SCDOT South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet

Bridge Package 15
11/7/2022 - 11/9/2022

Responsiveness	Crowder Yes/No	Crowder Comments	Dane Yes/No	Dane Comments	Blythe Development Yes/No	Blythe Development Comments	United-Reeves Yes/No	United-Reeves Comments	ES Wagner Yes/No	ES Wagner Comments	Palmetto Yes/No	Palmetto Comments
Is Proposer considered responsive?	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		No	

3.2 Introduction	Crowder Yes/No	Crowder Comments	Dane Yes/No	Dane Comments	Blythe Development Yes/No	Blythe Development Comments	United-Reeves Yes/No	United-Reeves Comments	ES Wagner Yes/No	ES Wagner Comments	Palmetto Yes/No	Palmetto 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			
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			
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			
3.2.4 Provide Unique Entity ID for all firms.	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 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			
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			
Procurement Officer Initials	CW		CW		CW		CW		CW			

3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution		Crowder Points	Crowder Scale ID	Crowder Comments	Dane Points	Dane Scale ID	Dane Comments	Blythe Development Points	Blythe Development Scale ID	Blythe Development Comments	United-Reeves Points	United-Reeves Scale ID	United-Reeves Comments	ES Wagner Points	ES Wagner Scale ID	ES Wagner Comments	Palmetto Points	Palmetto Scale ID	Palmetto Comments
3.3.1 Organizational Chart, Team Structure, and Team Integration	**Point Weight**	**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	Organizational chart is clear showing direct lines of reporting and communication.	1.0	Average - 3	Organizational chart is clear showing direct lines of reporting and communication.	0.7	Below Average - 2	Organizational chart is unclear as to what solid lines versus dashed lines mean with no legend shown to fully understand team structure.	1.0	Average - 3	Organizational chart is clear showing direct lines of reporting and communication.	1.0	Average - 3	Organizational chart is clear showing direct lines of reporting and communication.	0.0		
Provide a brief, written description of significant functional relationships and how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team.	**3**	1.5	Average - 3	Section is generic and doesn't provide much detail as for team integration.	1.5	Average - 3	Team lists out roles of key individuals but provides very generic details.	1.5	Average - 3	Section is generic and gives no specifics to how the team will function as an integrated team.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Team provided a detailed table highlighting key individuals and overa team integration and significiant functional relationships.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Team provides a detailed table on cohesive team strategies. Information provides roles for each individual and how they will function integrally. Team provides how team will be integrated despite no past teaming arrangements.	0.0		
• Identify the following in tabular form: o 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. o if no previous direct working relationship, provide projects that the firms and/or Key individuals have worked on that demonstrates how their past experience supports a successful teaming arrangement. Describe the types of projects, the year(s) worked on them, the level of participation, and a reference contact name, email address, and phone number for that project.	**3**	2.0	Above Average - 4	Table listed shows extensive past working relationships on both bid-build and design-build projects of similar scope and magnitude.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Team has not worked together in the past but table provided a lot of detail on how they can work well in a new environment and be successful.	1.5	Average - 3	Team provided past working relationships on project pursuits and on Bridge Package E where Blythe was not the prime contractor.	2.5	Excellent - 5	Team shows extensive experience working together on projects of similar scope and magnitude. (CLRB 2020-1, CLRB 2021-1) together as Lead Designer and Contractor. Projects also show work together with with proposed JV. Significant key individual overlap.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Despite no previous teaming arrangements, detailed tables are provided highlighting projects where subs have worked together. Contractor's design-build experience also provided in the table showing how both entities will make a successful team.	0.0		
Subtotal:	**8**	**4.5**			**4.5**			**3.7**			**5.5**			**5.0**					
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW					

