018-2A: Project was SCDOT DB emergency project, had bridgework, was a bridge bundle, was over waterways, and included both these teams and key personnel on the project.	1.4	Excellent - 5	CLRB 2020-1: Project is SCDOT DB, bundle of 16 bridges over waterways, and include both these teams key personnel on the project.	0.8	Average - 3	CATS Blue Line: Project was bid build, transit, with eleven bridges over various crossing types. Project included all key personnel overlap.	1.4	Excellent - 5	NCDOT DB 6YR: Project was DB and had bridgework, was a bridge bundle, were over waterways, and included PM and APM as key personnel overlap.	1.1	Above Average - 4	DIV10DB: Project was DB and had bridgework (10 bridges) and one culvert, was a bridge bundle, was over waterways, and included the APM on this project in the final stages.	1.4	Excellent - 5	EBP 5: Project was SCDOT DB and an emergency bridge package, over waterways, and included PM key individual overlap.	0.8	Average - 3	NCDOT Express DB: Project was DB, two bridge replacements with culverts being placed back, and were over water crossings. No key individual overlap.
Project 2	1.666666667	1.4	Excellent - 5	EBP 2020-1: Project was SCDOT DB emergency project, had bridgework, was a bridge bundle, was over waterways, and included both these teams and key personnel on the project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	2018-2B: Project was SCDOT DB emergency and had bridgework, bridge bundling over waterways. Project consists of United but no team or individuals from Reeves.	1.1	Above Average - 4	I85 Phase III: Project is SCDOT Design-Build includes 8 miles of interstate widening and multiple bridge replacements. Key Individual (PM) overlap. Project of much larger scale than the bridge package.	0.8	Average - 3	Horry County Landfill: Project was bid-build single bridge over wetlands where impacts had to be avoided. All construction key individuals were on this project.	1.4	Excellent - 5	DIV13B EXDB: Project was DB and had bridgework, was an 11 bridge bundle, over waterways, and included two key individuals.	1.1	Above Average - 4	EBP 2: Project was SCDOT DB and an emergency bridge package, over waterways. No key individual overlap.	0.6	Below Average - 2	US 321: Project was DBB seven stage single bridge replacement over water and included no key individuals.
Project 3	1.666666667	0.8	Average - 3	SRT: Project was not DB and was a redesign project with bigger scope, had bridgework (3 sites), was a bridge bundle, were over roadways, and included both these teams and key personnel on the project.	0.8	Average - 3	US15 Bridge Replacement: Project was DB accelerated bridge construction and over a waterway. A succesful project but it was a single bridge with just United and not Reeves. No key personnel overlap.	1.1	Above Average - 4	I85 DB/NC: Project is NC Design-Build includes 5.9 miles of interstate widening and multiple bridge replacements. Key Individual (PM, APM, CM) overlap. Project of much larger scale than the bridge package.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Mount Lebanon: Project was bid-build and had bridgework,consisting of 2 bridges, was over waterways, and included all construction key individuals on the project.	0.8	Average - 3	NC1340: Project was bid-build and had one bridge over a waterway and included two key individuals.	0.6	Below Average - 2	SC274/177: Project was bid-build pennies for progress where Lee acted as subcontractor to Blythe. Project had bridgework (3 bridges), over waterways. No key individual overlap.	0.6	Below Average - 2	SB3 Buffalo: Project was DBB single bridge replacement over water and included no key individuals.

SCDOT
South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Bridge Package 14
August 3, 8, 9, 10, 2022

Provide no more than 3 projects for which a design services contract was executed within the last 10 calendar years that identify the previous work experience by the Lead Designer or any Major Design Sub-consultants on the Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer. Projects for which the design services have been completed and accepted by the owner are preferred.

