

SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet											
	I-77 New Exit 26 Interchange and Connecting Roads 2/1/2024 to 2/2/2024 (Resumed 2/5 and 2/6)											
	AWC-ICE			Kiewit			Lane-RKK			United-Blythe-KCI		
Responsiveness	Yes/No	Comments		Yes/No	Comments		Yes/No	Comments		Yes/No	Comments	
Is Proposer considered responsive?	Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes		
3.2 Introduction	AWC-ICE			Kiewit			Lane-RKK			United-Blythe-KCI		
	Yes/No	Comments		Yes/No	Comments		Yes/No	Comments		Yes/No	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		
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		
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		
3.2.4 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		
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		
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		
Procurement Officer Initials	CW			CW			CW			CW		
3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution	AWC-ICE			Kiewit			Lane-RKK			United-Blythe-KCI		
	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.3.1 Organizational Chart, Team Structure, and Team Integration	Point Weight	5	Use the Likert Scale	5	Use the Likert Scale		5	Use the Likert Scale		5	Use the Likert Scale	

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet													
I-77 New Exit 26 Interchange and Connecting Roads													
2/1/2024 to 2/2/2024 (Resumed 2/5 and 2/6)													
SCDOT Design-Build		AWC-ICE			Kiewit			Lane-RKK			United-Blythe-KCI		
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	Generally clear organization chart, demonstrates lines of communication and average reporting structure. Two superintendents listed for roadway and structures (4 total). PM does not show as direct report to District 1 RCE; unclear reporting structure and potential deficiency in coordination. Did not clearly identify who DB Coordinator reports to.	1.0	Average - 3	Organization chart is clear and showed what is believed to be communication lines but did not identify in a legend. APM only involved with design team. Three CMs/superintendents identified to tackle different project components and reporting to key individual CM.	1.0	Average - 3	Organization chart is clear and demonstrated reporting and communication lines; detailed legend is included. All key individuals properly referenced in addition to added value notations. Quality control is included within/under construction manager and engineering management, unclear role of QC Manager relative to this inclusion.	1.0	Average - 3	Organization chart is unclear reporting structure for Joint Venture (i.e. who is this), who does the PM report to. Executives, JV, and Quality Assurance are siloed away from traditional structure. Unclear who SCDOT resident engineer is referring to. Legend is included and includes reporting and communication labels.
Provide a brief, written description of significant functional relationships and how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team.	1	0.5	Average - 3	Mostly clear on roles and chain of command. Proposed "zipper strategy" is potentially beneficial, however, DB Coordinator is not clearly incorporated in process. Executive committee acknowledgement demonstrates understanding of SCDOT coordination expectation	0.3	Below Average - 2	Integrated construction and design in one parent organization. Generic understanding and notes regarding firm as a whole and company structure and experience. Discussion or acknowledgement regarding integration between key individuals and subconsultants was lacking.	0.5	Average - 3	Provided clear discussion of roles and chain of command. Discussed previous partnering. Description of quality control process provided but potentially contradictory from organization chart.	0.5	Average - 3	Explains structure and partnering with chain of command. Provided examples of previous teaming in similar roles. Executive committee role discussed.
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 project) 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. Any references documented in this section must also be tabulated in a form that shall be provided in Appendix H.	2	1.7	Excellent - 5	14 projects listed, 7 of which were SCDOT DB projects. Significant experience working as team (~15 years) and performed same or similar roles on most projects. Many key individuals worked together throughout. Lead Design Engineer has not been involved to the extent as other key individuals.	1.3	Above Average - 4	Demonstrates integrated organization due to unique company structure. All projects listed are alternative delivery construction or pursuits. SCDOT project was DB pursuit only. KEGI performed both lead designer and subconsultant design duties. Three projects reference key individuals proposed in similar roles.	1.3	Above Average - 4	Two projects included were DB and fulfilled similar responsibilities. Key individuals have worked together in similar roles previously but not referenced in included tabular projects.	1.7	Excellent - 5	19 projects listed, 16 of which were DB. Consistent firm partnering for contractor and designer on variety of projects over last 10+ years. Blythe has patterned on some more recent projects, of which two were DBB.
Subtotal:	5	3.2			2.7			2.8			3.2		
Procurement Officer Initials		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
3.3.2 Project Resources, Strategies, and Execution	Point Weight	15	Use the Likert Scale		15	Use the Likert Scale		15	Use the Likert Scale		15	Use the Likert Scale	
Discuss the Proposer's strategy to ensure schedule certainty and coordinate and deliver all portions of the Project by November 30, 2026.	3.75	2.5	Above Average - 4	Team described general coordination approach. Bi-weekly CPM schedule updates and Utilization of Integrated Outlook Team Calendars seems beneficial. Segmented NOIs could allow expedited construction activities. SCDHEC expedited review program could be beneficial but is not assured. Potential concerns over availability of team resources with current project workload and completion dates. Milestone schedule summary included for design and construction phasing and timing and completion by project substantial completion.	1.9	Average - 3	Block scheduling with integrated CPM schedule creates manageable project segments throughout organization and varying activities. Early works packages intended as a part of accelerated construction. Subcontractor schedules noted as critical; five items listed as actions to overcome issues. Overtime work noted as possibility if necessary. Discussion was generic and could be applied to multiple projects (i.e. not project specific).	3.1	Excellent - 5	Team acknowledged potential schedule impacts surround. Resource assignment proposed to facilitate early coordination and design efforts. Self-performance of majority of construction activities can eliminate schedule or project delays with appropriate resources. Project to be segmented with separate design teams to maintain efficient design and construction timing. Variety of supplemental and external resources noted and available. Stakeholder awareness and inclusion.	2.5	Above Average - 4	Team acknowledged list of risks and expected coordination with construction strategy. Outlined mitigations and expected roles. Critical construction/scope items were addressed. Self-performance of earthwork and concrete paving should assist accelerated schedule. Separate girder design packages to expedite fabrication. Advanced material acquisition/procurement. Asphalt paving subcontractor and approach does not inspire confidence in quality or schedule certainty.



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet											
		I-77 New Exit 26 Interchange and Connecting Roads											
		2/1/2024 to 2/2/2024 (Resumed 2/5 and 2/6)											
		AWC-ICE			Kiewit			Lane-RKK			United-Blythe-KCI		
Demonstrate the team's capacity and available resources including personnel for this project.	3.75	2.5	Above Average - 4	Team included table showing available and intended project committed staff. Indication of anticipated staff (construction and design) commitment for successful project delivery. Construction availability and resources demonstrated in chart. Clear assignments and approach with regards to existing and future workloads.	2.5	Above Average - 4	Team quantified number of individuals anticipated to be utilized to staff and complete design and construction. Reachback ability for thousands of employees within region. Integrated project control system noted.	1.9	Average - 3	Team quantified number of employees and capacity within region and nationally but did not note available or project committed staff. Geographical locations referenced. Able to self-perform concrete paving work.	2.5	Above Average - 4	Team included table referencing capacity and available resources and those they intend to commit to the project for construction staffing. Additional regional resources and overhead referenced to be drawn upon. Equipment not referenced.
Discuss the Proposer's strategy to ensure Utility Relocations and Coordination, Railroad coordination, and Right of Way Acquisition will not impact the critical path of the project schedule.	3.75	3.1	Excellent - 5	Detailed approach for utility coordination and seem prepared for relocation outcomes. Demonstrated resources available in house and with future subcontractors. Utility coordination organization chart outlines chain of command and expected proactive coordination. Railroad schedule to be included in overall project CPM schedule. Prioritization for realignment, early coordination, and design noted. Evaluation of alternatives for ROW acquisition to avoid unnecessary delays. Example projects are indication of previous success on all coordination strategies.	2.5	Above Average - 4	Demonstrated general understanding of coordination efforts required. Project specific details noted for utilities and railroad. Demonstrated understanding of NSRR process and SCDOT coordination process. ROW acquisition acknowledged to be non-problematic based on conceptual design.	2.5	Above Average - 4	Team provided detailed approach to all coordination efforts. Third-party coordination role provided as value in order to stay on schedule. Coordination efforts between SCDOT and parties are clarified in each section. Referenced familiarity and relationship with NSRR and certifications.	1.9	Average - 3	Team did not include specific labeled section to cover this component, however, this was addressed in the schedule certainty and critical scope charts. General approach and mitigations were referenced for utilities, railroad, and ROW. Approaches included early coordination, meeting facilitation, and standalone package submittals.
Public and Media Relations - Describe the teams approach to interaction with the public and how adverse community impacts will be avoided. Describe past experience.	3.75	1.9	Average - 3	Team elaborated on previous public engagement on two projects under construction. Similar process to be followed for this project. Detailed general strategy and indication of stakeholder coordination. Meeting for referenced stakeholders (i.e. Richland County, SCOUT, etc.) are already a part of the project; further emphasis on public and resident portion as those affected by the project rather than those participating in project development process.	1.9	Average - 3	Clear understanding of what's necessary in general sense. Lack of project specific details with regards to avoidance of impacts and with public interaction.	1.9	Average - 3	Acknowledged understanding of SCDOT and contractor role for media relations. Provided case study with regards to familiarity with SCDOT and public involvement expectations and processes.	2.5	Above Average - 4	Team described approach similar to previous DB experience with project specific examples and previous history of public and media interactions with applicable project specific notes. Intends to provide advanced notification to public in area (i.e. I-77 commuters and public) and relocate US 21 tie-ins during summer months to avoid traffic impacts.
Subtotal:		15	10.0		8.8			9.4			9.4		
Procurement Officer Initials			CW			CW			CW			CW	
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals		AWC-ICE			Kiewit			Lane-RKK			United-Blythe-KCI		
		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		



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet											
		I-77 New Exit 26 Interchange and Connecting Roads											
		2/1/2024 to 2/2/2024 (Resumed 2/5 and 2/6)											
		AWC-ICE			Kiewit			Lane-RKK			United-Blythe-KCI		
<p>• Project Manager (12 points)</p> <p>o The Project Manager shall be the primary person in charge of and responsible for delivery of the Project in accordance with the contract requirements. The Project Manager should have full authority to make final decisions on behalf of the Proposer and have responsibility for communicating these decisions directly to SCDOT. After award of the Project, the Project Manager shall be the primary contact for communications with SCDOT and is expected to attend and lead all regularly scheduled meetings. 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.</p> <p>o The Project Manager must have a minimum of 10 years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects;</p> <p>o The Project Manager shall demonstrate knowledge of project CPM scheduling, logical construction process ordering, resource management, and a history of projects successfully managed to a schedule through substantial completion;</p> <p>• The Project Manager must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar:</p>	12	6.0	Average - 3	<p>PM has 32 years of overall experience. All projects on resume are DB. Projects include interstate widening, rehabilitation, interchanges, and utility coordination. Does not demonstrate or refer to CPM scheduling experience. Did not demonstrate ability to successfully manage a schedule/project through substantial completion in PM role on two of projects submitted. References: Poor to Good based on past project commitments with regards to PM role and substitutions.</p>	10.0	Excellent - 5	<p>PM has 34 years of overall experience. Experience includes variety of civil project experience, two transportation projects referenced that includes interstate widening, rehab, and utility coordination. Demonstrates familiarity with CPM scheduling. One project listed was DB. Resume includes large year gap between included projects. References: Outstanding to perfect based on references received.</p>	10.0	Excellent - 5	<p>PM has 31 years of overall experience. Most projects listed are DB. Projects include interstate widening, interchanges, bridge construction, major utility coordination, significant railroad coordination. Commitment to included projects from beginning to end is evident. References: outstanding to perfect in one provided reference.</p>	12.0	Outstanding - 6	<p>PM has 34 years of overall experience. All projects provided are DB. Experience includes interstate widening, new interchange construction, bridge construction and demolition, complex MOT, and accelerated schedules. CPM scheduling experience is noted. Current job is nearly identical in scope, scale, and complexity. References: good to outstanding based on one recent project.</p>
<p>• Assistant Project Manager (8 points)</p> <p>o The Assistant Project Manager must have a minimum of five years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects;</p> <p>o The Assistant Project Manager shall demonstrate knowledge of project CPM scheduling, logical construction process ordering, and resource management;</p> <p>o The Assistant Project Manager must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar:</p> <p>□ Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables;</p> <p>□ Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project;</p> <p>□ Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk.</p> <p>o 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.</p> <p>o For the duration of this procurement, or if the proposer is successful, the Assistant Project Manager will be considered unavailable for other SCDOT Design-Build procurements.</p>	8	6.7	Excellent - 5	<p>APM has 10 years of overall experience. One of three projects listed as DB. Projects include interstate widening, reconstruction, bridges, and minor to major interchanges. Progressive experience demonstrated and served in elevated roles and APM on recent projects. CPM experience noted on one project. References: Outstanding to Perfect.</p>	5.3	Above Average - 4	<p>APM has 15 years of overall experience. Projects included interstate widening and repair and vertical construction. Two projects included were DB (one was pursuit). Included projects were of lower construction value with shorter term assignments. Did not start or remain assigned to full length of several projects referenced. Experience suits project goals and organization as proposed. Demonstrated CPM scheduling experience. Progressive experience demonstrated. References: none received.</p>	6.7	Excellent - 5	<p>APM has 16 years of overall experience. Performed similar role in past project with project listed PM. All Projects were DB, experience includes interstate widening, interchanges, bridge construction and replacement, major utility and railroad coordination, paving operations, and accelerated schedules. References: outstanding to perfect based on provided reference.</p>	6.7	Excellent - 5	<p>APM has 26 years of overall experience. Two projects included were DB. Experience includes interstate widening, interchange reconstruction, complex MOT, bridge construction and replacement, utility coordination, and accelerated construction. References - satisfactory for reference received.</p>
Subtotal:		20	12.7		15.3			16.7			18.7		
Procurement Officer Initials			CW		CW			CW			CW		



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet											
		I-77 New Exit 26 Interchange and Connecting Roads											
		2/1/2024 to 2/2/2024 (Resumed 2/5 and 2/6)											
		AWC-ICE			Kiewit			Lane-RKK			United-Blythe-KCI		
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals		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	
<div>• Lead Design Engineer (10 points) o The Lead Design Engineer shall be in charge of and responsible for all aspects of the design of the Project, subject to oversight of the Project Manager. o The Lead Design Engineer must have a minimum of 10 years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects; o The Lead Design Engineer must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar: <div><input type="checkbox"/> Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables; <input type="checkbox"/> Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project; <input type="checkbox"/> Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk. o For the duration of the design phase, the Lead Design Engineer will attend all routine project meetings in person, be primarily dedicated to design of the Project, and be available as needed by SCDOT. o The Lead Design Engineer shall be a full time</div></div>	10	8.3	Excellent - 5	LDE has 23 years of overall experience. Experience designing Interstate widenings, bridges, and interchanges. Significant structural experience. Three of projects listed were DB. Some projects included railroad and utility coordination and MOT. Variety of complex work in roles on projects listed. References: were outstanding to perfect.	6.7	Above Average - 4	LDE has 15 years of overall experience. Work includes interstate interchange improvements, bridge construction, railroad coordination and some vertical construction. Four DB projects and one DBB. Demonstrates progressive experience. References: Good to Outstanding based on references received.	10.0	Outstanding - 6	LDE has 24 years of overall experience. Significant experience with DB, designing interstate widening, traffic safety, interchanges, bridge construction, railroad and utility coordination, accelerated design schedules, similar scope projects included. Served in same or similar role in all referenced projects. References: high performing and great communicator	10.0	Outstanding - 6	LDE has 32 years of overall experience. All projects included were DB and local. Includes interstate widenings, new interchange design accelerated design and construction, complex MOT, complex bridge design, utility and railroad coordination and design. References - outstanding to perfect for two projects referenced.
Subtotal:		10	8.3		6.7			10.0			10.0		
Procurement Officer Initials			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
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	



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet																									
		I-77 New Exit 26 Interchange and Connecting Roads																									
		2/1/2024 to 2/2/2024 (Resumed 2/5 and 2/6)																									
		AWC-ICE			Kiewit			Lane-RKK			United-Blythe-KCI																
<div>• Construction Manager (10 points)</div> <div>o The Construction Manager shall be responsible for all aspects of the construction of the Project, subject to oversight of the Project Manager.</div> <div>o The Construction Manager must have a minimum of 10 years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects;</div> <div>o The Construction Manager must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar:</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables;</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project;</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk.</div> <div>o For the duration of construction, the Construction Manager shall be dedicated solely to managing the construction of the Project, shall have no other assigned Project responsibilities, and shall not be utilized on any other projects.</div> <div>o The Construction Manager shall be on-site during all construction activities for the Project, attend weekly status meetings during the construction phase, and be available at the</div>	10	8.3	Excellent - 5	CM has 34 years of overall experience. Experience managing variety of complex interstate DB and DBB projects. Three of projects listed were DB. Interstate widening, rehabilitation, bridge, and interchanges. Performed CM duties on past three interstate projects listed. References: none provided.	3.3	Below Average - 2	CM has 15 years of overall experience. Resume demonstrated progressive construction experience, however, listed projects showed more work outside of highway transportation experience. Experience includes some interstate widening and vertical construction. Two Projects listed were DB. Demonstrated CPM scheduling experience. References: none received.	5.0	Average - 3	CM has 23 years of overall experience. Some DB experience provided. Construction management experience not evident. Listed as project engineer or equivalent on all projects included. References were above average to outstanding.	10.0	Outstanding - 6	CM has 19 years of overall experience. All projects included were DB. Includes interstate widening, interchange construction, bridge construction and replacement, complex MOT, utility coordination, accelerated design and construction. Progressive experience noted. Reference - outstanding to perfect														
														Subtotal:	10	8.3	3.3	5.0	10.0								
														Procurement Officer Initials		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
														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		
														• Provide three 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 – 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.													
														Project 1	1.66667	0.8	Average - 3	Project was DB, included bridge widening and rehab, interstate widening, and similar MOT. Minimal Railroad and Utility coordination. No major stakeholder coordination. Somewhat similar to scope and complexity without interchange construction. SCDOT records indicate that the key individual referenced as PM for I-77 widening project never officially filled role of PM.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DB and is complete, included bridge construction, interstate reconstruction, interchanges, utility and railroad coordination, and wetland impacts. Self-performed majority of work on project. Larger in scope, complexity, and scale. Affiliate of KISC. No key individuals referenced.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB and is complete, included interstate widening, interchange improvements, bridge construction and demolition, railroad coordination and construction, utility relocation, larger scale but similar scope for project. Key individual referenced for project.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project is DB and is under construction. Included interstate, bridge construction, new interchange, paving, MOT, key/major stakeholder coordination. Very similar scope, scale, and complexity. No railroad coordination. Two Key individuals referenced.



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet											
		I-77 New Exit 26 Interchange and Connecting Roads 2/1/2024 to 2/2/2024 (Resumed 2/5 and 2/6)											
		AWC-ICE			Kiewit			Lane-RKK			United-Blythe-KCI		
Project 2	1.66667	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DBB, included interstate system to sytem interchange, substantial amount of bridge construction and rehab, widening, and utility, railroad, row coordination. Major stakeholder coordination referenced. Similar overall project but on larger scale with additional complexities due to size.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB and is complete, included interstate widening, asphalt/concrete paving and replacement, stakeholder coordination, railroad coordination and agreements, bridge widening and construction, large scale erosion control activities. Project along high ADT corridor. Similar scale and coordination efforts. KISC was lead contractor. No key individuals referenced.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB and is complete, included interstate widening, interchange improvements, bridge construction and demolition and rehab, railroad coordination and construction, utility relocation, TMP, larger scale but similar scope for project. No key individuals.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project is DB and is under construction. Included interstate, widening, bridge construction, interchange improvements and reconstruction, concrete and asphalt paving, critical and complex MOT, major utility coordination, fixed price. Larger in scope, scale, and complexity. No railroad coordination. Two Key individuals referenced.
Project 3	1.66667	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DB, included interstate widening, bridge construction, and CD road construction. Urban area with many utility, railroad, and ROW coordination efforts. Of similar size and complexity. Major stakeholder coordination referenced. Key individuals referenced appear to not be involved beyond design phase according to time on project.	0.8	Average - 3	Project is CM/GC and currently under construction, included interstate bridge construction, phased large-scale MOT with restricted windows, and large scale erosion control activities. Project along high ADT corridor. Accelerated schedule project. No key individuals referenced.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB and is complete, included new interchange, railroad and utility coordination, staged construction, bridge construction, large scale environmental permitting. No key individuals.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DB and is complete. Included interstate, accelerated schedule, bridge construction, interchange reconstruction, paving, large stakeholder coordination, public/media relations. No railroad coordination. One key individual referenced.
• Provide three 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 4	1.66667	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DB, included interstate widening, multiple unique interchanges, major utility and row coordination efforts and intricate MOT. Larger in size and complexity. No key individuals from LDE present on project. Design/discipline leads served in similar roles.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project is DB and is under construction, KEGI performed 30% of overall design and served as lead designer. Included interstate widening, interchange replacement, construction/event coordination including large scale MOT operations, and bridge construction. High profile project and stakeholder coordination within high ADT corridor. Larger scope, scale, and complexity. No key individuals referenced.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB, currently under construction but design is complete. Includes interstate widening, variety of interchanges, complex bridge designs, utility coordination. Larger scope, scale, and complexity. Key individual included.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project is DB and is under construction. Design is complete. Includes interstate, paving, bridge design, environmental coordination, complex MOT, ROW acquisitions. Smaller scope, scale, and complexity. One key individual referenced.
Project 5	1.66667	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DB, still under construction, included interchange construction, long span bridge construction and rehab, wetland impacts, major utility coordination, major railroad coordination, and intricate MOT. Similar in size and complexity. No key individuals referenced. Design/discipline leads served in similar roles.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DB and is complete, KEGI performed 30% of overall design. Included interstate construction, interchange construction and improvements, paving operations, and public/residential community impacts. Large stakeholder coordination component. No key individuals referenced.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB and is complete, included interstate, interchange construction, bridge construction, utility coordination, roadway realignments, wetland coordination. Similar scale, scope, and complexity. Key individual included.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DB and is complete. Subconsultant work Included bridge design. Project included interstate, interchange ramp improvements, complex MOT, major stakeholder coordination, critical railroad coordination, environmental coordination, new alignment roadway. More complex scope, scale, and complexity. No key individuals referenced.



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet																										
		I-77 New Exit 26 Interchange and Connecting Roads																										
		2/1/2024 to 2/2/2024 (Resumed 2/5 and 2/6)																										
		AWC-ICE			Kiewit			Lane-RKK			United-Blythe-KCI																	
Project 6			1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DB, still under construction, included interchange reconstruction, bridge construction and rehab, major utility coordination, row coordination, and intricate MOT on interstate and local routes. Similar in size and complexity. No key individuals referenced. Design/discipline leads served in similar roles.				0.8	Average - 3	Project was DB and is complete, included vertical construction, railroad coordination, bridge rehabilitation and replacement, and multiple segments/contracts. Key individual referenced but not for design (PM).				1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB and is completed, included interstate, interchange modifications and IMR, railroad coordination, utility relocation and coordination, public relations, an environmental permitting. Greater in scope, scale, and complexity.				0.8	Average - 3	Project was DB and is complete. Included interstate, interchange improvements, bridge design, public/media relations. No key individuals referenced.					
Subtotal:		10		6.4			6.4			8.3			6.9															
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		
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			
<p>• 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.</p> <p>• The Proposer shall provide Work History and Quality Forms – Contractor/Designer for each transportation projects, other than those previously provided in Section 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.</p> <p>o Has the Lead Contractor or any member of the joint venture been declared delinquent or placed in default on any Project?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>o Have any design-build projects or projects of similar scope been delayed more than 30 days such that liquidated damages were assessed?</p> <p>o Has the Lead Contractor been cited by OSHA for violations deemed serious, willful, or repeated?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>o Has the Lead Designer filed legal proceedings against the Lead Contractor, or vice versa, on a design-build contract?</p>																												



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet											
		I-77 New Exit 26 Interchange and Connecting Roads											
		2/1/2024 to 2/2/2024 (Resumed 2/5 and 2/6)											
		AWC-ICE			Kiewit			Lane-RKK			United-Blythe-KCI		
Project 1	1.66667	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was on-time. No claims, disputes, or litigation. Did not address budget. Team assisted bridge rehab during I-77 widening project and maintained schedule without delay. Project reference was outstanding. Quality initiatives included: schedule control, utility coordination, QA/QC of design, Constructability review, QC Team, Work Plan Preconstruction Meetings.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was on-time, on budget, and no claims. ROW, design, and construction phases were accelerated. Reduced utility conflicts projectwide. Team optimized horizontal alignments to eliminate bridge and resulting in cost savings and accelerated schedule. Project reference was above average to outstanding. Quality initiatives included: were incorrectly identified in section g rather than i, partnering meetings, ROW task force.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was on-time, on budget, and no claims. Owner directed change orders for additional scope and costs. Project reference was outstanding. Quality initiatives included: concrete girders for saving maintenance costs, MOT innovation, utility relocation avoidance	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project is under construction but is on schedule. Budget was not discussed. There are no claims. ATC negotiated to include in contract to accommodate reduction in ROW impacts. Continued construction work despite stakeholder difficulties. References were outstanding. Quality Initiatives included: ATC inclusion.
Project 2	1.66667	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project met 23 interim completion dates and recovered four months of delays caused by weather and fabrication; project opened "as planned". Detailed scheduling operations with complex coordination. Potential claim taken to DRB and resolved. Did not address budget. Project reference not received. Quality initiatives included: QC review and team, constructability reviews, detailed testing regimen, utility relocations in early work packages, value engineering cost proposal.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was completed ahead of schedule, on budget, no claims discussed. Minimal client/owner oversight required throughout. Project reference was outstanding to perfect. Quality initiatives included: self-performed QA/QC, ATCs resulting in cost savings and accelerated schedule, construction innovation techniques to reduce impacts to traveling public.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project reached substantial completion by "negotiated date", no claims or LDs, and on budget. *additional scope added time to substantial completion date. Project reference not received. Quality initiatives include: design and construction quality management plan, partnering coordination.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project is under construction but is on schedule. Budget was not discussed. Claims were not discussed. Bridge and overpass construction was efficient and high quality. Assigned additional resources to project components to ensure progress and quality. Reference was outstanding. Quality Initiatives included: none described
Project 3	1.66667	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was on-time, on budget, and had no claims. Self-performance of all items on critical path. Project reference not received. Quality initiatives included: MOT sequence ATC, numerous ATCs submitted and accepted resulting in cost and schedule savings	0.8	Average - 3	Project is under construction. Will be accelerated bridge construction and currently on schedule. Project reference not received. Quality Initiatives included (these are planned): reduced public impact with MOT phasing plan, GMP proposals.	0.8	Average - 3	Project was on-time, budget and claims were not discussed. No OSHA violations. Project reference not received. Quality initiatives include: innovative bridge design saving maintenance costs	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was completed on time. Budget was not discussed. There were no claims. Project achieved AGC and DBIA awards. No references received. Quality Initiatives included: weekly coordination meetings with subcontractors and suppliers to keep up with aggressive schedule
Project 4	1.66667	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project is currently under construction. Does not address time, budget, or claims. Contract and submittal deliverables met. Design reviews have been non-problematic. Design adjusted quickly and performed at-risk at varying project critical points throughout. Project reference was outstanding. Quality initiatives included: QA/QC program, independent quality review (separate), constructability reviews	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project is under construction and is currently on schedule. Design is not fully complete. No claims discussed. Project reference was perfect. Quality initiatives include: design quality management plan, schedule savings as result of innovative MOT plan, accelerated bridge construction methods to ensure schedule certainty and safety.	0.8	Average - 3	Project completion, budget, and claims were not discussed . Accelerated schedule. Project reference not received. Quality initiatives include: interdisciplinary reviews, smart workzone system utilization, retaining wall analysis,	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project is on schedule. Budget not discussed. No claims. No references received. Quality Initiatives included: ATCs for cost savings, environmental impact reductions, coordination with floodplain administrator, variable MOT scheme to maintain critical route



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet											
		I-77 New Exit 26 Interchange and Connecting Roads											
		2/1/2024 to 2/2/2024 (Resumed 2/5 and 2/6)											
		AWC-ICE			Kiewit			Lane-RKK			United-Blythe-KCI		
Project 5	1.66667	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project is currently under construction. Does not address time, budget, or claims. Contract and submittal deliverables met. Design reviews have been mostly non-problematic. Project reference was average. Quality initiatives included: 14 ATCs approved saving cost and schedule and improved safety	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was completed was on-time, budget was not discussed, no claims. Project reference was outstanding. Quality initiatives include: coordination meetings, innovative tunnel design and other optimizations resulting in cost savings and accelerated schedule,	0.8	Average - 3	Project completion, budget, and claims were not discussed. Design improvements to reduce excavation depth. Project reference not received. Quality initiatives include: accelerated schedule via temporary connector road elimination	0.8	Average - 3	Project is complete and was not on time. Budget and claims were not discussed. No references received. Quality Initiatives included: VE/cost-saving designs
Project 6	1.66667	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project is currently under construction. Does not address time, budget, or claims. Contract and submittal deliverables met. Design reviews have been non-problematic. Project reference was average. Quality initiatives included: 10 ATCs approved saving cost and schedule and improved safety	0.8	Average - 3	Project was completed on-time, budget and claims were not discussed. Owner directed change orders with little project impacts. Complex coordination efforts. Limited discussion of quality initiatives related to design. Project reference not received. Quality initiatives include: extensive data collection, field reviews, peer review process, constructability reviews, extensive partnering with owner, and risk management activities.	0.8	Average - 3	Project completion, budget, and claims were not discussed. Project reference was outstanding to perfect. Quality initiatives include: accelerated schedule for RFC plans, interdisciplinary reviews	0.8	Average - 3	Project is complete. Schedule, budget, or claims were not discussed. No references received. Quality initiatives included: preparatory document improvements/savings
All other projects	5	3.3	Above Average - 4	Listed one project with OSHA violations (2 other-than serious, 1 serious) that included multiple fatalities. OSHA violation/incident occurred 5+ years ago with no other notable violations since.	4.2	Excellent - 5	Listed one project with pending litigation to recover costs incurred by necessary design deviations. Unclear of outcome or fault.	4.2	Excellent - 5	Five projects (4 contractor, 1 designer) were included citing OSHA violations, litigations, labor citations, and liquidated damages. Some projects and/or violations were resolved and some are ongoing.	4.2	Excellent - 5	Two projects listed. Overall project on time, intermittent schedules missed with LDs for three sites in each batch of bridges.
Previous Contractor Performance Evaluation System and Consultant Performance Evaluation Scores. Other available information related to past performance.	15	7.5	Average - 3	CPE - 78.07, CPES - 8.00, DB Performance Score - AWC has an average to slightly above average score on multiple projects. ICE has an above average score on multiple projects. AWC has consistent recent poor management of committed Key Individuals (PM) post-award. Often those committed in SOQ are pulled/substituted prior to construction activities or before substantial completion is accomplished. Inconsistencies noted between key individual resumes and inclusion of key individuals on projects submitted for contractor work experience. AWC has consistently demonstrated their ability to provide construction resources for their projects, however, they also consistently lack appropriate and effective erosion control measures.	10.0	Above Average - 4	CPE - 73.20, CPES - No current score, Kiewit does not have any current DB projects with SCDOT that are scored. KISC and KEGI in provided references were outstanding to perfect.	12.5	Excellent - 5	CPE - 79.10, CPES - 7.98, Performance score - Lane has an average to slightly above average score on several projects. RKK has an above average score on several projects. Provided references for Lane were outstanding to perfect.	12.5	Excellent - 5	CPE - United 71.07, Blythe Dev. 79.36. CPES - 8.52. Performance Score - United and Blythe Dev have an above average to excellent on several projects. KCI has an above average score for two projects. Provided references for United-Blythe JV were outstanding.
Subtotal:	30	18.6			20.8			22.2			23.3		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW		
Total Score		AWC-ICE			Kiewit			Lane-RKK			United-Blythe-KCI		
Points		100.0			100.0			100.0			100.0		



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet			
		I-77 New Exit 26 Interchange and Connecting Roads			
		2/1/2024 to 2/2/2024 (Resumed 2/5 and 2/6)			
		AWC-ICE	Kiewit	Lane-RKK	United-Blythe-KCI
Total:	100.0	67.5	64.0	74.4	81.5
Procurement Officer Initials		CW	CW	CW	CW
		I certify that the scores (weighted scores are rounded) shown on this sheet(s) accurately reflect the actions of the Committee on November 8-9th and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFC.			
		Tyler Clark Chairperson			
		Brooks Bickley Voting Member			
		Ben McKinney Voting Member			
		John Burns Voting Member			
		Jason Fulmer Voting Member			
		Doug Giovanetti Voting Member*			
		Carmen Wright Procurement Officer			
		Brian Gambrell Legal			
		Tad Kitowicz FHWA			