SCDOT
South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Bridge Package 20
08/15/2023 - 08/17/2023

Responsiveness	Dane Yes/No	Dane Comments	ES Wagner Yes/No	ES Wagner Comments	Palmetto Yes/No	Palmetto Comments	Reeves Yes/No	Reeves Comments	Superior Yes/No	Superior Comments
Is Proposer considered responsive?	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	

3.2 Introduction	Dane Yes/No	Dane Comments	ES Wagner Yes/No	ES Wagner Comments	Palmetto Yes/No	Palmetto Comments	Reeves Yes/No	Reeves Comments	Superior Yes/No	Superior 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 the Lead Contractor and Lead Designer or documentation indicating that an application was submitted in Appendix I. .	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
3.2.5 Provide a statement confirming the commitment of Key Individuals identified in the submittal to the extent necessary to meet SCDOT's quality and schedule expectations, and that they are available for the duration of the Project. Key Individuals are those persons holding specific positions required by this RFQ.	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
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		Dane Points	Dane Scale ID	Dane Comments	ES Wagner Points	ES Wagner Scale ID	ES Wagner Comments	Palmetto Points	Palmetto Scale ID	Palmetto Comments	Reeves Points	Reeves Scale ID	Reeves Comments	Superior Points	Superior Scale ID	Superior 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**	
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**	1.3	Above Average - 4	The organizational chart is clear defining direct reports and lines of communication. The vector notation is very helpful with following the reporting structure. Team shows lines of communication between the Lead Designer and the Construction Manager that will be beneficial during the contract.	1.3	Above Average - 4	Organizational chart is clear showing lines of direct reporting and communication. Lines of communication are shown between the Lead Designer and the Construction Manager to the Assistant Project Manager which is needed for day to day operations on the project.	0.7	Below Average - 2	Organizational chart shows an ambiguity with dual reporting to the ADE and QA/QC. The lower levels of the organizational chart underneath the Lead Designer and Construction Manager were clear. There is confusion with the direct reporting lines for both the Lead Designer and Construction Manager showing dual reporting roles going to both the Assistant Project Manager and the Project Manager.	1.3	Above Average - 4	Organizational chart is clear showing lines of communication and direct reports. Team lists Project Engineer to assist APM that lists no major responsibilities. While the LD and CM report to the project management team, they will also communicate throughout the project.	0.7	Below Average - 2	Organizational chart lacked key noting the lines of communication and direct reports. Lines are confusing on reporting from the project management team. The design team shows only communication between personnel while the construction team notes direct reports (line style).
Provide a brief, written description of significant functional relationships and how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team.	**3**	2.0	Above Average - 4	The team lists out a detailed table highlighting the repsonsibilities of the key individuals and how they will interact with each other. Construction will be involved in design meetings for input on constructability.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Team did a good job of describing the relationships within the organizational chart. Team included details in a table on their cohesive team strategies demonstrating how they will function as an integrated team.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Team provided a detailed discussion of how the organizational chart will function and how they will function as an integrated team. PM/Lead Designer will co-locate during plan development and coordinate daily.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Team provided a breakdown of the organizational chart with a summary of roles of each key individual and how they will function as an integrated team. A detailed table was also provided on "lessons learned" from previous DB bridge bundle projects broken down by disciplines.	1.5	Average - 3	Team provided table with key individuals and other staff and how they will be integrated and the responsibilities each role has.