3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.3.2 Project Resources, Strategies, and Execution	**Point Weight**	**12**	**Use the Likert Scale**		**12**	**Use the Likert Scale**		**12**	**Use the Likert Scale**		**12**	**Use the Likert Scale**		**12**	**Use the Likert Scale**		**12**	**Use the Likert Scale**	
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 firms responsible.	**6**	5.0	Excellent - 5	Table listed shows adequate equipment and resources breakdown to sucessfully complete the project. Team clearly defined what the Lead Designer and Contractor will self-perform. Team also included a detailed table for each bridge highlighting what will be done to have a succesful execution of the replacement.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Table provided list of adequate equipment and personnel to complete the project on time. Section discussed schedule and expedited delivery. Team will self perform the majority of the work.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Team gives available resources and what will be committed. While adequate crews are committed, it's unclear as to how only one superintendent will successfully complete the job. Contractor plans to self perform the majority of the work.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Team lists detailed information for each project site on approach and challenges. Team also presented a table for lessons learned on the current 24 CLRB bridges under contract. Team gives breakdown on equipment and personnel needed for the job. JV will self perform the majority of the work.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Team provides table breaking down available resources both equipment and personnel. Site assessment and breakdown of staffing for each site provided. Table lists what Contractor and LD will self perform which is the majority of the work.	0.0		

South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet

Bridge Package 15
11/7/2022 - 11/9/2022

		Crowder			Dane			Blythe Development			United-Reeves			ES Wagner			Palmetto		
Indicate how the geographical location of the firms will enchance integration, communication, issue resolution, and project excecution.	6	4.0	Above Average - 4	Bridges are centrally located around the Lead Designer and Contractor's offices. Team plans to have mobile offices at each bridge location.	3.0	Average - 3	Write up is very generic and lacked details on enhancing integration and communication.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Team will have an additional project field office and integrate the team for the project enhancing communication	5.0	Excellent - 5	Team went into great detail on staffing and location to the proximity of the bridges and provided location of offices in relation to bridge sites.	3.0	Average - 3	Team provides geographical locations in relation to the sites which in close proximity will allow team to integrate throughout the project.	0.0		
Subtotal:	12	9.0			7.0			8.0			10.0			7.0					
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW					

3.4 Experience of Key Individuals		Crowder			Dane			Blythe Development			United-Reeves			ES Wagner			Palmetto		
		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	
> 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. >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. >For the duration of this procurement or if the proposer is successful, the Project Manager will be considered unavailable for other SCDOT Design-Build procurements if no Assistant Project Manager is provided.	10	8.3	Excellent - 5	PM has 14.5 years of relevant experience showing a progressive career in the transportation field. Resume lists role as Project Manager on bridge projects both design-bid-build and design-build. Bridges over water and bridge bundles are listed. References provided were exceptional.	6.7	Above Average - 4	PM has 8.5 years of experience. Progressive career with Dane. Resume shows experience on DB and DBB projects of bridge replacements and bridge bundles of projects with similar scope and magnitude. References are above average to excellent.	6.7	Above Average - 4	PM has 19 years of experience. Listed as Senior PM/PM on the projects on his resume. Projects mostly widening projects with some being design-build projects. Projects of much larger scale and magnitude. References received were average.	8.3	Excellent - 5	PM has 41 years of experience all with United. Resume shows role of CM on projects of larger scale and magnitude of the proposed bridge package. Projects listed are both design-build and design-bid-build. References received were slightly above average.	8.3	Excellent - 5	PM has 20 years of experience all with ESW. PM is VP and General Manager of company. Projects listed on resume are a mix of DB and DBB of projects of similar scope and magnitude. No references were received.	0.0		
>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. >For the duration of this procurement or if the	10	5.0	Average - 3	APM has 9 years of experience. Resume lists past experience on bridge replacements over water and railroads. Projects listed were 3 bid-build and 1 design-build project. References received were average.	6.7	Above Average - 4	APM has 8 years of experience all with Dane. Resume shows past project experience on design-bid-build bridge replacements and one design-build bridge replacement bundle project in roles of Superintendent and APM. References are slightly above average.	6.7	Above Average - 4	APM has 21 years of experience with only one year with BDC. Projects listed are single bridge replacements over water and RR and DB mega project Structures Manager. Reference received was excellent.	6.7	Above Average - 4	APM has 8 years of experience all with United. Resume lists past roles as Project Engineer on DBB and DB projects of larger scope and magnitude of the proposed bridge package.	8.3	Excellent - 5	APM has 11 years of experience all with ESW. All projects on his resume are past PM roles of projects of similar scope and magnitude demonstrating the ability to be able to perform the work. References received were excellent.	0.0		
Subtotal:	20	13.3			13.3			13.3			15.0			16.7					
Procurement Officer Initials		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
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	
> 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	Lead Designer has 24 years of experience. He has experience with SCDOT Design-Build, emergency bridge replacements on accelerated schedules, bridge replacements over water, and bridge replacement bundles. Resume lists roles of Lead Structural Engineer and one project listed as Lead Design Engineer. References received were above average.	10.0	Outstanding - 6	Lead Designer has over 37 years of experience. Has a long background with bridge design and design-build projects. Projects on resume are well over the expectations needed.	6.7	Above Average - 4	LD has 18 years of experience. Experience with DBB bridges, DB emergency bridge replacements, assistance on Carolina Crossroads but not in full Lead Designer capacity. References were above average.	6.7	Above Average - 4	LD has 30 years of experience, 4 of those 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	LD has 15 years of experience. Listed as Lead Roadway Design Engineer and Lead Design Engineer (PM and Road) on projects of similar scope. DBB and DB experience.	0.0		
Subtotal:	10	8.3			10.0			6.7			6.7			6.7					
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW					

