South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 – P039720
Thursday, November 17, 2022

Responsiveness	Kiewit (KISC-KEGI) Yes/No	Kiewit (KISC-KEGI) Comments	AUBJV-ICE Yes/No	AUBJV-ICE Comments
Is Proposer considered responsive?	Yes		Yes	

3.2 Introduction	Kiewit (KISC-KEGI) Yes/No	Kiewit (KISC-KEGI) Comments	AUBJV-ICE Yes/No	AUBJV-ICE 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	
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	
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	
3.2.4 Provide Unique Entity ID for the Lead Contractor or documentation indicating that an application was submitted in Appendix I.	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	
3.2.6 Limit the Introduction to one page which counts towards the specified page limit in **Section 5.2.2.**	Yes		Yes	
Procurement Officer Initials	TB		TD	

3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution		Kiewit (KISC-KEGI) Points	Kiewit (KISC-KEGI) Scale ID	Kiewit (KISC-KEGI) Comments	AUBJV-ICE Points	AUBJV-ICE Scale ID	AUBJV-ICE Comments
3.3.1 Organizational Chart, Team Structure, and Team Integration	**Point Weight**	**7**	**Use the Likert Scale**		**7**	**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.**	3	1.5	Average - 3	Very clear on lines of communication indicating integrated team. No legend differentiating solid and dashed lines. Assistant PM leading design dilutes his responsibilities that seem to end at design phase. Construction Manager essentially functions as Assistant PM. Segments of responsibility are broken up via Segment Managers for construction.	2.0	Above Average - 4	The relationships between the Assistant PMs and the rest of the team are not clear--no dashed or solid lines between them and other team members. Risk management teams being highlighted shows commitment to managing risk. IQM reports directly to executive committee and SCDOT as required. They show segment managers for design and construction but do not indicate how many segments they will have. They show major discipline construction superintendents and the show quality, safety, and compliance managers. Wet and dry utility design goes through Lead Design Engineer to ensure all aspects of the design can be coordinated through one point. Safety Manager reports to executive committee directly, which gives additional safety accountability.
Provide a brief, written description of significant functional relationships and how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team.	1	0.8	Excellent - 5	Design-build understanding is very good with best practices enumerated. Kiewit can leverage its design, supervisory, and key craft resources under a single umbrella entity to successfully deliver the project. Construction-based design approach is excellent.	0.3	Below Average - 2	Team did not adequately describe how they will be working as an integrated design team. Description did include relationships of higher level team members.
Identify in tabular form if any of the firms and/or Key Individuals have worked together on the same team (not just on the same job) in the past. Describe the types of projects they worked on, the year(s) they worked together, the level of participation, and a reference contact name, email address, and phone number for that project.	3	2.0	Above Average - 4	Good representation of contractor and engineering firms working together, including KISC with KEGI and AECOM. Integration of KISC and KEGI can be beneficial to cross-functional delivery. RK&K has limited work experience shown with Kiewit with only one example shown. The firms have worked together, but there is limited documentation showing key individuals having worked together.	2.5	Excellent - 5	Two of the three firms within the contractor's JV are currently working on three large design-build projects that are interstate/interchange. Those firms also delivered two previous projects that are complete. ICE has worked previously with all three prime contractors. Numerous Key Individuals on the above teams have worked together previously on large design-build projects. Construction Manager is new but has worked with AWC and UIG previously.