SCDOT
South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Bridge Package 20
08/15/2023 - 08/17/2023

		Dane			ES Wagner			Palmetto			Reeves			Superior		
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	Team has not worked together in past projects but provides a table detailing out projects demonstrating how the firms and/or key individuals can support a sucessful teaming arrangement. The team has shown determination teaming up for the last three bridge packages despite being unsucessful.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Team provided detailed table on previous working experience. Past experience on pursuits of Package 14 and 16 but was awarded SCDOT DB Package 15. Table 3 also provided information notating team's past experience on projects and details about them on how they relate to this package.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Team shows past experience working together. Three projects were SCDOT DB and two were VE study re-designs. Table shows breakdown of which key personnel also worked with each other.	2.5	Excellent - 5	Team shows extensive past experience together (including key individuals) specifically with bridge packages (Monroe Bypass, CLRB 2020-1, CLRB 2021-1).	1.5	Average - 3	Team did a good job on showing previous teaming history together but could have put more emphasis on what key individuals worked together and on what projects.
Subtotal:	**8**	**5.3**			**5.3**			**4.7**			**5.8**			**3.7**		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		
		Points			**Points**			**Points**	**$0**	**Comments**	**Points**	**$0**	**Comments**	**Points**	**$0**	**Comments**
3.3.3 Project Resources, Strategies, and Execution	**Point Weight**	**12**			**12**			**12**	**0**		**12**	**0**		**12**	**0**	
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**	4.0	Above Average - 4	Table provided list of adequate equipment and personnel to successfully deliver the project. The strategy to deliver the project is clear and the team is 100% available to use whatever resources are needed to finish the job. The team identifies the tasks that will be self-performed and will handle the majority of the work.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Team provided detailed list of resources for both design and construction. Team also described the strategy and details for each specific bridge site. Table lists out what DB team will self perform but its unclear on the design breakdown between Holt and Davis & Floyd.	3.0	Average - 3	Information provided is what is expected. Team identifies two bridge crews at a minimum to sucessfully complete the project. Contractor and LD to self-perform the majority of the work.	5.0	Excellent - 5	Team put together a detailed table explaining the challenges and approach to the sites. Available resources were listed for both contractor and lead designer for what is available for the job and how they will utilize the crews at sites concurrently. Team details out items that will be self-performed which is the majority of the work.	3.0	Average - 3	Team lists out available resources and discuss the strategy of working on bridges moving crews to the next as tasks are complete. Team intends to self perform over 85% of the work.
Indicate how the geographical location of the firms will enhance integration, communication, issue resolution, and project excecution.	**6**	4.0	Above Average - 4	Team illustrates a map showing bridge sites in relation to the office locations. Mobile sites will be used at all locations which will be used for in person meetings and coordination efforts.	3.0	Average - 3	Team provided map depicting bridge locations with respect to the office locations. Not much detail was provided on how this will enhance integration, communication, issue resolution, and project excecution.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Map illustrates office locations to bridge proximities. Mention of co-locating during procurement and move to on-site when construction.	3.0	Average - 3	Map provided with office locations in relation to bridge sites. Table listed travel times for crew proximity but doesn't ellaborate on how this enhances the geographical location.	3.0	Average - 3	Team provided map with office locations in relation to bridge sites. Details of the mobile office are unclear with multiple sites being worked on at one time and it's unclear as to whether or not the LD will co-locate with the contractor.
Subtotal:	**12**	**8.0**			**7.0**			**7.0**			**8.0**			**6.0**		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		
		Dane			**ES Wagner**			**Palmetto**			**Reeves**			**Superior**		
		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**	
> 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	The PM has 23 years of experience showing a progressive career from Project Manager all the way to President of the company. Projects listed on resume are all design-build projects of similar scope and magnitude including bridge bundles. Reference received was slightly above average.	8.3	Excellent - 5	PM has over 20 years of experience all with ESW. Currently in the role of Vice President/General Manager. Projects listed on resume were a mix of DBB and DB of similar scope and magnitude. References received were above average to excellent.	8.3	Excellent - 5	PM has 39 years of experience and has been with the current firm for 15 years. Previous company experience shows a progressive path. He is the President of his company giving him full authority to make all decisions. Was listed as the PM the projects on his resume which consists of SCDOT design-build and bid-build low volume bridge replacements. Responsibilities on the projects listed were similar to this project. References were average to slightly above average.	10.0	Outstanding - 6	PM has over 25 years of experience and with Reeves for 20 years showing a progressive career with a strong bridge construction background. Resume shows projects both DBB and DB projects including the CLRB 2020-1 bundle of 16 bridges. References received were excellent.	6.7	Above Average - 4	PM has 17 years of experience, 2 with the firm. Resume lists projects of DBB and DB with projects of various scope and magnitude. References received were slightly above average.