South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet

Bridge Package 15

11/7/2022 - 11/9/2022

3.4 Experience of Key Individuals		Crowder			Dane			Blythe Development			United-Reeves			ES Wagner			Palmetto		
		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	
> 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	CM has 10 years of experience. Resume shows a progressive career with Crowder. Experience on design-build, design-bid-build, and bridge replacement bundles. References received were average to slightly above average.	5.0	Average - 3	CM has 6 years of experience all with Dane. Projects listed on resume are bridge replacements, bridge replacement bundles, both design-bid-build and design-build listed as CM role on all projects. References listed were above average.	6.7	Above Average - 4	CM has 34 years experience and 5 of those years with BDC showing a progressive career. Projects on resume list design-bid-build and design-build bridge replacement projects. His role has been in a Superintendent capacity and not as a CM. References were slightly above average.	5.0	Average - 3	CM has 6 years of experience with one being with United. Resume lists projects with roles of Foreman to Superintendent/Structures Superintendent. Project listed are of similar scope and magnitude and include both DB and DBB projects.	8.3	Excellent - 5	CM has 39 years of experience showing progression throughout his career. Projects listed are both design-build and design-bid-build projects including single bridge replacements and design-build bridge package bundles. Projects listed are of similar scope and magnitude. Roles listed were structures oriented and not overall construction of the entire project. References received were slightly above average to excellent.	0.0		
Subtotal:	10	6.7			5.0			6.7			5.0			8.3					
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW					