South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 – P039720
Thursday, November 17, 2022

		Kiewit (KISC-KEGI)			AUBJV-ICE		
Subtotal:	7	4.3			4.8		
Procurement Officer Initials							
3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.3.2 Critical Risks	**Point Weight**	5	**Use the Likert Scale**		5	**Use the Likert Scale**	
SCDOT has identified the following risks as critical risks for this project: • Utility relocations • Schedule growth • Maintenance of traffic Discuss the strategies the Proposer's team will implement to mitigate or eliminate each risk including how the 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.	5	3.3	Above Average - 4	Proposer identified specific utility risks that are high impact and identified methods for mitigating those risks. Researched old water lines along river/CSX. They discuss placing priority on changes that affect third parties due to integrated nature in CPM schedule. Schedule growth discusses separating project into three segments that will help minimize schedule growth across segments. Early works packages will be beneficial. MOT risk identifies integrated approach to driver safety. Team lists SCDOT providing an approved list of alternative materials due to market shortages is not an SCDOT role. Leveraging current and past Kiewit craft labor can address labor shortage risk.	4.2	Excellent - 5	Discussed project-wide issues, such as material availability. Discussed their team of Brown and Caldwell in past projects to expedite design. Discussed finding a safe place to relocate utilities. Will try to avoid additional right of way on this project and consolidate interstate bores. Discussed AT&T and the risk they pose to schedule. Keith McLeod will use his experience in past projects with the City of Columbia. Skilled Labor - Discussed efforts to utilize workforce from projects currently under construction locally. MOT - Provided a good discussion on challenges maintaining traffic in an urban corridor within CCR3 by maintaining traffic on frontage roads. Using knowledge gained on recent local projects and deign experience to minimize road closures and detours.
Subtotal:	5	3.3			4.2		
Procurement Officer Initials							
3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.3.3 Project Resources, Strategies, and Execution	**Point Weight**	8	**Use the Likert Scale**		8	**Use the Likert Scale**	
Demonstrate the team's capacity and available resources including personnel but not construction equipment, for this project.	2	1.0	Average - 3	There are offices in SC that can be scaled up. Proposal shows estimated number of designers and craft needed during peak production, which is beneficial. Team can draw from nationwide resources to fulfill demand.	1.0	Average - 3	Narrative and charts demonstrate the team's capacity and available resources for design and construction.
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.	2	1.0	Average - 3	Good balance of self-performing and local personnel to perform tasks. Plan to self-perform design management.	1.0	Average - 3	Team discussed their capacity and resources, but did not differentiate between team members of the JV within that section. However, this division of tasks is mentioned in the section above. Team clearly identified self-performed tasks. However, tasks for each entity are not clearly identified.
Describe the approach to environmental coordination, utilities, public relations support, and permitting. Describe how your team will ensure environmental commitments are honored, utilities are dealt with in a timely manner, the public is kept informed about the project and how all permits will be secured in a timely manner.	2	1.0	Average - 3	Provided general responses of how each item will be addressed. Not very detailed or project-specific.	1.0	Average - 3	Description met the requirements of describing these items but was more general in nature.
Describe the approach to communication, issue resolution and project execution relative to SCDOT's proposal to acquire all right of way in advance of the project, OVTI process, in-contract third party utility relocation and USACE permit modifications.	2	1.3	Above Average - 4	Provided general responses of how each item will be addressed. Not very detailed or project-specific with the exception of aligning the USACE permit and ROW acquisition with CPM schedule which aids SCDOT coordination.	1.3	Above Average - 4	OVTI discussion was detailed and tailored to CCR QAP. Discussed lessons learned on utility relocations and permitting with prior projects. ROW approach is more general in nature.
Subtotal:	8	4.3			4.3		
Procurement Officer Initials							
3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.3.4 Quality Assurance Program	**Point Weight**	5	**Use the Likert Scale**		5	**Use the Likert Scale**	

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 -- P039720
Thursday, November 17, 2022

		Kiewit (KISC-KEGI)			AUBJV-ICE		
The Proposer is advised that pursuant to contract execution, the selected Proposer's team will be contractually obligated for performance of and compliance with certain aspects of the Quality Assurance Program (QAP) for the Carolina Crossroads Project. Proposer assigned QAP obligations are enumerated in the QAP. In the Proposer's Statement of Qualifications, the Proposer shall discuss the Proposer's team understanding of the QAP and describe individually how the team will meet the Quality Control (QC) and Quality Acceptance (QA) component requirements of the QAP. The QC discussion must cover the role and interactions of the QC manager with the Independent Quality Firm and SCDOT, document control strategies, and understanding of hold points at a minimum. The QA discussion must cover the role and interactions of the Independent Quality Manager with the Proposer's team and SCDOT, engineering judgement use, implementation, and coordination with SCDOT, AASHTO-accredited laboratory capabilities and outline anticipated staffing levels for SCDOT-certified testing and inspection needed to perform the required volume of work as outlined in the QAP at a minimum.	5	3.3	Above Average - 4	Team demonstrated good understanding of QAP and general responses addressing each item, also noting recent experience with Tappan Zee Bridge. Team states that quality starts at the lowest level, which is a good approach.	3.3	Above Average - 4	Team demonstrated that they have a working knowledge of the CCR Quality Assurance Program with an understanding of hold points, document management, and use of engineering judgment.
Subtotal:	5	3.3			3.3		
Procurement Officer Initials							

3.4 Experience of Key Individuals		Kiewit (KISC-KEGI)			AUBJV-ICE		
		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.4.4 Project Management Team	**Point Weight**	**15**	**Use the Likert Scale**		**15**	**Use the Likert Scale**	
Project Manager • 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, with exception to activities associated with the Quality Acceptance. The SOQ must identify the Project Manager and the employing firm and, confirm the Project Manager has full authority, or 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 shall have a minimum of 15 years of experience in the management of highway transportation projects; • The Project Manager must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar: • Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables; • Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project; • Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk. • The Project Manager shall be available to be on-site during all construction activities, 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, the Project Manager will be considered unavailable for other SCDOT Design-Build procurements. If the Proposer is successful, the Project Manager shall be dedicated solely to managing the Project; have no other assigned Project responsibilities and not be utilized on any other projects, except other phases of Carolina Crossroads.	10	5.0	Average - 3	PM listed has required years of experience in the management of highway transportation projects and has design-build experience in multiple states. Proposal demonstrates some day-to-day management responsibilities of similar projects to CCR3. Of the four projects listed, one demonstrated the same role and responsibilities as CCR3. PM has 34 years of experience with Kiewit, which demonstrates continued success in delivery.	5.0	Average - 3	PM listed meets the minimum years of experience required. He has experience for entire regions of company for approximately $300 million per year, which would be similar in magnitude, scope, and complexity to CCR3. Previous work with Kiewit demonstrates performing project management and executive project management duties for many large civil projects.
Assistant Project Manager(s) • The Assistant Project Manager(s) shall be the primary persons in charge of and responsible for delivery of the assigned Project segments in accordance with the Contract Documents. The Assistant Project Manager(s) shall have full authority to make final decisions on behalf of the Proposer and have responsibility for communicating these decisions directly to SCDOT for their assigned Project segments, with exception to activities associated with the Quality Acceptance. The Assistant Project Manager(s) shall be the primary contact for communications with SCDOT for their assigned segments and shall attend and lead all segment-related meetings. • The Assistant Project Manager(s) shall have a minimum of 10 years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects; • The Assistant Project Manager(s) must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar: • Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables; • Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project; • Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk. • For the duration of the contract, the Assistant Project Manager(s) shall be dedicated solely to managing the Project segment(s), have no other assigned Project responsibilities and not be utilized on any other projects, except other phases of Carolina Crossroads. • The Assistant Project Manager(s) shall be available to 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.	5	1.7	Below Average - 2	The APM listed met criteria with one roadway project that was similar in scope and complexity but was Bid-Build, and he had limited responsibilities. APM meets demonstrated years of experience with growth in responsibility and expertise. APM's listed experience is largely construction-related and administrative, but his role in this SOQ is more design/administrative-focused. Projects are largely smaller in scale than CCR3 with two projects not being transportation projects.	4.2	Excellent - 5	Assistant Project Managers exceed minimum years of experience have decades of experience in relevant projects in their resumes. Every project listed was design-build. APMs are assigned to their discipline areas of highest experience and expertise. Overall experience includes lead Project Management experience. APMs have not yet worked on a project together.

South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 -- P039720
Thursday, November 17, 2022

		Kiewit (KISC-KEGI)			AUBJV-ICE		
Subtotal:	15	6.7			9.2		
Procurement Officer Initials							
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.4.5 Design Engineering Team	Point Weight	8	Use the Likert Scale		8	Use the Likert Scale	
Lead Design Engineer • 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 15 years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects; • The Lead Design Engineer must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar: • Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables; • Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project; • Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk. • 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 (including other phases of Carolina Crossroads as applicable) and be available as needed by SCDOT. • The Lead Design Engineer shall be a full time employee of the lead design firm.	5	3.3	Above Average - 4	Project experience demonstrates similar responsibilities as required for this project and exceeds minimum years of experience. Past experience demonstrates design work and design management. Of the five listed projects, most were design-build with some being very complex projects.	4.2	Excellent - 5	Lead Design Engineer exceeds minimum experience requirements and has decades of significant experience as design lead and can perform design management required for this project. Projects listed for experience are all interstate/interchange design-build projects in urban and suburban areas similar to CCR3.
Traffic Engineer • The Traffic Engineer shall be a registered professional engineer and shall have a minimum of 10 years of progressive experience in traffic design to include operational and capacity analysis, traffic signals, signing and marking, and maintenance of traffic. • The Traffic Engineer shall have experience in preparing Interchange Modification Reports and conducting operational analyses through both Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodologies and simulation software. • The Traffic Engineer shall have experience using TransModeler to conduct traffic microsimulation of complex road networks that contain freeway/uninterrupted flow facilities, collector-distributor linkages, interchange ramp termini with signalized traffic control, innovative interchange designs, and signalized arterials. • The Traffic Engineer shall have experience developing, coordinating, and obtaining approval of System-to-System Interchange Modification reports from State and Federal agencies. • The Traffic Engineer shall also have experience in the traffic design of projects of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity.	3	2.5	Excellent - 5	Traffic Engineer exceeds years of experience and work includes all required aspects. TE has experience with several IMR/IJRs, including system interchanges of larger size than CCR3. Completed microsimulation modeling on projects more complex than CCR3.	2.0	Above Average - 4	TE exceeds minimum number of years of experience. Numerous projects demonstrated interstate/interchange design-build experience, including MOT and signals in urban/suburban corridors. TE's IMR for the GDOT project had no comments and was used by FHWA as their example for DOTs nationwide.
Subtotal:	8	5.8			6.2		
Procurement Officer Initials							
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.4.6 Construction Management Team	Point Weight	12	Use the Likert Scale		12	Use the Likert Scale	
Construction Manager • 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 15 years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects; • The Construction Manager must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of the construction phase of projects with similar: • Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables; • Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project; • Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk. • For the duration of construction, the Construction Manager shall be dedicated solely to construction of the Project, shall have no other assigned Project responsibilities, and shall not be utilized on any other projects. • The Construction Manager shall be on-site during Project construction and be available for weekly status meetings during the construction phase, and at the request of the SCDOT.	6	4.0	Above Average - 4	Construction Manager exceeds years of experience and work includes all required aspects. CM has experience with numerous projects, including projects of larger size than CCR3. All projects are design-build. He has 25 years of experience with Kiewit.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Exceeds minimum years of experience and has performed the same function on projects of similar complexity and magnitude, mostly design-build. CM has worked on only one project with these team member firms.

South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 -- P039720
Thursday, November 17, 2022

		Kiewit (KISC-KEGI)			AUBJV-ICE		
Independent Quality Manager (IQM) / Independent QC • The IQM shall be responsible for ensuring that all workmanship and materials are in compliance with the contract requirements, and for carrying out the IQF responsibilities of the Quality Acceptance (QA) portion of the Quality Assurance Program (QAP) for the Carolina Crossroads Project. The QAP is available at https://www.scdot.org/business/pdf/CCRphase2/attachb/Construction/1.%20Quality%20Assurance%20Program-FINAL.pdf. • The IQM shall coordinate with the SCDOT Construction Manager for Carolina Crossroads or their designee for all owner verification testing and inspection activities, and Independent Assurance Program compliance. • The IQM shall have a minimum of 15 years of progressive experience and expertise in the Quality Acceptance (QA) of highway transportation projects and must include at least one project of similar magnitude and complexity as the Project. • The IQM shall be a licensed professional engineer in the state of South Carolina and an employee of the Proposer's Independent Quality Firm. • The IQM shall report jointly to the Proposer's Project executive committee (construction joint venture or construction company if only one prime contractor) and SCDOT. IQM shall have the authority to stop construction work. • The IQM shall have no other assigned Project responsibilities. • For the duration of construction, the IQM shall be dedicated solely to Project QA, shall have no other assigned Project responsibilities, and shall not be utilized on any other projects. • The IQM shall be on-site during Project construction and be available for weekly status meetings during the construction phase, and at the request of the SCDOT.	4	1.3	Below Average - 2	Listed IQM has experience with construction engineering judgment and materials issues. The IQM's experience with a DOT demonstrates experience managing compliance with contract requirements and quality acceptance practices. The single projects listed demonstrate experience on urban interstate interchange projects. The proposal lacks demonstration of the IQM's day-to-day responsibilities of inspection and testing requirements.	2.7	Above Average - 4	IQM listed meets minimum requirements of the RFQ. He has working knowledge of CCR QAP. Projects listed were interstate/interchange design-build or other alternative delivery method.
Safety Manager • The Safety Manager is responsible for implementing the Safety Management Plan and all safety-related activities, including training and enforcement of safety operations. • The Safety Manager shall report directly to the Project Manager. • The Safety Manager shall be dedicated solely to the Project, shall have no other assigned Project responsibilities, and shall not be utilized on any other projects assigned to the Project full time whenever construction activities are being performed;. • The Safety Manager shall be on-site during Project construction and available by phone and be on-site to perform their responsibilities throughout the Project duration during the construction phase. • The Safety Manager must have the authority to stop Work. • The Safety Manager shall have 15 years of experience on highway infrastructure projects. • The Safety Manager shall have 5 years of experience coordinating safety programs on similar projects. • The Safety Manager shall have 10 years of experience working in roadway work zone and OSHA regulation.	2	1.7	Excellent - 5	Safety Manager listed has 35 years of experience with this firm mostly in safety and exceeds all minimum experience requirements. His resume demonstrated similar projects to that of CCR. He contributes to Kiewit's better-than-average EMR rating of 0.41. He was Safety Manager on most projects listed in his resume. Listed roadway projects and bridge projects. Listed airport projects as well. All heavy civil projects of similar work to CCR.	1.7	Excellent - 5	Safety Manager listed exceeds minimum years of experience during his entire career. All projects listed are design-build, and he was senior safety manager on all.
Subtotal:	12	7.0			8.3		
Procurement Officer Initials							

		Kiewit (KISC-KEGI)			AUBJV-ICE		
3.5 Past Performance of Team		**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**	
Provide 4 projects awarded within the last 15 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. For each of these projects, if any Key Individuals being proposed for this RFQ worked on the project, identify in Section G, the Key Individual name, role, and time on the project. The required Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer may be downloaded from the SCDOT Design-Build Website under the SCDOT Design-Build Standard Forms Section at https://www.scdot.org/business/design-build.aspx. This information shall be included in the Appendix B and will not be counted against the specified page limit in Section 5.2.2. • If work identified on the Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer was performed by an affiliated or subsidiary company of the contractor, list the full legal name of the affiliated or subsidiary company and describe their role on this Project. Additionally, provide a justification for utilizing an affiliated or subsidiary company to satisfy the relevant experience on this Project and the control the Lead Contractor will exercise over the affiliated or subsidiary company on this Project. • If the owner's project manager is no longer with the owner, provide alternative contact information at the agency that is familiar with the project.							
Project 1	**1.25**	1.0	Excellent - 5	Design-build with large ADTs. Significant coordination with third parties. Kiewit was lead contractor for project and lead designer for large added scope. CM in this SOQ was Superintendent. High DBE goal of 12%.	1.0	Excellent - 5	Project was freeway/interchange major project with similarities to CCR3, including utilities, bridges (simple and complex), noise walls, and segments in an urban environment. Traffic Engineer was mentioned on the team as a Key Individual.

South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 – P039720
Thursday, November 17, 2022

		Kiewit (KISC-KEGI)			AUBJV-ICE		
Project 2	1.25	1.0	Excellent - 5	Interchange work with bridge structures. Significant environmental coordination and noise walls. Project included IQF. Team members all worked on project but represented various entities. Two Key Individuals operated in the same roles as proposed for CCR3. DBE goal was 20%.	1.0	Excellent - 5	Project was complex, design-build urban project with similarities to CCR3 with the addition of signature bridge. The project also included system interchange reconstruction, which includes multi-phase approach, railroad coordination, and noise walls. CM listed in SOQ was PM on this project.
Project 3	1.25	0.8	Above Average - 4	CM listed in this proposal was the CM on this TDOT project. Project scope is smaller than CCR3. Built in two major phases. Significant railroad and utility coordination design-build project. Major interchanges included.	0.8	Above Average - 4	Project was complex, design-build suburban project with similarities to CCR3. The project also included interchange reconstruction, which includes noise walls. Also included ROW, environmental, and utility challenges. A significant portion of the project was new alignment/greenfield segment. Structures Manager listed is proposed as Structures APM for CCR3.
Project 4	1.25	1.0	Excellent - 5	Very high ADT at 300,000 large interchange project. Not design-build. Had to manage multiple phases. Large number of utility relocations. Managed labor shortages and significant railroad coordination. DM in this SOQ was DM on this Montreal project.	0.6	Average - 3	Project was a design-build, turbine system interchange. Similar work to Blythe's proposed work on CCR3. Blythe Development was a subcontractor to Lane, instead of prime. No key individuals listed.
Provide 4 projects for which a design services contract was executed within the last 15 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, Sections A through G. Projects for which the design services have been completed and accepted by the owner are preferred. The required Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer may be downloaded from the SCDOT Design-Build Website under the SCDOT Design-Build Standard Forms Section at https://www.scdot.org/business/design-build.aspx This information shall be included in the Appendix B and will not be counted against the specified page limit in Section 5.2.2. • If the owner's project manager is no longer with the owner, provide alternative contact information at the agency that is familiar with the project.							
Project 5	1.25	0.6	Average - 3	Similar project of interchange reconstruction, multi-phase design-build, but smaller in scope. No Key Individuals on project. Project is very early in delivery, so performance is not readily apparent. Kiewit team is integrated with both engineering and design. Significant coordination between engineering and design to meet aggressive schedule with Superbowl as target opening date. Won on Best Value even though highest bidder.	0.8	Above Average - 4	Project was phased construction of a design-build, major project of interstate widening and several service interchange reconstructions. Major redesign of MOT during contract. Project includes ROW acquisition, noise walls, wet/dry utility relocations. Revised interchange type through innovation, including IMR revision and NEPA re-evaluation. This project does not include any system interchanges in urban environment. Major owner-directed change to MOT plan coordination was absorbed by the team to improve public safety. Project Executive on this project is listed as PM for CCR3. Lead Designer on this project is listed as Lead Designer for CCR3. First PM on this project is listed as APM for CCR3. Second PM on this project is listed as CM for CCR3.
Project 6	1.25	0.6	Average - 3	Complex 35-mile multi-phase interstate widening design-build project. Adjacent to other projects; contractor coordination required. Fifty separate stakeholders. Significant environmental coordination. No Key Individuals on project. Smaller scope than CCR3. Limited MOT, since project is built on new alignment.	0.8	Above Average - 4	Project is part of a multi-phase, major project construction program. This project is design-build, interstate widening with a service interchange reconstruction. Includes bridge over river and floodplain. Project includes some ROW acquisition, wet/dry utility relocations, railroad coordination. Revised interchange type through innovation, including IMR revision and NEPA re-evaluations. Project Executive on this project is listed as PM for CCR3. Lead Designer on this project is listed as Lead Designer for CCR3. PM on this project is listed as APM for CCR3.
Project 7	1.25	0.8	Above Average - 4	Larger scope design-build project. CM on TxDOT project is CM in this SOQ. Construction just began. Implemented PSQMP similar to CCR3. System interchange project in high-accident area. Complex MOT.	0.8	Above Average - 4	Project is part of a multi-phase, major project construction program. This project is design-build, interstate widening with a service interchange reconstruction. Includes bridges over interstate and ramp. Project includes some ROW acquisition, wet/dry utility relocations, noise wall. Revised interchange type through innovation, including IMR revision and NEPA re-evaluations. Project Executive on this project is listed as PM for CCR3. Lead Designer on this project is listed as Lead Designer for CCR3. PM on this project is listed as APM for CCR3.

South Carolina Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 -- P039720
Thursday, November 17, 2022

		Kiewit (KISC-KEGI)			AUBJV-ICE		
Project 8	1.25	0.6	Average - 3	Interstate widening and interchange improvement design-build project. More rural environment instead of urban/suburban. Coordination with adjacent projects along I-40. No Key Individuals listed.	0.4	Below Average - 2	Project is rural interstate widening. Lead design firm was owner's rep for design-build prep services. Lead designer managed subconsultants for IMRs. Self-performed NEPA environmental services. As prep team, their scope was not design-build final design with contractor input. No Key Individuals listed.
Subtotal:	10	6.7			6.5		
Procurement Officer Initials							
3.5 Past Performance of Team		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**	
• For each of the projects identified per Section 3.5.1, provide the information requested in Sections H through J of the Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer that is included in the Appendix B. • The Proposer shall provide Work History and Quality Forms – Contractor/Designer for each transportation projects, other than those previously provided in 3.5.1, 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 involving the Lead Contractor or Lead Designer 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 pursued compensation from the Lead Designer due to errors and omissions? o Has the Lead Designer filed legal proceedings against the Lead Contractor, or vice versa, on a design-build contract?							
Project 1	2.25	1.5	Above Average - 4	Saved owner $8 million and reduced schedule by 6 months. Exceeded 12% DBE goal with 12.7% achievement. No safety incidents in three years. Discussion did not elaborate extensively on most of timeline of long-duration fourteen-year delivery schedule.	1.1	Average - 3	No claims. AWC's delivery was on time and on budget. AWC self-performed all items on the critical path.
Project 2	2.25	1.5	Above Average - 4	Implemented high-performing sediment and erosion control program. Avoided delays by working in areas where permits are not required while permits are secured saving 7 months. Worked through and included 27 ATCs. Eliminated form liner on barrier.	1.9	Excellent - 5	Walsh self-performed 62%. ATCs eliminated settlement period and increased self-performed work by eliminating subcontracted work. ATCs also mitigated impacts to conflicting utilities and a physical conflict with railroad. Work performed over major navigable waterway with significant volume of barge traffic underneath. On time and on budget with no claims. Team took on additional scope and still completed within original schedule.
Project 3	2.25	1.9	Excellent - 5	Project was quickly designed saving 4 months, built 2 months ahead of schedule. Beat accelerated bid. Good team integration between KEGI and Kiewit saved time and improved delivery under budget by $3 million.	1.5	Above Average - 4	Significant political and environmental challenges caused long delay. Team worked with owner to still deliver project within budget. Implemented safety plan with no lost time for JV. Reduced impacts with design. Team received early completion bonus.
Project 4	2.25	1.1	Average - 3	Kiewit worked with third parties to manage craft labor and union issues. Self-performed 50% of the work. Project is P3. Discussion was silent on cost and schedule target achievements.	1.1	Average - 3	Despite RFC changes team still was able to perform work at an acceptable pace. Urban project and used innovative haul locations to enhance schedule.
Project 5	2.25	1.1	Average - 3	Project is very early in delivery. Because of high quality score, team was selected as winning team with highest cost proposal.	1.5	Above Average - 4	Lead designer delivered pavement innovations. Construction is on schedule currently with an IMR and NEPA Re-evaluation, including additional public involvement. Designer met every deliverable on time.
Project 6	2.25	1.1	Average - 3	Eliminated a bridge in design to save time and cost, although savings are not quantified. Developed comprehensive environmental compliance approach to the project.	1.5	Above Average - 4	Team worked with DOT to develop Over-the-Shoulder meetings to answer outstanding issues quickly. Developed ATCs for a partial DDI type interchange. Proposed additional cost savings initiatives approved by owner. Project included IMR and NEPA Re-evaluation.
Project 7	2.25	1.1	Average - 3	Project is very early in delivery. Striving to develop plan to stay on time and on budget.	1.5	Above Average - 4	Team worked with DOT to develop Over-the-Shoulder meetings to answer outstanding issues quickly. Developed ATCs for an offset DDI type interchange. Proposed additional cost savings initiatives approved by owner. Eliminated "tunnel" design in as proposed in Modified Selected Alternative. Project included IMR and NEPA Re-evaluation.
Project 8	2.25	1.5	Above Average - 4	Overhead conveyor system to drop aggregate into median eliminates significant traffic control and 7,600 truck loads entering and exiting median. Smart Work Zone helped manage traffic flow. Eliminated walls through environmental coordination.	1.5	Above Average - 4	Lead designer delivered a NEPA Environmental Assessment within accelerated 12-month schedule. Engineering contract was delivered under budget.