		Palmetto/CTEA			Reeves-United/RK&K			Lane/ICE			ESWagner/Holt			Dane/Neel-Schaffer			Lee/D&F			BDC/KCI		
Project 4	1.666666667	1.4	Excellent - 5	EBP 2018-2A: Project was SCDOT DB emergency project utilizing low volume bridge criteria, had bridgework, was a bridge bundle, was over waterways, and included both these teams and key personnel on the project.	1.7	Outstanding - 6	CLRB 2020-1: SCDOT DB project. 16 bridges over water crossings. Significant key personnel overlap. All bridges are RFC'd with over half of the bridges back open to traffic.	1.1	Above Average - 4	2018-1: Was a SCDOT DB emergency bridge replacement project. Three bridges with two over water and one over an interstate. No key personnel on this project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	EBP 2018-2A: Was a SCDOT DB emergency project. Multiple low volume bridges with water crossings. Was a sub on this project. One key individual (Lead Designer) on project.	0.8	Average - 3	Pio Novo Ave: DB project with two bridges over RR. Team member overlap but no key individuals were present on this job.	0.8	Average - 3	Cherokee Lake: County project with one low volume bridge over a waterway. One key individual overlap.	1.1	Above Average - 4	I77 Panthers: Is a SCDOT DB project that is still in construction. New Interchange construction. Lead Designer Key Individual overlap.
Project 5	1.666666667	1.4	Excellent - 5	EBP 2020-1: Project was SCDOT DB emergency project utilizing low volume bridge criteria, had bridgework, was a bridge bundle, was over waterways, and included both these teams and/or key personnel on the project.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Four Low Impact Bridges: Was a NC Express D-B package bundle similar to SCDOT low volume bridge design criteria. No mention of any key personnel overlap.	1.4	Excellent - 5	2018-2B: Was a SCDOT DB emergency bridge replacement project. Four bridges with water crossings. Proposed Lead Designer was key individual overlap on this project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	EBP 2020-1: Was a SCDOT DB emergency project. Two low volume bridges with water crossings. Was a sub on this project. One key individual (Lead Designer) on project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	2018 Batch 1: Was a DB project. Six bridges bundled with water crossings. No key personnel on this Job.	0.8	Average - 3	S31 York: Was a bid-build SCDOT bridge (2 bridges) replacements over RR. Wooden bridges. One key individual overlap.	1.4	Excellent - 5	EBP5: Was a SCDOT DB ermergency project. Four bridges with water crossings. Lead Designer Key Individual overlap.
Project 6	1.666666667	0.6	Below Average - 2	SRT: Project was not DB and not designed to vehicular design requirements. It was a redesign with a bigger scope, was a bridge bundle, were over roadways, and included both these teams and key personnel on the project.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Nine Low Impact Bridges: Was a NC Express D-B package bundle similar to SCDOT low volume bridge design criteria. No mention of any key personnel overlap.	1.1	Above Average - 4	EBP4: Was a SCDOT DB emergency bridge replacement project. Four bridges with water crossings. No key personnel on this project.	0.0	Unacceptable - 0	I26 Nexton: Project listed does not meet the criteria for a project by the Lead Designer. Lead Designer is defined as the prime design consulting firm responsible for the design of the overall project which is as stated in Section 3.2.3.	1.1	Above Average - 4	2016 Batch 4/5: Was a DB project. 11 bridges with water crossings. No key personnel on this job.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Port Access: Was a SCDOT DB project. Complex road and bridge including an interchange. Bridges over water (D&F responsible for). One key individual overlap.	1.4	Excellent - 5	EBP6: Was a SCDOT DB ermergency project. Three bridges with water crossings. Lead Designer Key Individual overlap.
Subtotal:	**10**	**6.9**			**7.5**			**6.7**			**5.6**			**6.4**			**5.8**			**5.8**		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		
3.5 Past Performance of Team		**Points**	**Scale ID**	**Comments**	**Points**	**Scale ID**	**Comments**	**Points**	**Scale ID**	**Comments**	**Points**	**Scale ID**	**Comments**	**Points**	**Scale ID**	**Comments**	**Points**	**Scale ID**	**Comments**	**Points**	**Scale ID**	**Comments**
3.5.2 Quality of Past Performance	**Point Weight**	**30**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**30**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**30**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**30**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**30**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**30**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**30**		**Use the Likert Scale**
> For each of the projects identified per Section 3.5.1, provide the information requested in Sections H and I of the Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer that is included in the Appendix B. > The Proposer shall provide a Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer for all transportation projects, active or completed, within the last five years that has a "yes" response to any of the following questions. Sections A through G and Section J shall be completed. > Has the Lead Contractor or any member of the joint venture been declared delinquent or placed in default on any Project? > Has the Lead Contractor or any member of the joint venture submitted a claim on a project that was litigated? If litigated, explain the results. > Have any projects been delayed more than 30 days such that liquidated damages were assessed? > Has the Lead Contractor been cited by OSHA for violations deemed serious, willful, or repeated? > Have any projects under contract with the Lead Contractor or any member of the joint venture been subject to remediation actions, stop work orders, or project delays in excess of 30 days as a result of Section 404/Section 401 permit violations? > Has an owner, a Lead Contractor, or any member of a joint venture filed a claim against the Lead Designer's Errors and Omissions Insurance? > Has the Lead Designer filed legal proceedings against the Lead Contractor, or vice versa, on a design-build contract?																						
Project 1	1.666666667	1.1	Above Average - 4	EBP 2018-2A: This project was completed on budget with zero claims and on schedule. Completed the work on an accelerated schedule. No references for this project.	0.8	Average - 3	CLRB 2020-1: This project is still under construction. Designs are complete for all 16 sites. 10 bridges have been completed with the remaining 4 under construction. No references for this project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	CATS Blue Line: This project was still able to be completed on time despite the utility delays. Reference for the project was outstanding.	1.1	Above Average - 4	NCDOT 6YR: This project was completed under budget with zero claims and on time. Wet utilities relocated by a supplemental agreement after the contract award with no delays. No references for this project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	DIV10: This project was ahead of schedule and on budget with an incentive that the full amount was received. Completed the work on an accelerated schedule. No references for this project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	EBP 5: This project was completed on budget with zero claims and on schedule. Completed the work on an accelerated schedule. No references provided for this project.	0.8	Average - 3	NC Express: Unclear of project schedule or budget. Use of precast culverts helped reduce project risk for quality issues. No LDs assessed on the project. No references provided for project.
Project 2	1.666666667	1.1	Above Average - 4	EBP 2020-1: This project was completed on budget with zero claims and on schedule. Completed the work on an accelerated schedule. Contractor used a unique and innovative way of installing composite piles to eliminate build up or cut off. No references for this project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	EBP 2018-2B: This project was completed under budget with zero claims and on schedule. Completed the work on an accelerated schedule. No references for this project.	0.8	Average - 3	I85 Phase III: This project is still ongoing and has received one OSHA violation to date. Team accomodated a utility change order that didn't impact the project schedule. No project references received.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Horry County: This project was completed ahead of schedule with zero claims. Contractor worked to propose alternate materials or means to cut out material delays. No references for this project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	DIV13: This project was completed on time. VE study done for two sites for cost savings. No references for this project.	0.8	Average - 3	EBP 2: This project was completed under budget with zero claims and on schedule for one site and the other one week late due to unforseen conditions (no LDs assessed). No refererences provided for project.	0.6	Below Average - 2	US 321: This project was completed under budgel and finished 28 days late with assessed LDs. Reference for the project was satisfactory.
Project 3	1.666666667	0.8	Average - 3	SRT: This project is still ongoing and is projected to be complete on time and on budget. References for the project was excellent.	1.7	Outstanding - 6	US15: This project was completed on budget with zero claims and 16 days ahead of schedule. Project won a nation DBIA award. Completed the work on an accelerated design-build emergency schedule. No refererences for this project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	I85 DB/NC: This project experienced delays from owner due to additional scope but received no LDs. Reference for the project was outstanding.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Lebanon: This project well ahead of schedule with zero claims. Reference for the project was outstanding.	1.1	Above Average - 4	NC1340: This project was completed on time and within budget. Supplemental agreements were completed as a part of the overall project. Reference listed were excellent.	0.6	Below Average - 2	SC274/177: Project description is not clear whether project was on time or not. No claims or LDs were asssessed. No references for this project.	0.6	Below Average - 2	S83 Buffalo: This project was not completed on time and was assessed LDs due to weather and utility delays. Reference for the project was excellent.
Project 4	1.666666667	1.4	Excellent - 5	EBP 2018-2A: This project was completed on budget with zero claims and on schedule. Project won 2020 ACEC SC Engineering Excellence Award. Completed the work on an accelerated schedule. Submitted deliverables on day of NTP. No references for this project.	0.8	Average - 3	CLRB 2020-1: This project is still under construction. Designs are complete for all 16 sites. 10 bridges have been completed with the remaining 4 under construction. No references for this project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	2018-1: This project work was completed on an accelerated schedule. No references were provided for the project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	EBP 2018-2A: This work was done on time and on budget with zero claims. Project won 2020 ACEC SC award. No references on this project.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Pio Nono Ave: This project was completed on time. Superstructure replaced in 25 day closure. Project received numerous awards. No references were received.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Cherokee Lake: This project was completed on budget with zero claims and on schedule. Team used low volume bridge criteria and precast barriers as cost saving measures. Team completed value engineering and accelerated shop drawing reviews. No refererences for project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Panthers: This project is currently still in construction but the design is complete. Designer met or exceeded the Department's expectations with no delay. Reference for the project was excellent.
Project 5	1.666666667	1.1	Above Average - 4	EBP 2020-1: This project was completed on budget with zero claims and on schedule with a changed condition due to unforseen circumstances. Completed the work on an accelerated schedule. No references for this project.	0.6	Below Average - 2	Four Low Impact:This project write up is not clear if schedule was met or project budget was met. No references provided for this project.	1.4	Excellent - 5	2018-2B: Completed the work on an accelerated schedule. Submittal process was shortened eliminating preliminary plans. First project to handle bridge load ratings. Reference for the project was outstanding.	1.1	Above Average - 4	EBP 2020-1:This work was done on time and on budget with zero claims. Reference for the project was above average.	1.1	Above Average - 4	2018 Batch 1: This project was completed on budget with zero claims and on schedule. No references listed on project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	S31: This project was completed on time on an accelerated design schedule and won two awards. No refererences for project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	EBP5:This project was on time and on an accelerated schedule. References for the project were above average.
Project 6	1.666666667	1.4	Excellent - 5	SRT: The design portion was completed on time and on budget. During the VE, the team was able to reduce construction costs in half and accelerated the construction schedule by 30%. References for the project were excellent.	0.6	Below Average - 2	Nine Low Impact: This project write up is not clear if schedule was met or project budget was met. No references provided for this project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	EBP4: This project was completed on an accelerated schedule. Design work completed in very short period. Finished under budget and no litigation and arbitration. No references received for this project.	0.0	Unacceptable - 0	I26 Nexton: Project listed does not meet the criteria for a project by the Lead Designer. Lead Designer is defined as the prime design consulting firm responsible for the design of the overall project which is as stated in Section 3.2.3.	1.1	Above Average - 4	2016 Batch 4/5: This project was completed under budget with zero claims and on schedule. Project used innovative construction techniques. Reference for the project was excellent.	0.8	Average - 3	Port Access Road: This project design piece for D&F was on time under an aggressive schedule. No refererences for project.	1.1	Above Average - 4	EBP6: This project was completed on schedule with zero change orders or quality issues. No safety issues or LDs assessed. Reference for the project was slightly above average.
All other projects	5	5.0	Outstanding - 6	No additional projects listed.	0.8	Poor - 1	36 projects with LDs, 1 project with an OSHA violation, and 1 project with designer error & omissions.	3.3	Above Average - 4	1 project with LDs. 1 project with a serious OSHA violation.	5.0	Outstanding - 6	No additional projects listed.	5.0	Outstanding - 6	No additional projects listed.	4.2	Excellent - 5	One project with LDs. Project is not closed out and unresolved	5.0	Outstanding - 6	No other projects provided besides the two projects referenced above and were scored accordingly.
Previous Contractor Performance Evaluation System and Consultant Performance Evaluation Scores. Other available information related to past performance.	15	10.0	Above Average - 4	Design Build Performance Scores for this Designer were above average. DBPS for this contractor were average to above average in design phase and stayed average to above average during construction. CPES - 3 year average is 7.5 out of 10 and this is above standard to very good. CPS - 79.95 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for the Lead Designer were slightly above average but one reference was poor due to plan quality. The Contractor's references are slightly above average.	10.0	Above Average - 4	Design Build Performance Scores for this Designer were Slightly Above Average. DBPS for this contractor were (Average to Slightly Above Average for Reeves) (Average to Slightly Above Average for United) in design phase and went to (Above Average for Reeves) (Slightly Above Average to Above Average for United) during construction. CPES - 3 year average is 7.89 out of 10 and this is above standard to very good CPS - 73.96 (Reeves) and 81.46 (United) based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for the contractor are above average. References for the Lead Designer are above average.	10.0	Above Average - 4	Design Build Performance Scores for this Designer were above average. DBPS for this contractor were average in design phase and went to above average during construction. CPES - 3 year average is 7.81 out of 10 and this is above standard to very good. CPS - 79.85 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for Lead Designer were overall above average but a few references were below average due to communication and responsiveness issues. Contractor's references were average.	7.5	Average - 3	No Design Build Performance Scores for Contractor or Lead Designer. CPES - 3 year average is 7.46 out of 10 and this is above standard to very good. CPS - 80.47 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. Contractor reviews were overall slightly above average. Lead Designer references were above average.	7.5	Average - 3	No DB CPES for Contractor or Lead Designer. CPES - 3 year average is 7.8 out of 10 and this is above standard to very good. CPS - 75.55 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References provided for Lead Designer were above average. References for the Contractor were slightly above average.	5.0	Below Average - 2	No Design Build Performance scores for Lead Designer or Contractor. CPES - 3 year average is 7.45 out of 10 and this is above standard to very good. CPS - 59.06 based on safety index and is below the threshold established by DOC. References received for the Lead Designer are slightly above average. References for the Contractor are slightly above average.	10.0	Above Average - 4	Design Build Performance Scores for this Designer were above average. DBPS for this contractor were above average in design phase and went to slightly below average during construction. CPES - 3 year average is 8.43 out of 10 and this is very good to excellent. CPS - 79.37 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for the Lead Designer were outstanding. References for the Contractor were slightly below average.
Subtotal:	**30**	**21.9**			**16.4**			**20.0**			**18.1**			**19.4**			**14.7**			**20.3**		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		
Total Score		**Palmetto/CTEA**			**Reeves-United/RK&K**			**Lane/ICE**			**ESWagner/Holt**			**Dane/Neel-Schaffer**			**Lee/D&F**			**BDC/KCI**		
Points		**100.0**			**100.0**			**100.0**			**100.0**			**100.0**			**100.0**			**100.0**		
Total:	**100.0**	**74.6**			**62.2**			**67.7**			**61.3**			**53.7**			**69.7**			**62.8**		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Bridge Package 14
August 3, 8, 9, 10, 2022

Palmetto/CTEA	Reeves-United/RK&K	Lane/ICE	ESWagner/Holt	Dane/Neel-Schaffer	Lee/D&F	BDC/KCI

I certify that the scores (weighted scores are rounded) shown on this sheet(s) accurately reflect the actions of the Committee on DATE and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFQ.

Michael Pitts Chairperson	
Trapp Harris Voting Member	
Randy King Voting Member	
Tyler Clark Voting Member	
Jesse Hames Voting Member	Jesse Hames 2022.08.13 12:39:05 -04'00'
Voting Member*	
Carmen Wright Procurement Officer	Carmen Wright
Brian Gambrell Legal	
FHWA	