3.5 Past Performance of Team		Crowder			Dane			Blythe Development			United-Reeves			ES Wagner			Palmetto		
		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	
Provide no more than 5 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	2.5	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP 2020-2: SCDOT Design-Build Emergency Project. Bridge over waterways and included key personnel overlap.	2.5	Outstanding - 6	13B D-B: Design-Build. 11 bridge replacement bundle over waterways. Key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	US 321: Project was DBB seven stage single bridge replacement over water with key individual overlap.	2.1	Excellent - 5	CLRB 2020-1: Project is SCDOT DB, bundle of 16 bridges over waterways and include key personnel overlap. Project is not yet complete.	2.5	Outstanding - 6	NCDOT DB 6YR: Project was design-build bridge replacement bundle over waterways, and included key personnel overlap.	0.0		
Project 2	2.5	2.5	Outstanding - 6	Emergency Design-Build Package 6: SCDOT Design-Build (3) bridge replacement bundle over waterways. Included key personnel overlap.	2.5	Outstanding - 6	10 DB Package: Design-Build. 10 bridges and one culvert bridge replacement bundle. Key individual overlap.	1.3	Average - 3	Package E: SCDOT DB, accelerated schedule, over water. No key overlap Not the prime contractor.	2.1	Excellent - 5	2018-2B: SCDOT Emergency Design Build Bridge Bundle over waterways. No key individual overlap.	2.1	Excellent - 5	Mount Lebanon: Project was design-bid-build and had bridgework,consisting of 2 bridges, was over waterways, and included key personel overlap.	0.0		
Provide no more than 5 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.																			
Project 3	2.5	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP 2020-2: SCDOT Design-Build Emergency Project. Bridge over waterways and included key personnel overlap.	1.3	Average - 3	Pio Ono: DB project with two bridges over RR. Team member overlap but no key individuals.	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP 2018-2B: SCDOT Emergency DB Bridge bundle over waterways. Key Individual overlap but not in the same role.	2.5	Outstanding - 6	CLRB 2020-1: SCDOT DB Bundle over waterways. 16 bridges all RFC'd 14 of 16 bridges are complete and opened to traffic.	1.7	Above Average - 4	EBP 2020-1: Was a SCDOT design-build emergency project. Two low volume bridges with water crossings. Was a sub on this project for roadway design and bridge design QC only. Key Individual overlap.	0.0		
Project 4	2.5	2.5	Outstanding - 6	Emergency Bridge Package 2016-1A: SCDOT Design-Build bridge bundle over waterways on an accelerated schedule. Key Individual overlap.	2.1	Excellent - 5	2016 Batch 4/5: Design-Build. 11 bridges with water crossings. Team member overlap but no key individuals.	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP4: SCDOT DB Emergency Bridge Replacement bundle over waterways. No key individual overlap.	2.1	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.	2.1	Excellent - 5	2016 B2: Project was design-bid-build bridge replacement bundle over waterways. Lead Designer on this project. Key Individual overlap.	0.0		
Subtotal:	10	9.2			8.3			7.1			8.8			8.3					
Procurement Officer Initials		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
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	

South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet

Bridge Package 15
11/7/2022 - 11/9/2022

> 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?