SCDOT
South Carolina
Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 -- P039720
Thursday, November 17, 2022

		Kiewit (KISC-KEGI)			AUBJV-ICE		
Other Projects (Appendix C)	2	1.7	Excellent - 5	Team was rated based on confidential information.	1.0	Average - 3	Team was rated based on confidential information.
Previous Contractor Performance Evaluation System and Consultant Performance Evaluation Scores. Other available information related to past performance.	10	8.3	Excellent - 5	Team has above-average contractor and professional services performance scores. RK&K has above-average design-build performance scores. Kiewit's team and Key Individual references are above-average to perfect. Kiewit Infrastructure South Company score = 74.25	8.3	Excellent - 5	Team has above-average contractor and professional services performance scores. ICE has above-average design-build performance scores. AUBJV team and Key Individual references are above-average to perfect. AUBJV team members have average to above-average design-build scores. Design CPE scores = 7.55 Archer Western Construction, LLC = 78.60 United Infrastructure Group, Inc. = 81.93 Blythe Development Company = 79.37
Subtotal:	30	20.9			21.0		
Procurement Officer Initials							

Total Score		Kiewit (KISC-KEGI)	AUBJV-ICE
Points		100.0	100.0
Total:	100.0	62.4	67.8
Procurement Officer Initials			

Post Office Box 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-0191

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

SCDOT
South Carolina
Department of Transportation

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet
Carolina Crossroads Phase 3 -- P039720
Friday, October 21, 2022

Kiewit (KISC-KEGI)	AUBJV-ICE

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

Brian Klauk	Chairperson	
Tony Magwood	Voting Member	
David Rister	Voting Member	
Ron Hinson	Voting Member	
Chris Lacy	Voting Member	
Brad Reynolds	Voting Member*	
Nicholas Pizzuti	Procurement Officer	
Brian Gambrell	Legal	
Jim Martin	FHWA	

Post Office Box 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-0191

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