South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Bridge Package 20
08/15/2023 - 08/17/2023

		Dane			ES Wagner			Palmetto			Reeves			Superior		
>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	10	6.7	Above Average - 4	APM has 8 years of experience. Roles listed previously are Superintendent and Assistant Project Manager. Projects listed on resume are both DBB and DB showing single and bundled bridge replacements. Previous experience with the other construction key individuals for this contract. References were average to slightly above average.	10.0	Outstanding - 6	APM has 32 years of experience with a progressive career at ESW. Has experience with DBB and DB projects. Those listed have similar scope and magnitude. References listed were outstanding.	3.3	Below Average - 2	APM has 34 years of experience, 3 with company. Previous roles of CM and superintendent and has both DB and DBB experience but lacks previous experience as a project manager. Projects listed are not all of the same scope and magnitude. Reference received was above average.	6.7	Above Average - 4	APM has 11 years of experience and with the current firm for 10 years with history as project manager and engineer showing progression in his career. Resume is composed of DBB and DB projects. References received were above average.	6.7	Above Average - 4	APM has 10 years of experience with 2 with current firm. Resume shows previous roles of project engineer and assistant project manager. Projects listed were not of the same scope and relevancy. Reference received was above average.
Subtotal:	20	15.0			18.3			11.7			16.7			13.3		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		
		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	
> 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	10.0	Outstanding - 6	Lead Designer has over 37 years of experience. Progressive career with an influence in structures. Projects listed are both DB and DBB with some projects listed are of much larger scope and magnitidue. References were excellent to outstanding.	6.7	Above Average - 4	LD has over 15 years of experience. Past roles have been as Lead Roadway Engineer and Lead Design Engineer (PM and Road) on projects of similar scope. Experience on both DBB and DB projects. References were average to slightly above average.	8.3	Excellent - 5	Lead Designer has 34 years of experience with only one with current company. There is slight concern with position jumps from previous companies. Extensive past experience in numerous roles in structure positions. Has experience of DB and DBB projects. References were average to slightly above average.	6.7	Above Average - 4	LD has 31 years of experience and and has a background in project management with SCDOT and current firm shows past experience as assistant/lead designer role on DB bridge bundles. While in the role of assistant, LD has stepped up and lead the projects handling all aspects of design. Resume lists projects of similar scope and magnitude. References received were above average.	10.0	Outstanding - 6	LD has over 35 years of experience. Progressive career with a heavy influence in structures. Projects listed are all in previous roles as Lead Designer and design-build projects. References received were above average to excellent.
Subtotal:	10	10.0			6.7			8.3			6.7			10.0		
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
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	
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 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; o 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. o For the duration of construction, the Construction Manager shall have a construction superintendent onsite during all construction activities for each bridge site	10	8.3	Excellent - 5	CM has 23 years of experience all with Dane. Resume shows a progressive career moving up with the company and has worked along side the construction staff on the organizational chart. Projects listed show both DBB and DB experience with projects of similar scope and magnitude. References were slightly above average.	8.3	Excellent - 5	CM has 39 years of experience showing progression with his career. Projects listed on resume are both DBB and DB projects of similar scope and magnitude but more heavily DBB projects listed. References received were above average to excellent.	8.3	Excellent - 5	32 years of experience and 12 of those with Palmetto. Resume shows progressive growth. Projects listed are both DBB and DB with roles of CM. References received were slightly above average to above average.	8.3	Excellent - 5	CM has 32 years of experience and 4 years with the current firm. Career shows progression in past roles of superintendent to construction manager on DB and DBB projects. References received were above average.	6.7	Above Average - 4	CM has 34 years of experience, 5 with Superior. Resume shows gaps in years and list current time to be with Blythe Development Co. Projects listed on resume are both DB and DBB projects in the role of superintendent and assistant to the superintendent. Projects listed were more bid build projects and lacks more experience with design-build. Reference received was above average.
Subtotal:	10	8.3			8.3			8.3			8.3			6.7		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		