		Crowder			Dane			Blythe Development			United-Reeves			ES Wagner			Palmetto		
Project 1	**2.5**	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP 2020-2: Project completed 3 weeks ahead of substantial completion on an accelerated schedule. Contractor worked upfront with utilities to avoid delays.	1.7	Above Average - 4	13 DB: Project was completed on time. VE study for two sites for cost savings. Utility conflicts recognized early.	0.8	Below Average - 2	US 321: This project was completed within budget and finished 28 days late with assessed LDs. Reference for the project was slightly above average.	1.7	Above Average - 4	CLRB 2020-1: Project still under construction. Design complete and 2 of the 16 bridges are currently under construction. Project is tracking ahead of schedule.	2.1	Excellent - 5	NCDOT DB 6YR: Project completed under budget with zero claims and on time. Wet utilities were relocated by a supplmental agreement after the contract award with no delays.	0.0		
Project 2	**2.5**	1.7	Above Average - 4	Design Build Package 6: Schedule was met on an aggressive schedule with zero change orders.	1.7	Above Average - 4	DIV 10: Project was ahead of schedule and on budget with an incentive that the full amount was received. Completed the work on an accelerated schedule.	0.4	Poor - 1	Package E: Project under budget but LDs were assessed for one bridge site being 70 days late as a sub to the project. References for this project were below average.	2.1	Excellent - 5	2018-2B: Early construction work was completed at risk prior to RFC. Four dedicated bridge crews and cranes working 7 days a week where needed. On time and under budget, no LDs and claims. Stone screenings were added value to shortening closure times.	2.5	Outstanding - 6	Mount Lebanon: Project finished 4 months ahead of schedule and completed project under budget under the original contract. References were outstanding.	0.0		
Project 3	**2.5**	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP 2020-2: Team submitted early work design submittals for pile driving. Team worked through many right of way issues and provided innovative solutions to avoid any project delays.	1.7	Above Average - 4	Pio Nono: This project was completed on time. Bridge superstructure replaced in 25 day closure. Project received numerous awards.	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP 2018-2B: Completed the work on an accelerated schedule. Submittal process was shortened eliminating preliminary plans. First project to handle bridge load ratings. Team advanced hydraulic design and finished RFC plans ahead of schedule. Reference on project was above average.	1.7	Above Average - 4	CLRB 2020-1: Project is still under construction. Quality initiatives listed highlighting exceptional performance on the project. Project is tracking 5 months ahead of schedule.	1.7	Above Average - 4	EBP 2020-1: Project was completed on time, on budget, with zero claims. References on project were slightly above average.	0.0		
Project 4	**2.5**	1.3	Average - 3	2016-1A: Project was on time and on budget on an aggressive schedule. Plan deliverables were on schedule.	1.3	Average - 3	2016 Batch 4/5: This project was completed under budget with zero claims and on schedule. Limited information on how designer contributed to project success other than delivering the plans on schedule	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP4: Completed work on an aggressive accelerated shedule designing four bridges in 89 days with no claims, disputes, or litigation and arbitration.	1.3	Average - 3	Nine Low Impact: The write up is unclear for project quality initiatives for if the project was on time and budget for the design work. Some early coordination was done to minimize impacts.	1.7	Above Average - 4	2016 B2: Project was completed on time, on budget, with no claims. Write up includes that references from GDOT were above average scores.	0.0		
All other projects	**5**	2.5	Average - 3	Two projects listed for Lead Designer error and omissions. Both claims are unresolved.	5.0	Outstanding - 6	No additional projects listed.	2.5	Average - 3	S-83 over Buffalo Creek was assessed liquidated damages. (Scoring on LDs for Package E and US 321 were scored above).	2.5	Average - 3	Out of 100+ projects only three bridge/package projects were listed with minor LDs. One E&O listed for the Lead Designer.	5.0	Outstanding - 6	No additional projects listed.	0.0		
Previous Contractor Performance Evaluation System and Consultant Performance Evaluation Scores. Other available information related to past performance.	**15**	12.5	Excellent - 5	Design Build Performance Scores for this Designer were slightly above average. DBPS for this contractor were above average in design phase and went to excellent during construction. CPES (JMT)- 3 year average is 6.81 out of 10 and this is slightly above average to above average. CPS (Crowder) - 78.43 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for the Contractor are excellent. References for the Lead Designer are excellent.	10.0	Above Average - 4	No DB CPES for Contractor or Lead Designer. CPES (NS)- 3 year average is 7.85 out of 10 and this is above average to very good. CPS (Dane) - 78.70 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for the contractor are average. References for the Lead Designer are above average.	7.5	Average - 3	Design Build Performance Scores for this Designer were slightly above average. DBPS for this contractor were average to slighly above average. CPES (ICE) - 3 year average is 7.92 out of 10 and this is above average to very good. CPS (BDC) - 79.37 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for the contractor are below average. References for the Lead Designer are above average to outstanding.	10.0	Above Average - 4	Design Build Performance Scores for this Designer were slightly above average to above average. DBPS for this contractor were (Above Average for United) and (Slightly Above Average for Reeves) CPES (RKK) - 3 year average is 7.95 out of 10 and this is above average to very good. CPS (Reeves) - 73.63 and CPS (United) - 81.93 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for the contractor are (above average - United) and (above average - Reeves) References for the Lead Designer are above average.	12.5	Excellent - 5	No Design Build Performance Scores for Contractor or Lead Designer. CPES (Holt) - 3 year average is 7.61 out of 10 and this is above average to very good. CPS (ESW) - 80.42 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. Contractor references were overall above average to excellent. Lead Designer references were above average.	0.0		
Subtotal:	**30**	**22.1**			**21.3**			**15.4**			**19.2**			**25.4**					
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW					

Total Score		Crowder	Dane	Blythe Development	United-Reeves	ES Wagner	Palmetto
Points		**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Total:	**100.0**	**73.1**	**69.4**	**60.8**	**70.1**	**77.4**	**INCOMPLETE SCORING**
Procurement Officer Initials		CW	CW	CW	CW	CW	

I certify that the scores shown on this sheet(s) accurately reflect the actions of the Committee on 11/7/2022 to 11/9/2022 and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFQ.

Michael Pitts Chairperson

Jason Byrd Voting Member — Jason A Byrd

Austin Purgason Voting Member — Austin Purgason

David Rister Voting Member — David Rister

Melanie Mobley Voting Member — Melanie Mobley

Carmen Wright Procurement Officer — Carmen Wright

Brian Gambrell Legal

Post Office Box 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-0191

Phone: (803) 737-2314
TTY: (803) 737-3870

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER