SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
P038652 - Interstate 77 Panther Interchange
September 15 - 17, 2020

Responsiveness	Brasfield & Gorrie / JMT		United-Blythe / KCI		Granite / Atkins		Lynches River / Carolina TEA		Crowder / Parish & Partners		Sloan / RK&K		Lane / Baker	
	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments
Is Proposer considered responsive?	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	

3.2 Introduction	Brasfield & Gorrie / JMT		United-Blythe / KCI		Granite / Atkins		Lynches River / Carolina TEA		Crowder / Parish & Partners		Sloan / RK&K		Lane / Baker	
	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments
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, if applicable, of the entity that will be contracting with SCDOT. If a joint venture, identify the entities that comprise the joint venture, and their parent companies, if applicable, 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	
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	
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	
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	
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	

3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution		Brasfield & Gorrie / JMT			United-Blythe / KCI			Granite / Atkins			Lynches River / Carolina TEA			Crowder / Parish & Partners			Sloan / RK&K			Lane / Baker		
		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
3.3.1 Organizational Chart, Team Structure, and Team Integration	**Point Weight**	**5**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**5**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**5**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**5**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**5**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**5**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**5**		**Use the Likert Scale**
Provide an organizational chart showing the flow of the "chain of command" with lines identifying participants who are responsible for major functions to be performed and their reporting relationships in managing, designing, and building the Project. The chart must show the functional structure of the organization down to the design discipline leader and construction superintendent level and must identify Key Individuals by full legal name and firm. 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	3.0	Average - 3	Lines of communication between Design & Construction were clear. Dotted lines were confusing at times when they connected to a solid line. Communication with design team/environmental will be necessary due to the lack of public involvement during the NEPA/Permitting phase. Overall Organization chart met expectations.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Risk Management Teams identified and listing of major 3rd parties is a positive. Identifying lead inspectors for Bridge and Road is positive. Communication with design team/environmental will be necessary due to the lack of public involvement during the NEPA/Permitting phase. Overall chart was above average.	3.0	Average - 3	Clear structure and communication lines between major design disciplines and construction. Would expect to see a communication line between QC manager and CM or DBC since those personnel are on-site during all construction activities. Meets expectations.	2.0	Below Average -	Chart shows CM reporting to QC Manager and DB Coordinator. RFQ states that names should not be provided for non key individuals. Multiple extra key individuals provided - not considered a positive. President of company leading project has advantages in issue resolution but also creates concerns considering LRC's rep on the Executive Committee works for Preslar. No Environmental permitting or compliance shown on the chart. Solid lines and dotted lines not defined.	3.0	Average - 3	Clear structure and communication lines between major design disciplines and construction. Met expectations.	3.0	Average - 3	Good attempt to show there is lots of communication between different disciplines throughout the chart. Location of lines (dotted and solid is somewhat confusing - presentation could be improved), positive to includes specific 3rd parties, location of design QC on construction side of the chart could be improved.	3.0	Average - 3	Clear organizational structure reporting structure and communication. No communication lines between Superintendents & field engineers.
Provide D-U-N-S Number for all team members.																						
Provide a brief, written description of significant functional relationships and how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team.	1	1.0	Poor - 1	Response was more focused on staffing and firm qualifications rather than integration. Integration of a designer and contractor that have no previous design-build experience together in their respective roles was lacking.	3.0	Average - 3	Generic response that meets expectations.	2.0	Below Average - 2	Lacks discussion of integration. Response focuses more on personnel and their responsibilities. DQM will train design team on requirements of QAP is a positive. No discussion of how the PM and DBC will interact and who will be managing the day-to-day operations on-site.	1.0	Poor - 1	Response was very general and lacks any detail into how the team will function.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Very general discussion. Quarterly Executive committee meeting is a positive. Table with integration strategies is a positive.	3.0	Average - 3	Unique way to present the information in the chart, positive from a functional relationship but didn't really fully address the integration portion.	2.0	Below Average - 2	General explanation of reporting structure. No specific discussion on integration of the team.
Identify in tabular form if any of the firms, key individuals, and/or other team members 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.	2	1.0	Poor - 1	JMT & Brasfield and Gorrie have no previous working experience. Half of the projects in the table are design-build pursuits. Key subs have very little experience with JMT per information provided in the table. CCR Phase 2 was listed and that project is currently in the first phase of procurement.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Significant working history for UIG and KCI on design-build projects. UIG and BDC have limited working history - no JV experience.	2.0	Below Average - 2	Names provided are not listed as Key Individuals so we don't know who they are. Table does not specify if projects are DB. Table does not provide reference information. Level of participation and roles of firms are not provided.	2.0	Below Average -	Lynches River, Boggs, and Lee have experience working together on several projects. None of the design staff have worked with the Lead Contractor. Role and level of participation is not shown on the chart.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Crowder and P&P have working relationships on several DB projects and pursuits. Many of the same players participated in most of the projects.	3.0	Average - 3	CLRB is just beginning and currently in design review phase so this is not indicative of a teaming success, Cross slope correction project was a unique teaming situation that demonstrated teams ability to collectively resolve an issue. Monroe Bypass demonstrates ability to work together on a design-build project.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Lane and MBI have experience teaming on design-build projects. Team has performed well together on SCDOT projects.
Subtotal:	**5**	**1.5**			**3.2**			**2.0**			**1.5**			**3.3**			**2.5**			**2.7**		

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
P038652 - Interstate 77 Panther Interchange
September 15 - 17, 2020

		Brasfield & Gorrie / JMT			United-Blythe / KCI			Granite / Atkins			Lynches River / Carolina TEA			Crowder / Parish & Partners			Sloan / RK&K			Lane / Baker		
		Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments
3.3.2 Critical Risks	**Point Weight**	**10**		**Use the Likert Scale or Identify Risk**	**10**		**Use the Likert Scale or Identify Risk**	**10**		**Use the Likert Scale or Identify Risk**	**10**		**Use the Likert Scale or Identify Risk**	**10**		**Use the Likert Scale or Identify Risk**	**10**		**Use the Likert Scale or Identify Risk**	**10**		**Use the Likert Scale or Identify Risk**
SCDOT has identified the following risks as critical risks for this project: • Schedule • Maintenance of traffic • Third-party coordination Discuss the strategies the Proposer's team will implement to mitigate or eliminate each risk including how the Proposer's proposed personnel and organizational structure would aid in the mitigation of the risk. Describe the role that the Proposer expects SCDOT or other agencies to have in addressing these Project risks.	10	5.0	Excellent - 5	Schedule: Very detailed and demonstrated that the team has thought through many of the major issues that could impact schedule. Securing a borrow pit is critical based on county rules and regulations. MOT: Very detailed and demonstrated that the team has thought through many of the major issues that could impact MOT. Good forethought on access. Excellent commitment to repairing potholes.3rd Party Coordination: great job identifying issues/3rd party players but mitigation strategies were very general. Additional Considerations: well thought out and insightful.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Schedule: Detailed responses with hard commitments on schedule. Good thought into schedule delay mitigation. MOT:3rd Party main points were discussed, good idea to build south bound ramps for access 3rd Party Coordination: BDC is working for the Panthers on site, great job identifying 3rd party stakeholders. Very proactive / aggressive approach. No mention of NPDES permitting.	1.0	Poor - 1	Assigning task groups was a positive. Schedule: Very generic response that is not project specific. Flexibility in CPM to accommodate ROW delays provides value to SCDOT. SCDOT cannot guarantee expedited reviews. MOT: Very general response. Access to site was not discussed High impact closures is a concern. Opportunities for innovation cannot be guaranteed. 3rd Party Involvement: Very generic, boilerplate response.	1.0	Poor - 1	No discussion into issues that could affect schedule/MOT/3rd Party Involvement with appropriate mitigation. Very vague response in general to each risk.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Schedule: Excellent development of mitigation strategies and proactive approach. Design phase submittals has been considered to expedite construction. MOT: Detailed response with project specific strategies. 3rd Party: detailed response that covers the significant 3rd party organizations, failed to mention City of Rock Hill coordination with lighting and signals.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Schedule: well developed response with project specific mitigation strategies, clear that team has invested time to understand this risk. MOT: well developed response, good point about existing shoulder, positive that safety is important part of the response 3rd Party Coordination: Coordination with other projects in the area is very important coordination, well developed response overall.	3.0	Average - 3	Schedule: very general response that is not project specific MOT: General other than access to Panther facility 3rd Party very general response that focused on meetings. Drainage risks are associated with 3rd party coordination and considered relevant.
Subtotal:	**10**	**8.3**			**8.3**			**1.7**			**1.7**			**8.3**			**8.3**			**5.0**		

		Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments
3.3.3 Project Resources, Strategies, and Execution	**Point Weight**	**5**		**Use the Likert Scale or Identify Risk**	**5**		**Use the Likert Scale or Identify Risk**	**5**		**Use the Likert Scale or Identify Risk**	**5**		**Use the Likert Scale or Identify Risk**	**5**		**Use the Likert Scale or Identify Risk**	**5**		**Use the Likert Scale or Identify Risk**	**5**		**Use the Likert Scale or Identify Risk**
Discuss the Proposer's strategy for implementation of available resources to execute the project. 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 firms responsible.	3	3.0	Average - 3	Contractor will be self performing most of the work which is a positive on this schedule critical project. B&G past experience with Populous & Barton Malow is a positive. Very little discussion on actual execution of the contract and strategies to deliver the project on schedule. Very little discussion on execution of key subcontractors. No discussion of Manpower table - it is a bit difficult to understand but demonstrates thought into an actual delivery schedule. Is this internal only or including external?	5.0	Excellent - 5	Specific strategy on advancing design to expedite schedule. Most tasks self performed by Lead Contractor and Design. Several statements and examples are included about finishing the project early. Having BDC as a JV partner is a good strategy to mitigate 3rd party risks with the Panther site contractor. Asphalt plant close to the job site is a positive.	3.0	Average - 3	Co-location of Contractor and Designer in Charlotte is a positive. Exhibit 5 showing labor resources and project needs is a positive. Identification of key sub (D&F) that has recent design-build experience is a positive. Good information on approach to utilities, environmental, PR - some of this information would have improved the responses in the risk section.	2.0	Below Average -	Very little discussion on implementing resources to design and build the project. Lacks strategies. No discussion of tasks lead designer and lead contractor will self perform.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Available staff was listed, needed staff would have improved the response, previous working experience with the Panthers is a positive, availability of 5 bridge crews is a positive, CC and P&P have experience working together under compressed schedules, CC will self perform 70% of the work, all subcontractor/sub consultant tasks were listed.	3.0	Average - 3	RK&K and Sloan clearly have the resources to deliver this project, Sloan has ability to self perform all primary elements of the project, lacking discussion of project execution.	2.0	Below Average - 2	Lane & MBI can self perform most of the work required on the project. Both firms have adequate resources. Strategies are very high level and general & doesn't demonstrate implementation of resources.
Indicate how the geographical location of the firms will enhance integration, communication, issue resolution and project execution.	2	2.0	Below Average - 2	Lacking discussion on how the team will integrate. Concerns over management from Atlanta, GA. Didn't address the fact that the team is all in different locations when they have very little experience working together. Concerns over issue resolution with management in Atlanta. Will there be an office on site for the construction team?	6.0	Outstanding - 6	Immediate co-location to the site of UIG and BDC is a positive. Majority of the resources are very close the project site. Project executives are within a few miles of the project site. Very specific plan that is advantageous to the project.	2.0	Below Average - 2	Not clear on how project will be managed on-site and implementation of resources. Initial coordination will be in the Atkins Charlotte office but what happens after that? Lacking discussion of where personnel will be during the project. Response is more focused on design.	4.0	Above Average -	Key players are local and has strong ties to this area. Large network of materials and equipment in close proximity to the project site.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Lead Contractor will locate an office on the project site. Lead Designer and Lead Contractor are both fairly close the site with their existing offices.	2.0	Below Average - 2	Per the map, Sloan has significant resources in the project area. RK&K has fairly quick access to the project. Lacks detail. SCDOT rarely has in person meetings related to design and does not allow hand delivering of submittals. ProjectWise is currently utilized for design submittals - team should be familiar with this based on role on current project with SCDOT.	3.0	Average - 3	Co-location of design & construction, both Lane and MBI have offices in close proximity to the site. Very general response.
Subtotal:	**5**	**2.2**			**4.5**			**2.2**			**2.3**			**3.8**			**2.2**			**2.0**		

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
P038652 - Interstate 77 Panther Interchange
September 15 - 17, 2020

		Brasfield & Gorrie / JMT			United-Blythe / KCI			Granite / Atkins			Lynches River / Carolina TEA			Crowder / Parish & Partners			Sloan / RK&K			Lane / Baker		
		Brasfield & Gorrie / JMT			United-Blythe / KCI			Granite / Atkins			Lynches River / Carolina TEA			Crowder / Parish & Partners			Sloan / RK&K			Lane / Baker		
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals		**Points**		**Comments**	**Points**		**Comments**	**Points**		**Comments**	**Points**		**Comments**	**Points**		**Comments**	**Points**		**Comments**	**Points**		**Comments**
3.4.4. Project Management Team	**Point Weight**	**15**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**15**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**15**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**15**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**15**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**15**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**15**		**Use the Likert Scale**
• Project Manager (7 points) o 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. o The Project Manager shall have a minimum of 10 years of progressive experience and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects and must include experience and expertise in the management of projects of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity. o The Project Manager shall attend and lead weekly status meetings during the design and construction phases, and be available at the request of the SCDOT.	7	3.0	Average - 3	Ogle: Not a significant amount of design-build experience. Has experience delivering projects on schedule critical projects with 3rd party involvement. Good progressive experience within B&G. Has interstate / heavy MOT experience. Emergency project experience is a positive when considering expedited schedule. Projects demonstrate that Ogle has experience dealing with project risks associated with the job. Was classified as APM in 2011 however project 5 has him listed as PM. Positive reference received.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Grey: Very experienced PM with significant design-build projects of similar scope and magnitude. Major design experience early in career. No experience working with UIG.	3.0	Average - 3	Cherdine Lewis: Resume doesn't show that she has significant experience in the role of Project Manager. She has experience in significant bridge work on major design-build/p3 projects. Several positive references.	2.0	Below Average -	Preslar: Very little design-build experience in this role shown. Has management experience but not on this scale for project with this type scope of work and complexity. Lacks bridge construction experience.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Tuschak: has significant design-build experience, high level management positions over multiple projects at once which works well with their proposed org structure with DB Coordinator. Positive References.	2.0	Below Average - 2	Bishop: Only one design-build project and Sloan was not the Prime. Other projects are not similar scope and complexity. Lacks experience on interchange projects. No references received.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Chaparro: limited experience in role of Project Manager. Has design-build experience on relevant projects. Experience working on interstate projects. Positive reference. Appears his last assignment on a single project was 2012
• Design-Build Coordinator (8 points) o The Design-Build Coordinator shall be the person in charge of and responsible for daily coordination of the design-build Project. After award of the Project, the Design-Build Coordinator will be the daily contact for communications with SCDOT, with primary project contact remaining the responsibility of the Project Manager. o The Design-Build Coordinator shall have a minimum of 5 years of progressive experience and expertise in highway transportation projects of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity. o For the duration of the contract, the Design-Build Coordinator 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. o The Design-Build Coordinator shall be on-site during all construction activities, attend weekly status meetings during the design and construction phases, and be available at the request of the SCDOT.	8	3.0	Average - 3	Reese: Significant design-build management experience with PM experience on interstate/interchange/major MOT project. Very familiar with Project Management role. Highway experience is limited to the last few years. Two projects listed are not highway construction - Table 2 says 20 years of highway experience but resume doesn't support this statement. Resume shows 4 years of highway experience from 2017-2020. No reference received.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Lindy: significant design-build experience - mostly emergency projects. No interstate projects shown. Positive references with good history of success. Exceeds minimum qualifications.	2.0	Below Average - 2	Bowyer:Currently on same project with the proposed PM in this role but only for a year. Has significant design experience and appears to lack construction experience that will be needed to execute the project. Narrative failed to address Bowyer's role day to day. Positive references related to design roles.	1.0	Poor - 1	Auret: lacks design-build experience in similar role. Lacks experience with bridge construction. Background in resurfacing.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Naumann: lots of DB experience with previous firm on major projects, resume does not support significant management role on several of his projects. I-4 is the only project that seems to be relevant for this role. Positive references.	2.0	Below Average - 2	No DB Coordinator Proposed. Score from PM utilized for this category.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Baucom: Projects 1, 2, & 3 appear to be occurring currently so unsure on how in-depth of a role he actually plays on the project level. Has experience in design-build projects and interstate interchange work.
Subtotal:	**15**	**7.5**			**12.5**			**6.2**			**3.7**			**10.0**			**5.0**			**10.0**		

		Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments
3.4.5 Design Engineering Team	**Point Weight**	**15**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**15**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**15**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**15**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**15**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**15**		**Use the Likert Scale**	**15**		**Use the Likert Scale**
o 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. o The Lead Design Engineer shall have a minimum of 10 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. o 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. o The Lead Design Engineer shall be a full time employee of the lead design firm.	15	5.0	Excellent - 5	Russell: Has significant design-build experience with interchange design/interstate MOT. Significant roadway experience. Lead Designer on US 1 over I-20 DB project. Positive references - as reputation of responsiveness and cooperation with owner.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Shawn Davis: very experienced in project delivery of major interchanges, lacks recent design-build experience as presented. Positive references. Would have liked to see another project listed that was more recent.	3.0	Average - 3	Doesn't appear to have design-build experience in this role, working for the contractor. Most of experience is DB prep or traditional DBB. Has experience in the design of interchanges. Positive references.	4.0	Above Average -	Staton: Positive references. Has significant design-build experience. Lacks lead design experience on project with similar size and complexity. Significant structures experience.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Positive references, has DB experience. 2 projects listed are pursuits which are not completely relevant, recent projects are relevant to scope and complexity of this project, has lead design experience on DB projects	4.0	Above Average - 4	Peterson: significant design-build experience with major projects that have similar complexities. Experience is predominantly structures lead. Positive reference.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Swygert: Has significant design-build experience in a lead position. Positive references. Has interstate and interchange experience.
Subtotal:	**15**	**12.5**			**10.0**			**7.5**			**10.0**			**12.5**			**10.0**			**12.5**		

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
P038652 - Interstate 77 Panther Interchange
September 15 - 17, 2020

		Brasfield & Gorrie / JMT			United-Blythe / KCI			Granite / Atkins			Lynches River / Carolina TEA			Crowder / Parish & Partners			Sloan / RK&K			Lane / Baker		
		Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		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**
• Construction Manager (5 points) o The Construction Manager shall be responsible for all aspects of the construction of the Project, subject to oversight of the Project Manager. o The Construction Manager shall have a minimum of 10 years of progressive experience and expertise in the construction of highway transportation projects and must include experience and expertise in the management of the construction phase of projects of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity. o For the duration of construction, the Construction Manager shall be dedicated solely to managing the construction of the Project, shall have no other assigned Project responsibilities, and shall not be utilized on any other projects. o The Construction Manager shall be on-site during all construction activities for the Project.	5	3.0	Average - 3	Cleckley: Entire 20 year career with B&G. 4 of 5 projects is highway work although none are design-build. His only design-build project is not a highway project. His roles on previous projects are similar to work anticipated on this project. Has previous working experience with the dedicated PM and DB Coordinator. Project #4, Cleckley was only present for 4 months. Was on project #1 and #4 for a portion of the same time.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Marsh: lacking information on project role in resume. Very positive reference received. Has design-build experience.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Positive references. Has strong management experience. Projects are of similar size and complexity. Appears he remained on his projects for their entirety so he has experience with all phases of construction.	1.0	Poor - 1	Tim Staton: Lacks design-build experience. Lacks bridge construction experience. Experience is mostly with paving.	3.0	Average - 3	Faulkner: Has some design-build experience, has served in this role on other projects.	3.0	Average - 3	No design-build experience shown, all work shown is structures based which is very important for this project. Positive references.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Magro: Has design-build experience on similar scope projects in the role of CM.
• Quality Control (QC) Manager (5 points) o The QC Manager shall be responsible for ensuring that all workmanship and materials are in compliance with the contract requirements. The QC Manager shall coordinate with the SCDOT Resident Construction Engineer (RCE) for all QA&IA testing. The QC Manager shall not report directly to the Project Manager or other Project personnel, but shall report to a responsible officer of the entity with whom SCDOT has contracted. o The QC Manager shall have a minimum of 10 years of progressive experience and expertise in the QC of highway transportation projects and must include experience and expertise in the QC management of the construction phase of projects of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity. o For the duration of construction, the QC Manager shall be dedicated solely to project quality control, shall have no other assigned Project responsibilities, and shall not be utilized on any other projects. o The QC Manager shall be on-site during all construction activities for the Project.	5	2.0	Below Average - 2	Callahan: Good resume that clearly shows experience and lengths of assignments on the example projects. Table 2 and H are in conflict. QC Manager must be on site full time - H indicates this is not a requirement. The last time he was full time on a project was 14 years ago. Have concerns with the low percentages of time he was active on several of his projects.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Atkinson - Very positive references. Great projects listed show depth of experience. Has experience in design-build and work as owners rep and working directly for the contractor.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Significant experience in QC on multiple major design-build projects. Has been with Granite over 18 years in this role.	2.0	Below Average -	Ciatt: No experience in this specific role. No design-build experience.	3.0	Average - 3	Nelson: has some design-build experience, significant experience working with SCDOT as Chief Inspector for on-call but unclear on his ability to manage.	1.0	Poor - 1	Gambill: experience is asphalt, lacks transportation project experience. No design-build experience. Overall lacks experience in this role.	3.0	Average - 3	Weihrauch: has QC experience on highway projects. Appears to have some design-build experience. Several projects he was working with the owner so unsure of his experience working with a contractor.
Subtotal:	**10**	**4.2**			**7.5**			**7.5**			**2.5**			**5.0**			**3.3**			**5.8**		

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
P038652 - Interstate 77 Panther Interchange
September 15 - 17, 2020

		Brasfield & Gorrie / JMT			United-Blythe / KCI			Granite / Atkins			Lynches River / Carolina TEA			Crowder / Parish & Partners			Sloan / RK&K			Lane / Baker		
		Brasfield & Gorrie / JMT			United-Blythe / KCI			Granite / Atkins			Lynches River / Carolina TEA			Crowder / Parish & Partners			Sloan / RK&K			Lane / Baker		
3.5 Past Performance of Team		**Points**		**Comments**	**Points**		**Comments**	**Points**		**Comments**	**Points**		**Comments**	**Points**		**Comments**	**Points**		**Comments**	**Points**		**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 7 calendar years that identify the previous work experience by the Lead Contractor or any Major Subcontractors using the Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer, Sections A through G. Projects that have reached substantial completion are preferred.																						
Project 1	1.67	5.0	Excellent - 5	I-75/285: Good project that demonstrates ability to deliver project with heavy MOT and significant 3rd party involvement. Not a design-build project. Not an interchange project. Project doesn't make improvements to mainline interstate. Lessons learned on this project would be relevant to this project.	3.0	Average - 3	EBP 2018-1: Emergency design-build project with structure over interstate. Not similar in scope or complexity. Project did have an accelerated schedule.	4.0	Above Average - 4	I-4: Project is design-build has similar complexity in certain areas of the project (Interstate interchange construction, MOT). Project is a JV and Granite is not solely responsible. Not clear of the responsibilities between the JV partners.	3.0	Average - 3	I-77 Gold Hill: size and complexity not comparable. Only a bridge widening / retrofit. Significant complexity with MOT. Not design-build.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Rainbow over I-26: Not design-build, significant MOT, key individual involvement, bridge over interstate with tight frontage roads and traffic signal work, emergency demo created complex schedule.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Monroe Bypass: Sloan was major sub on this design-build project. Significant MOT, bridge construction, interchange construction, coordination with adjacent projects / contractors, key individual involvement, RK&K was lead design and demonstrated good partnering.	6.0	Outstanding - 6	I-85 Phase III: Basically same design-build team as proposed on this project (4 key members). Projects has 4 interchange replacements, significant MOT, 3rd party coordination with Railroad and coordination with adjacent construction project. Similar complexities.
Project 2	1.67	4.0	Above Average - 4	I-59/20 Interchange: Project is not design-build. Project is not substantially complete. Contractor was required to worked with adjacent contractors. Project had unique features. 3 Key individuals were involved.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Volvo: major subcontractor responsible for the structures on this major design-build project over I-26. Similar bridge scope.	3.0	Average - 3	I-40/I-440: Mark Monreal is not a key individual for this project but listed as such. Project has interstate MOT. No references to interchange construction, 3rd party involvement. Project is Design-Build.	2.0	Below Average -	I-3802A I-85: subcontractor; built two bridges over the interstate, no 3rd party coordination listed, not MOT discussed. Project had aggressive schedule.	5.0	Excellent - 5	US 78 & SC 7: not design-build, aggressive schedule, urban bridge construction, 3rd party involvement, key member involvement, significant MOT.	2.0	Below Average - 2	I-85 Resurfacing: Not a design-build project with relevant scope of work - resurfacing only. Project had routine traffic control, traffic was heavy.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Port Access Road: design-build project with interchange, lots of similar complexities, 3rd party involvement with RR and other entities, no key personnel on this project. JV with Fluor that doesn't involve MBI.
Project 3	1.67	3.0	Average - 3	HWY 150: Project is not design-build, interstate, or interchange. 3rd Party coordination was significant. Complex MOT. Two key individuals involved.	4.0	Above Average - 4	I77 HOT Lanes: BDC was a major sub with over$100M of scope on this design-build project. No interchanges but several structures over I-77. UIG was also involved in this project for schedule recovery.	3.0	Average - 3	I-59/I-20: Not clear if project was design-build. Not clear why the water relocations was highlighted - irrelevant to I-77 Panther Interchange. Geotechnical issues and aggressive schedule would be comparable. MOT is not mentioned. Response lacks how this is similar to the I-77 Panther Interchange.	1.0	Poor - 1	US 521: This was a Rural Road Safety project. Project scope and complexity not comparable. Not design build, no bridge construction, no significant MOT, no significant 3rd party involvement.	4.0	Above Average - 4	I-85 DB: Crowder was a subcontractor on this DB project, project had aggressive schedule and 3rd party coordination, key member was involved (Tuschak), bridge over Interstate.	2.0	Below Average - 2	NC 133: not design-build, rehab project, very few similarities other than aggressive schedule and complex techniques.	4.0	Above Average - 4	I-40 / I-77: Design-build interchange project, has key individual involvement (Baucom -appears to not be day-to-day), complex MOT.
Provide no more than 3 projects for which a design services contract was executed within the last 7 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.																						
Project 4	1.67	5.0	Excellent - 5	Volvo: Significant 3rd party involvement with adjacent contractor. Key individuals involved. Similar scope and complexity. Project was design-build. MOT and traffic volumes are not similar.	3.0	Average - 3	Port Access Road: KCI was major sub and responsible for a major portion of the structure design of the mainline. Project was design-build. KCI did not design the interchange, only mainline and ramps. Project required coordination with multiple design teams and 3rd parties.	3.0	Average - 3	I-80: Project was design-build. Interstate widening with 11 interchanges. Unsure on interchange scope of work based on the $80M cost (suggests very little bridge work). Project was with Granite - key individuals listed are not key on this project.	3.0	Average - 3	EBP 2012-2A: Design-build project, not similar size and complexity, no MOT, short span cored slab bridge construction, accelerated schedule.	5.0	Excellent - 5	I-85 Widening: Lead designer on design-build project. 3rd party involvement, challenging MOT design and implementation, multiple interchanges, involvement with Crowder, multiple key individuals involved.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Monroe Bypass: lead design on design-build project, similar scope of work and complexities, aggressive schedule, complex MOT, 3rd party coordination.	6.0	Outstanding - 6	I-85 Phase III: Basically same design-build team as proposed on this project. Projects has 4 interchange replacements, significant MOT, 3rd party coordination with Railroad and coordination with adjacent construction project. Similar complexities.
Project 5	1.67	4.0	Above Average - 4	I-85 77-98: JMT is not lead designer. Within their segment of the project, they had a similar roles. Good interaction of permitting. Project required significant coordination with other designers and contractors involved with other segments. MOT was significant.	4.0	Above Average - 4	R-2247 CD Winston-Salem Interchange: Relevant design-build interchange project that is similar in size and complexity. Project had aggressive schedule with 3rd party involvement.	4.0	Above Average - 4	I-185: Challenging design schedule. Urban interchange design similar to I-77 Panther interchange area. Project was not design-build. Lead Designer was involved with this project. Was this final design or preliminary design?	3.0	Average - 3	I-85 CSX Railroad: bridge design over Interstate. Significant 3rd party involvement, significant MOT. Not an interchange but MOT was significant due to demolition and construction process.	1.0	Poor - 1	I-40/440: RS&H was lead designer when Rogers worked for RS&H so this is not reflective of work performed by P&P team. This project is more appropriate on Key Individual Resume for Chad rather than a project for P&P. If P&P was involved as a firm, this is not clear on the form. PDG had involvement with MOT.	5.0	Excellent - 5	I-40 Widening: Design-build project with multiple interchanges, aggressive schedule, complex MOT, 3rd party coordination with adjacent projects, similar scope of work and complexities.	2.0	Below Average - 2	I-26 85-101: Design-build prep work - only conceptual plans. Not a relevant project in terms of scope of work.
Project 6	1.67	4.0	Above Average - 4	I-95: Crossroads reference appears to be copy and paste error. Design-build interchange project over Interstate with heavy MOT. Significant 3rd party coordination required.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Monroe Bypass - relevant design-build project with significant structures involvement from KCI. United was part of the construction team. Key individual involvement from United. Similar complexities on this project.	4.0	Above Average - 4	I-26 Palmetto Commerce Parkway- design is similar in scope and complexity. Project is not design-build. Project has not been constructed. Key individuals listed are not listed as key's on this project. D&F is not doing structural design and only portions of road design on I-77 Panther interchange.	1.0	Poor - 1	I-285 / SR400: Holt was not responsible for design, only design review. Scope of work is not relevant.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Volvo - project was design-build, had complex MOT and drainage design that was completed by CDM Smith who is a major sub on the P&P team. Project required 3rd party coordination with adjacent contractor. Compressed schedule.	5.0	Excellent - 5	I-95 Widening: design-build project involving interstate interchange, lead design role, multiple interchanges with complex MOT, required coordination with adjacent projects, similar scope of work and complexities.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Nexton: DBB project, new location interchange design, 3rd party coordination, complex MOT but not as constrained as Panther site, project has been constructed.
Subtotal:	**10**	**6.9**			**6.1**			**5.8**			**3.6**			**6.7**			**6.4**			**7.5**		

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
P038652 - Interstate 77 Panther Interchange
September 15 - 17, 2020

		Brasfield & Gorrie / JMT			United-Blythe / KCI			Granite / Atkins			Lynches River / Carolina TEA			Crowder / Parish & Partners			Sloan / RK&K			Lane / Baker		
		Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		Comments	Points		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. o Has the Lead Contractor or any member of the joint venture been declared delinquent or placed in default on any Project? o 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. o Have any projects been delayed more than 30 days such that liquidated damages were assessed? o Has the Lead Contractor been cited by OSHA for violations deemed serious, willful, or repeated? o 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? o 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? o Has the Lead Designer filed legal proceedings against the Lead Contractor, or vice versa, on a design-build contract?																						
Project 1	2	5.0	Excellent - 5	I-75/285: Under budge and ahead of schedule. No references received. Met schedule for opening day.	4.0	Above Average - 4	EBP 2018-1: Project was completed on-time under an aggressive schedule. Positive references received.	2.0	Below Average - 2	I-4: Project is not complete, not clear if project is on schedule or on budget. Claims exist between Granite and the designer. 2nd Work History form references CCR Phase II.	2.0	Below Average -	I-77 Gold Hill: Poor reference contradicts self assessment. Project is not complete but appears to be on schedule.	3.0	Average - 3	Rainbow over I-26 - Positive reference, on-time delivery, coordination with utilities was a positive, in-depth planning of emergency demo was complex, quality initiatives are weak.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Monroe Bypass: significantly reduced project schedule, significant coordination with subs demonstrates partnering.	4.0	Above Average - 4	I-85 Phase III: Good detailed write-up with specific examples. Worked around some utility conflicts to avoid delays. Project is currently in construction but appears to be on schedule.
Project 2	2	3.0	Average - 3	I-359/20 Interchange: Project is not complete but appears to be on schedule. No references received. Response meets minimum.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Volvo: Schedule recovery for the prime contractor. Worked 24/7 at times to gain time on project schedule. Time was recovered and project was delivered on-time.	3.0	Average - 3	I-40/I-440: Discussion of schedule is not provided. Claim against designer. Portable concrete crusher appears to simply be a cost savings measure for the contractor. Quality initiatives are very general.	2.0	Below Average -	I-3802A I-85: Very general discussion. Quality initiatives were weak and lacking detail.	4.0	Above Average - 4	US 78 & SC 7: Project was completed on time, no claims, positive reference, quality initiatives are weak.	3.0	Average - 3	I-85 Resurfacing: average reference, successful implementation of warm-mix technology for first time in SC required additional coordination. General response.	2.0	Below Average - 2	Port Access Road: Negative references, Project is not complete but appears to be on-schedule.
Project 3	2	4.0	Above Average - 4	HWY 150: Project was ahead of schedule despite major utility delays. Contractor re-sequenced work to avoid critical path delays. Contractor provided an independent 3rd party reviewer.	3.0	Average - 3	I77 HOT Lanes: Project is not complete but appears to be on schedule. Very general response that meets expectations.	4.0	Above Average - 4	I-59/I-20: schedule was met and team received an early completion bonus. Self assessment was lacking. Quality initiatives are a positive. Rideability bonus received and no bridge deck grinding.	4.0	Above Average -	US 521: Positive reference. Project was successful overall.	2.0	Below Average - 2	I-85 DB: project was completed on time, quality initiatives are weak.	3.0	Average - 3	NC 133: Positive reference, project was completed early, lacks detail on quality initiatives.	3.0	Average - 3	I-40 / I-77: Positive reference, schedule is not clear, project specific discussion on coordination with utilities to avoid delays and keep project on the aggressive schedule.
Project 4	2	5.0	Excellent - 5	Volvo: Positive references. Project was completed on-time and on-budget. No claims or litigation. Quick environmental approvals.	2.0	Below Average - 2	Port Access Road: Positive reference received, very general response and lacking in detail. Predominantly discussion of preaward activities under quality initiatives. In section I. What ideas were developed?	4.0	Above Average - 4	I-80: Positive reference received. Very general response on quality. Reduced MOT from 3 phase to 2 phase which is a positive. On time and on budget and received incentives.	5.0	Excellent - 5	EBP 2012-2A: high quality design experience, very positive references. Project was on-time. All design submittals were in accordance with the submittal schedule.	3.0	Average - 3	I-85 Widening: positive references, general response outlining QA/QC procedures, meets expectations.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Monroe Bypass: Positive Reference, well documented response on quality, good partnering with NCDOT.	3.0	Average - 3	I-85 Phase III: general response that is lacking details on quality in the write-up, positive reference.
Project 5	2	3.0	Average - 3	I-85 77-98: Positive references. Successful environmental coordination efforts. Quality initiatives were very general. Claims against JMT from Lead Contractor is unresolved.	2.0	Below Average - 2	R-2247 CD Winston-Salem Interchange: very general response and lacking in detail. Predominantly discussion of preaward activities under quality initiatives.	2.0	Below Average - 2	I-185: Self assessment is very weak - not much discussion. What did Atkins did to save costs and keep project under budget? Quality initiatives are very general and standard.	3.0	Average - 3	I:85 CSX Railroad: Design was schedule critical. Response meet expectations.	1.0	Poor - 1	I-40/440: RS&H was lead designer when Rogers worked for RS&H so this is not reflective of work performed by P&P team. This project is more appropriate on Key Individual Resume for Chad rather than a project for P&P. If P&P was involved as a firm, this is not clear on the form. PDG had involvement with MOT. Quality of work for PDG is hard to determine from the response. Response meets few expectations.	4.0	Above Average - 4	I-40 Widening: clear innovations in the design and construction, well documented responses for quality.	3.0	Average - 3	i-26 85-101: general response that is lacking specific details on quality in the write-up, positive reference.
Project 6	2	5.0	Excellent - 5	I-95: Very positive references. Highest VDOT performance score ever given. Bridge designed to reduce long term maintenance.	3.0	Average - 3	Monroe Bypass - project received early completion bonus despite issues with ROW. Design was on time or ahead for each bridge. KCI's quality control process was well documented. No major design issues that impacted construction. Very general response.	3.0	Average - 3	i-26 Palmetto Commerce Parkway-project design appears to be on schedule but is not complete. Quality initiatives are very general and standard.	3.0	Average - 3	I-285 / SR400: Clearly this was a very complex design-review assignment for Holt. Difficult to assess quality based on the write-up and scope of work. No references received.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Volvo - positive references, project was completed on time, QMP process discussed. Overall quality design and implementation of design.	3.0	Average - 3	I-95 Widening: Project is still in the design phase there it is difficult to judge how well the designer has integrated with the contractor. Well documented responses for quality.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Nexton: general details on quality in the write-up, ahead of schedule and under budget. MBI was involved with several VE initiatives that saved significant money on the project.
All other projects	4	3.0	Average - 3	Claims against JMT from Lead Contractor on Port Access is unresolved.	2.0	Below Average - 2	Two SCDOT design-build projects in liquidated damages. Blythe was involved in Package E as well and contributed to the delays. United lacked oversight on these projects.	2.0	Below Average - 2	Granite: Several projects with claims against lead designer. Several OSHA violations and a project with significant LD's.	3.0	Average - 3	two projects with LD's out of 60 total.	5.0	Excellent - 5	None - impressive that Crowder has no projects with more than 30 days LDs	2.0	Below Average - 2	Sloan has multiple projects in LD's; however Sloan does have a significant amount of work. In dispute-resolution with an owner on one project.	3.0	Average - 3	Several projects with LDs for lane which is not significant based on size of the company.
In addition to the required information above and in order to evaluate past performance, SCDOT will utilize information available on each Proposer, or any member of the Proposer's team, through the following: o Contractor Performance Evaluation System o Consultant Performance Evaluation Scores o Lead Contractor and major subcontractor's Design-Build Team Performance Evaluation Scores o Lead Designer and major sub-consultant's Design-Build Team Performance Evaluation Scores o Experience Modification Rate (EMR) Scores o References	14	3.0	Average - 3	82.25 CPS score, Average DB performance evaluations for JMT other than initial evaluations on Port Access Road, above average consultant evaluations, average references for JMT. No DB Performance scores for B&G.	5.0	Excellent - 5	CPS: 81.43 (United) 76.11 (Blythe), DB Performance Scores above average. KCI CPS scores above average. Positive references and history of performing quality work for both UIG and KCI.	3.0	Average - 3	CPE: 77.9, No references for Granite, Several positive references for Atkins, Good reference for D&F, CPE average to above average. No design-build performance evaluations.	3.0	Average - 3	CPE: 79.84 (LRC), CTEA has above average DB performance evaluation scores and CPE scores. Average references for Lynches River.	4.0	Above Average - 4	CPS - 79, CPE above average, significant positive references for both P&P and CC. Design-Build Performance Evaluations - average	3.0	Average - 3	CPS:79.36 RKK: No CPE Scores. RKK has above average references. Sloan has multiple average and below average references.	3.0	Average - 3	CPS: 78.91, CPE Average to above average scores, Average to above average references for Lane and MBI, DB Performance Evaluations: mostly average to above average with exception to Port Access Road which is below average.
Subtotal:	**30**	**17.3**			**19.0**			**14.3**			**15.3**			**18.3**			**15.7**			**15.3**		

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
P038652 - Interstate 77 Panther Interchange
September 15 - 17, 2020

		Brasfield & Gorrie / JMT	United-Blythe / KCI	Granite / Atkins	Lynches River / Carolina TEA	Crowder / Parish & Partners	Sloan / RK&K	Lane / Baker
Total Score		Brasfield & Gorrie / JMT	United-Blythe / KCI	Granite / Atkins	Lynches River / Carolina TEA	Crowder / Parish & Partners	Sloan / RK&K	Lane / Baker
		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total:	100.0	60.4	71.1	47.2	40.6	68.0	53.4	60.8

I certify that the scores shown on this sheet(s) accurately reflect the actions of the Committee from 9/15/20 to 9/17/20 and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFQ.

Jae Mattox, Chair James H. Mattox, III — Digitally signed by James H. Mattox, III Date: 2020.09.21 13:37:06 -04'00'

Maria Ott (Voting) Maria Ott — Digitally signed by Maria Ott Date: 2020.09.21 14:05:50 -04'00'

Clay Richter (Voting) Clay Richter 2020.09.21 14:14:23 -04'00'

Melanie Mobley (Voting) Melanie Mobley — Digitally signed by Melanie Mobley Date: 2020.09.21 14:00:17 -04'00'

Doug Giovanetti (Voting) Douglas Giovanetti — Digitally signed by Douglas Giovanetti Date: 2020.09.21 14:18:19 -04'00'

Carmen Wright, Procurement Officer Carmen L. Wright — Digitally signed by Carmen L. Wright Date: 2020.09.21 14:24:38 -04'00'

Barbara Wessinger, Legal Barbara Wessinger — Digitally signed by Barbara Wessinger Date: 2020.09.21 17:05:34 -04'00'

Tad Kitowicz, FHWA NA