SCDOT
South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Bridge Package 20
08/15/2023 - 08/17/2023

		Dane			ES Wagner			Palmetto			Reeves			Superior		
		Dane			ES Wagner			Palmetto			Reeves			Superior		
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
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**	
Provide no more than 2 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**	2.5	Outstanding - 6	13B DB Package: Design-Build bridge bundle containing 10 bridges and one culvert over waterways. Key individual overlap (PM & APM).	2.5	Outstanding - 6	NC DB 6 YR: Design-build bridge bundle containing 6 bridges over waterways. Key individual overlap (PM).	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP 2018-2A: SCDOT DB emergency project bridge bundle of only 3 sites over waterways. Key individual overlap (PM, APM, CM, LD).	2.5	Outstanding - 6	CLRB 2020-1: DB bridge bundle including 16 secondary bridges over waterways and include key personnel overlap. (PM, CM, LD)	0.8	Below Average - 2	CR200A over Lofton Creek: Single bridge over waterway. Delivery method unclear. No mention of key individuals.
Project 2	**2.5**	1.7	Above Average - 4	NC11 DB Package: Design-Build Package containing only 3 bridges over waterways. Key individual overlap (AP).	1.7	Above Average - 4	Mount Lebanon: Design-bid-build project consisting of only two bridges over waterways. Key individual overlap (PM, APM, CM).	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP 2020-1: SCDOT DB emergency project bridge bundle of only two sites over waterways. Key individual overlap (PM APM, CM, LD).	1.7	Above Average - 4	Monroe Bypass: DB project including 14 bridges on 9 sites over waterways. Team was sub to overall project. Key individual overlap (APM).	0.8	Below Average - 2	SR 200: 5 mile widening of six lane roadway with one single bridge replacement over water. Delivery method unclear. No mention of key individuals.
Provide no more than 2 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**	2.5	Outstanding - 6	2018 DB Batch 1: Design-Build bundle containing 6 bridges over waterways.	1.3	Average - 3	EBP 2020-1: SCDOT Design-build emergency project with two low volume bridge replacements over waterways. LD was a sub on the project for roadway and bridge design QC.	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP 2018-2A: SCDOT DB emergency project bridge bundle of only 3 sites over waterways.	2.1	Excellent - 5	CLRB 2021-1: DB bridge bundle with 8 bridges over waterways. Construction not complete.	1.3	Average - 3	401 on SR1236 over Little East Fork Pigeon River: Design-bid-build single bridge replacement over water.
Project 4	**2.5**	2.5	Outstanding - 6	FY2016 DB Batch 4/5: Design Build bundle containing 11 bridges over waterways.	1.3	Average - 3	2016 B2: Design-bid-build bundle of 4 bridges over waterways.	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP 2020-1: SCDOT DB emergency project bridge bundle of only two structures over waterways.	2.5	Outstanding - 6	CLRB 2020-1: DB bridge bundle including 16 secondary bridges over waterways.	1.3	Average - 3	590 on SR 1729 over Somey Creek: Design-bid-build single bridge replacement over water.
Subtotal:	**10**	**9.2**			**6.7**			**8.3**			**8.8**			**4.2**		
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 20
08/15/2023 - 08/17/2023

3.5 Past Performance of Team		Dane			ES Wagner			Palmetto			Reeves			Superior		
		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	
> For each of the projects identified per Section 3.5.1, provide the information requested in Sections H and I of the Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer that is included in the Appendix B. > The Proposer shall provide a Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer for all transportation projects, active or completed, within the last five years that has a "yes" response to any of the following questions. Sections A through G and Section J shall be completed. > Has the Lead Contractor or any member of the joint venture been declared delinquent or placed in default on any Project? > Has the Lead Contractor or any member of the joint venture submitted a claim on a project that was litigated? If litigated, explain the results. > Have any projects been delayed more than 30 days such that liquidated damages were assessed? > Has the Lead Contractor been cited by OSHA for violations deemed serious, willful, or repeated? > Have any projects under contract with the Lead Contractor or any member of the joint venture been subject to remediation actions, stop work orders, or project delays in excess of 30 days as a result of Section 404/Section 401 permit violations? > Has an owner, a Lead Contractor, or any member of a joint venture filed a claim against the Lead Designer's Errors and Omissions Insurance? > Has the Lead Designer filed legal proceedings against the Lead Contractor, or vice versa, on a design-build contract?																
Project 1	**2.5**	1.7	Above Average - 4	13B DB Package: Project was complete on time and safely. VE study was completed for two sites for cost savings. Utility conflicts recognized early on to ensure no delays. Good project reference received.	2.1	Excellent - 5	NCDOT DB 6 YR: Project was completed under budget with zero claims and on time. Wet utilities were relocated by a supplemental agreement after award with no delay. References on project were outstanding.	1.7	Above Average - 4	EBP 2018-2A: This project was completed on budget with zero claims and on schedule. Completed the work on an accelerated schedule. Reference received was above average.	2.5	Outstanding - 6	CLRB 2020-1: Project completed within budget and finished 141 days ahead of the contract completion date. Project references were above average to excellent.	1.7	Above Average - 4	CR200A over Lofton Creek: On time and under budget. Re-design of bridge abutments to create a better product not delaying the project. No references received.
Project 2	**2.5**	1.3	Average - 3	NC11 DB Package: The project is currently ongoing and set to be on time and within budget. Team worked 3 weeks straight to mitigate effects of supply chain issues. Reference received was slightly above average to above average.	2.1	Excellent - 5	Mount Lebanon: Project finished 4 months ahead of schedule and completed the project under budget under the original contract amount. It's unclear if the emergency work included additional time to the contractor's schedule. References on the project were outstanding.	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP 2020-1: This project was completed on budget with zero claims and on schedule. Completed the work on an accelerated schedule. Contractor used a unique and innovative way of installing composite piles to eliminate build up or cut off. References received were above average.	1.3	Average - 3	Monroe Bypass: Team worked with department to mitigate row acquisitions and utility conflicts leading to 5 months of time savings on critical path. The write up is unclear if the project completed on time and within budget. Project reference was above average.	1.7	Above Average - 4	SR 200: Project completed in the allowable time. Contractor was granted additional relief due to unforseen conditions. No references received.
Project 3	**2.5**	1.3	Average - 3	2018 DB Batch 1: Team worked together closely to make changes reducing costs and accelerating the construction schedule. Overall, the other information provided was generic. No references were provided.	1.7	Above Average - 4	EBP 2020-1: Project was completed on time, on budget, with zero claims. Team developed design to not impact wooden flume of adjacent property owner. References on project were slightly above average.	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP 2018-2A: This project was completed on budget with zero claims and on schedule. Project won 2020 ACEC SC Engineering Excellence Award. Completed the work on an accelerated schedule. Submitted deliverables on day of NTP. Team used innovative "top down" construction techniques for one of the sites. Reference received was above average.	1.7	Above Average - 4	CLRB 2021-1: Project plans were delivered to RFC on schedule. Team did a good job designing to SCDOT standards. Designed to minimize row acquisitions. Project is still under construction. Project reference was excellent.	1.3	Average - 3	401 on SR1236 over Little East Fork Pigeon River: Section was very generic and lacked details on quality initiatives other than what items are expected to be discussed.
Project 4	**2.5**	1.3	Average - 3	2016 Batch 4/5: Project was completed under budget with zero claims and on schedule. Overall, the information provided was generic and lacked detail on how NS contributed to the success of the project. No references received for the project.	1.3	Average - 3	2016 B2: Project was completed on time, on budget, and with zero claims. Write up included references that were above average scores. No other information was provided discussing quality initiatives. Project reference was very good.	2.1	Excellent - 5	EBP 2020-1: This project was completed on budget with zero claims and on schedule with a changed condition due to unforseen circumstances. Completed the work on an accelerated schedule. References received were above average.	2.1	Excellent - 5	CLRB 2020-1: Project completed within budget and finished 141 days ahead of the contract completion date. LD delivered plans on schedule working to minimize impacts. Project references were above average to excellent.	1.7	Above Average - 4	590 on SR 1729 over Somey Creek: Team utilized retaining walls to avoid jurisdictional streams with the allowance of a single span structure. No references received.
All other projects	**5**	5.0	Outstanding - 6	No additional projects listed.	5.0	Outstanding - 6	No additional projects listed.	5.0	Outstanding - 6	No additional projects listed.	4.2	Excellent - 5	One project listed due to an error and omissions claim.	5.0	Outstanding - 6	No additional projects listed.

SCDOT
South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Bridge Package 20
08/15/2023 - 08/17/2023

		Dane			ES Wagner			Palmetto			Reeves			Superior		
Previous Contractor Performance Evaluation System and Consultant Performance Evaluation Scores. Other available information related to past performance.	15	10.0	Above Average - 4	No SCDOT DB Peformance Evaluation scores for Contractor or Lead Designer. CPES (NS) - 3 year average is 7.90 out of 10 and this is above average to very good. CPS (Dane) - 78.26 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for the contractor are slightly above average to above average. References for the Lead Designer are slightly above average to above average.	10.0	Above Average - 4	Design-Build Performance Scores for Contractor were average and Lead Designer were average. CPS (Holt) - 3 year average is 7.76 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 and Lead Designer references were above average to excellent.	10.0	Above Average - 4	Design Build Performance Scores for this Designer were slightly above average. DBPS for this contractor were slightly above average. CPES - 3 year average is 7.39 out of 10 and this is above average to very good. CPS - 75.16 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for the Lead Designer were average. The Contractor's references were slightly above average.	12.5	Excellent - 5	Design Build Performance Scores for this Designer were slightly above average DBPS for this contractor were slightly above average. CPES (RKK) - 3 year average is 7.99 out of 10 and this is above average to very good. CPS (Reeves) - 71.36 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for the contractor are slightly above average and for the Lead Designer are above average to excellent. This team recently successfully delivered a 16 bridge design-build bundle 141 days ahead of schedule and on schedule with no change orders. The same team is on track to complete the 8 bridge bundle on schedule as well.	5.0	Below Average - 2	Design Build Performance Scores for this Contractor were below average. No DBPS listed for Lead Designer. CPES (WSP) - 3 year average is 8.35 out of 10 and this is very good to excellent. CPS (Superior) - 80.75 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for the contractor are below average. No references received for the Lead Designer. Overall, Superior is struggling with personnel turnover, ability to meet project schedules, and produce a quality product.
Subtotal:	30	20.4			22.1			22.9			24.2			16.3		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		

Total Score		Dane	ES Wagner	Palmetto	Reeves	Superior
Points		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total:	100.0	76.3	74.4	71.3	78.4	60.1
Procurement Officer Initials						

I certify that the scores (weighted scores are rounded) shown on this sheet(s) accurately reflect the actions of the Committee on August 15-17 and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFQ.

Michael Pitts Chairperson

Trapp Harris Voting Member

Will McGoldrick Voting Member — Will McGoldrick

Jesse Hames Voting Member — Date: 2023.08.18 11:40:14 -04'00'

Derrick Goodman Voting Member — Derrick Goodman

Carmen Wright Procurement Officer — Carmen Wright

Brian Gambrell Legal — Brian Gambrell