

SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet							
	I-26 at I-95 Interchange Improvement							
	3/1/2023 -03/03/2023							
	Lane		Branch/Reeves		Crowder/Balfour Beatty		Archer Western	
Responsiveness	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments
Is Proposer considered responsive?	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
3.2 Introduction	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 Provide Unique Entity ID for all firms.	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	

SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet											
		I-26 at I-95 Interchange Improvement											
		3/1/2023 -03/03/2023											
		Lane			Branch/Reeves			Crowder/Balfour Beatty			Archer Western		
3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution		Lane			Branch/Reeves			Crowder/Balfour Beatty			Archer Western		
	Point Weight	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		10		Use the Likert Scale	10		Use the Likert Scale	10		Use the Likert Scale	10		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 .	4	2.0	Average - 3	The chart was clear and showed the line of communication and direct lines of reporting. Showed all of the critical support roles as requested.	2.7	Above Average - 4	Very clean org chart, shows the lines of communication and reporting. Traffic control during construction coordinating during Traffic Design and TMP. Assistants that are from the opposite JV partner shows that they are integrated on the construction side. Not clear on the Quality Control piece with Quality Control reporting to CM and not directly to the Quality Control Manger.	2.0	Average - 3	Like the way they have quality control broken out reporting to Alternative Delivery. Shows communication lines between the lead designer and construction manager. Included what we think are communication lines between Design team and Construction Team. Need to include in legend what the lines on chart mean.	2.7	Above Average - 4	Very clear reporting structure that show that all items in production goes through the PM. Shows that the Quality Control component is reporting directly to SCDOT and coordinating with PM. Like that they show the Independent Complex Bridge component even though required. Design-build support did not included Roadway and MOT.
Provide a brief, written description of significant functional relationships and how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team.	2	1.0	Average - 3	In this section they had a very brief write up with high level view of relationships. They did talk standard practices in a later section discussing how the team would function as a integrated team.	1.7	Excellent - 5	Very clear on positions, how they will be integrated, and what the responsibilities of each position will be. This table indicates the correct communication lines for Quality Control. Good addition of added value personnel in the table.	1.3	Above Average - 4	Did provide a description of significant functional relationships. Discussed being a integrated team and included the additional chart on Team Integration and detailed responsibilities.	1.3	Above Average - 4	Very clear on roles and chain of command. Continue to explain how they will be able to complete this project and CCR Phase 3. The integrated focus of the team relies on the DB Coordinator. The "zipper strategy" can provide benefit to the design and construction tasks on this project minimizing delays and errors.
o If any of the firms and/or Key Individuals have worked together on the same team (not just on the same job) in the past. Describe the types of projects they worked on, the year(s) they worked together, the level of participation, and a reference contact name, email address, and phone number for that project. o If no previous direct working relationship, provide projects that the firms and/or Key individuals have worked on that demonstrates how their past experience supports a successful teaming arrangement. Describe the types of projects, the year(s) worked on them, the level of participation, and a reference contact name, email address, and phone number for that project.	4	1.3	Below Average - 2	They provided projects that show both the Contactor and Designer have worked together in the past. 2 of the 3 projects listed firm participation did not discuss key individuals that have worked on them. Did not include the years that they worked together.	3.3	Excellent - 5	Projects indicate that the Lead Designer has direct relevant experience working with both JV partners. The Key individuals have worked together. Very clear the description of the responsibilities of the member on projects listed. Project duration were given. Overall showed a extensive working relationship.	2.0	Average - 3	Both contractors has past working relationships with lead designer. Contractors did not show that they have worked together. Designer has work experience with the other major subs on projects. Does not show that key individuals have worked together.	3.3	Excellent - 5	The number of projects indicate that the Contractor and Lead Designer have a great working relationship and significant experience working on several different types of projects including design build. Included a very simple chart that covers the working relationships that these teams have in common over a extended period, they included the durations, includes projects of the same complexity and large majority were DB. Did show past working relationship for contractors Key individuals for a couple projects but did not include designer.
Subtotal:	10	4.3			7.7			5.3			7.3		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW		



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet											
		I-26 at I-95 Interchange Improvement											
		3/1/2023 -03/03/2023											
		Lane			Branch/Reeves			Crowder/Balfour Beatty			Archer Western		
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	10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale	
Demonstrate the team's capacity and available resources including personnel for this project.	4	1.3	Below Average - 2	Both the designer and contractor cover the companies capacity but did not get into the specifics resources for this project. Lane did discuss available equipment but still not specific on this project.	3.3	Excellent - 5	They indicated the number of available crews and committed crews for the contractors for this project. Design will be supplemented with additional resources from sub if need on the project. The gave the overall capacities for the JV and design teams.	2.0	Average - 3	Provided a chart with their overall personnel but did not give project specifics for designer but did later for the contractor. They are including Job specific recruiter. Did discuss the key staff and when they would be available.	3.3	Excellent - 5	Very clear on the resources that are assigned, ones that are needed, and available for this project for the design and construction team. Addressed the needs of other projects they are in pursuit of and clear that they have resources for this project. Identified that they have resources with sub contractors, if needed.
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 team members responsible.	4	1.3	Below Average - 2	Contractor did not clearly discuss how they would implement their resources. They clearly showed the self performance item for the contractor and design team. Not clear on the design side if the Lead or sub would perform the major subtask.	3.3	Excellent - 5	Clearly identified what resources are available to execute the work for the JV and when they will be available. Identified all items that will be self-performed. The JV partners are complimentary from work they complete.	2.7	Above Average - 4	Did discuss the strategy for implementation of resources. Included that JV will construct walls to make sure that does not impact schedule. Did show what they will self perform and it looks like the most of the major task. Included what anticipated task subs would perform.	3.3	Excellent - 5	Contractor has ability to complete almost all construction tasks; however some tasks will be performed by subs. All major task were identified. Equipment support from Walsh is available if needed. Staff and equipment on two NC projects can be relocated to this project upon award.
Indicate how the geographical location of the firms will enhance integration, communication, issue resolution and project execution.	2	1.0	Average - 3	Did not discuss the geographical location of the Prime and Lead Designer. Co-location of Key personnel during the design review process is a plus. The discussion and importance on integration and issue resolution is a plus. The team will then transition to on-site office so they addressed design and construction.	1.7	Excellent - 5	Clear on the integration, communication and resolving of issues. Important that they can be onsite with same day notice. Diagram of geographical location shows all of the projects that are ramping down and the overall resources in the area that are going to be available.	1.0	Average - 3	Located 40 miles from the project site and would be available for onsite or virtual meeting. Co-location in Columbia during the project will help with integration.	1.3	Above Average - 4	The contractor and designer will co-locate at the designer office during the design phase. This is how they will be integrated and enhance communication. In there layout for locations the indicated both time and distance to project site. Did mention onsite construction offices.
Subtotal:	10	3.7			8.3			5.7			8.0		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW		



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet											
		I-26 at I-95 Interchange Improvement											
		3/1/2023 -03/03/2023											
		Lane			Branch/Reeves			Crowder/Balfour Beatty			Archer Western		
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals		Lane			Branch/Reeves			Crowder/Balfour Beatty			Archer Western		
		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		
<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 shall have a minimum of 10 years of experience in the management of highway transportation;</p> <p>o The 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>	20	13.3	Above Average - 4	PM has 18 years overall experience with 13 years in Management. PM has direct experience with DB projects that includes a system to system interchange project and interstate widening's in this role. Experience with projects that have large bridge structures. Only 1 project reference but it was nearly perfect.	16.7	Excellent - 5	He has 38 years of overall experience. He exceeds the 10 years of management experience but has served in elevated roles on most recent projects and has not been PM since 2012. All projects in the resume were DB projects. Projects listed were of like scope, magnitude and complexity with 3 of the projects including system to system interchanges.	6.7	Below Average - 2	He had 14 years of overall experience. Has minimum required 10 year of transportation project management. He has worked projects that involve interstates, not a PM for a system to system project, projects not of the same size and complexity. Has DB experience but was not in this role. Received very poor reference on the project that he was PM on.	16.7	Excellent - 5	PM has 23 years overall experience with 20 years in Management. PM has direct experience with 2 DB projects that includes a system to system interchange project and interstate widening's in this role. Experience with projects that have large bridge structures. Two project references that were outstanding to perfect.
Subtotal:	20	13.3				16.7				6.7			
Procurement Officer Initials		CW				CW				CW			

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet													
I-26 at I-95 Interchange Improvement													
3/1/2023 -03/03/2023													
SCDOT Design-Build		Lane			Branch/Reeves			Crowder/Balfour Beatty			Archer Western		
		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals													
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	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead Design Engineer (7 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 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. o For the duration of the design phase, the Lead Design Engineer will attend all routine project meetings in person, be primarily dedicated to design of the Project, and be available as needed by SCDOT. o The Lead Design Engineer shall be a full time employee of the lead design firm. 	7	5.8	Excellent - 5	He has 25 years of experience. Had experience managing the design on multiple projects that included system to system interchanges. All project were Alternative Delivery projects. Projects were of very similar size, magnitude and scope to this project. References for the projects were outstanding to perfect.	3.5	Average - 3	He has 18 years of experience. Most of that was as a traffic engineer. 3 of the 5 project were DB projects. He was involved in IMRs with one being system to system. Served in the Lead design role on two of the projects. Has some experience with geometric design and waivers and a lot of experience developing traffic engineering final plans.	4.7	Above Average - 4	He has 30 years experience. All projects were DB. Recently served as Lead Designer on an Interstate job for SCDOT. No projects showed system to system experience. Has interstate design experience. All projects were DB but two were design for the owner. Received 5 references that were outstanding to perfect.	3.5	Average - 3	He has 12 years of progressive experience. Served as LDE on 3 of the projects submitted. 2 projects very recent and current. All projects were DB projects. Only one of the projects included RFC plans and that was a system to system interchange. References range for average to perfect.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Engineer (3 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 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. o 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. o The Traffic Engineer shall have experience developing, coordinating, and obtaining approval of System-to-System Interchange Modification reports from State and Federal agencies. o The Traffic Engineer must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 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.. 	3	2.5	Excellent - 5	Has 17 years of experience all in Traffic Engineering. He has experience with IMRs, traffic design, HCM, and simulation software. 3 of the 4 projects included system to system interchanges. Project were of similar size and complexity from a traffic standpoint and included approvals from the state and FHWA. References were from outstanding to perfect.	2.0	Above Average - 4	He has 19 years of overall experience all in traffic engineering. Experience interstate projects including IMR's including system to system experience. He has experience in various traffic simulation software. Only 1 of the projects listed were DB. References received on the project were outstanding to perfect.	3.0	Outstanding - 6	He has 36 years of experience with majority it in traffic engineering, designed multiple system to system interchanges. All project listed were DB projects. Experience in traffic final plans and traffic operational analysis. Experience with MOT on interchanges and interstates. Worked projects with same or larger complexity to this project. He has 4 nearly perfect references.	2.5	Excellent - 5	He has 22 years of experience all with traffic engineering. Was serving in this role on all projects that were submitted. 1 of the projects was a DB project. Had experience with all the programs for traffic analyses and projects were similar in size and complexity. Has experience with system interchange IMR. Reference received was outstanding.
Subtotal:		10	8.3		5.5			7.7			6.0		
Procurement Officer Initials			CW			CW			CW			CW	



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet															
		I-26 at I-95 Interchange Improvement															
		3/1/2023 -03/03/2023															
		Lane			Branch/Reeves			Crowder/Balfour Beatty			Archer Western						
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		
<div>• Construction Manager (10 points) o The Construction Manager shall be responsible for all aspects of the construction of the Project, subject to oversight of the Project Manager. o The Construction Manager must have a minimum of five years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects; o The Construction 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. o For the duration of construction, the Construction Manager shall be dedicated solely to managing the construction of the Project, shall have no other assigned Project responsibilities, and shall not be utilized on any other projects. o The Construction Manager shall be on-site during all construction activities for the Project and attend status meetings during the</div>	10	6.7	Above Average - 4	Has 16 years experience managing various aspects of construction projects. Experience includes design build and P3. Has performed various construction management duties on design build projects of varying size, scope, and complexity. Has also performed PM duties on prior projects. References received were average to perfect.	5.0	Average - 3	Has 18 years experience managing various aspects of construction projects. Experience includes 1 design build. Projects listed were of significantly smaller, scope, and complexity.	6.7	Above Average - 4	Has 24 years experience managing various aspects of construction projects. Experience includes a design build project. Has performed various construction management duties on projects that have aspects that are of similar, scope, and complexity. No references were provided.	8.3	Excellent - 5	Has 43 years of experience. 21 years of that managing various aspects of both design build and bid build construction projects. 3 of the 4 projects were DB. System-to-system interchange experience. Has performed various construction management duties on design build projects of similar, scope, and complexity some with accelerated schedules. References received were almost perfect.				
Subtotal:		10	6.7		5.0			6.7			8.3						
Procurement Officer Initials			CW		CW			CW			CW						
		Lane			Branch/Reeves			Crowder/Balfour Beatty			Archer Western						

SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet															
		I-26 at I-95 Interchange Improvement															
		3/1/2023 -03/03/2023															
3.5 Past Performance of Team		Lane			Branch/Reeves			Crowder/Balfour Beatty			Archer Western						
		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments				
3.5.1 Experience of Proposer's Team		10	Use the Likert Scale			10	Use the Likert Scale			10	Use the Likert Scale			10	Use the Likert Scale		
Provide no more than 3 projects awarded within the last 10 calendar years that identify the previous work experience by the Lead Contractor or any Major Subcontractors using the Work History and Quality Form of Contractor/Designer, Sections a through g. Projects that have reached substantial completion are preferred.																	
Project 1	1.66667	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DB, Did include bridges over Interstate with interchanges, did not include system to system interchange, similar in size and complexity, did include interstate MOT, required 3rd party coordination on utilities, and no key individuals listed.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB, Did include bridges over Interstate with interchanges, included system to system interchange, larger in size and complexity, did include interstate MOT, required 3rd party coordination on utilities, and the PM was a key individual but not in the same role.	0.6	Below Average - 2	Project was not DB, Did include large bridges, no work on interstate or with interchange, not a system to system interchange, not similar in size and complexity, did include MOT, required 3rd party coordination with the RR. No key individual indicated.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB, did include bridges over Interstate with interchanges, including system to system interchange, similar in size and complexity, did include interstate MOT, and required 3rd party coordination on utilities. The PM was a key individual in the same role and the Lead Designer was a design reviewer.				
Project 2	1.66667	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB, Did include bridges over Interstate with interchanges, included system to system interchange, similar in size and complexity, did include interstate MOT, required 3rd party coordination on utilities, and the PM was a key individual in the same role.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DB, Did include bridges and interchanges, did not include system to system interchange, similar in size and complexity, did include MOT, required 3rd party coordination on utilities, and the PM was a key individual but not in the same role.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB, Did include complex bridges over Interstate with interchanges, included system to system interchange, larger in size and complexity, did include complex interstate MOT, required 3rd party coordination on utilities. No key individuals indicated.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB, did include bridges over Interstate with interchanges, including system to system interchange, larger in size and complexity, did include interstate MOT, and required 3rd party coordination on utilities. The CM was project superintendent on this project.				
Project 3	1.66667	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DB, included bridges over Interstate with interchanges, did not include system to system interchange, similar in size and complexity, included interstate MOT, required 3rd party coordination with the RR, and the PM was a key individual in the same role.	0.8	Average - 3	Project was DB, Did include bridges and interchanges, did not include system to system interchange, work completed similar, complex, but not same magnitude. Did include MOT, required 3rd party coordination on utilities, Key individuals including the CM, Lead Designer, and Traffic Engineer.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was not DB, Did include interstate bridge over waterway. Did not include system to system interchange, similar in size, did include complex interstate MOT, required complex 3rd party coordination. PM on project 3 would be the CM on this project.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB, did include bridges over Interstate with interchanges, including system to system interchange, similar in size and complexity, did include interstate MOT, and required 3rd party coordination on utilities. The PM was on this project in the same role.				



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet												
		I-26 at I-95 Interchange Improvement												
		3/1/2023 -03/03/2023												
		Lane		Branch/Reeves			Crowder/Balfour Beatty			Archer Western				
Provide no more than 3 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 bridges over Interstate with interchanges, did not include system to system interchange, similar in size and complexity, included interstate MOT, required 3rd party coordination, and the Lead Designer and Traffic were key individuals with the Traffic engineer in the same role.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB, Did include bridges over interstate and interchanges, did not include system to system interchanges, much larger in size and complexity, did include interstate MOT, required 3rd party coordination on utilities, and the Lead Designer as a key individual in a similar role.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB, Did include bridges over Interstate with interchanges, did not include system to system interchange, similar in size and complexity, did include interstate MOT, required 3rd party coordination on utilities and RR, same Lead Designer and Traffic Engineer were as Key individuals. Need to include in project write up.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DB, did include bridges over Interstate with interchanges, not a system to system interchange, larger in size and complexity, did include interstate MOT, and required 3rd party coordination on utilities. Project did include and IMR and NEPA re-evaluation. The Traffic Engineer was on project for traffic design reviews and not design.	
Project 5	1.66667	0.8	Average - 3	Project was DB, included bridges over Interstate with interchanges, did not include system to system interchange, some bridge work on project similar in size and complexity, included interstate MOT, required 3rd party coordination with utilities and RR, and they have personnel on the project that will be on this one but not Key roles.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DB, did include bridges over interstate and interchanges, did not include system to system interchange but completed IMR, similar in size and complexity, did include interstate MOT but part of project was new location, required 3rd party coordination on utilities, and the Lead Designer as a key individual in Traffic engineering role.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was DB, Did include bridges on expressway. Did not include system to system interchange, similar in size and complexity, did include MOT, required 3rd party utility relocations, did not included IMR modification, and no key individuals listed.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB, did include bridges over Interstate with interchanges, a system to system interchange ramp, similar in size and complexity, did include interstate MOT, and required 3rd party coordination on utilities. Project did include and IMR and NEPA re-evaluation. The Traffic Engineer was on project in that role and Lead designer was on project for peer reviews.	
Project 6	1.66667	0.0	Unacceptable - 0	Project was outside of the window of time to be submitted in accordance with the criteria in Section 3.5.1.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB, did include bridges over interstate and interchanges, did include system to system interchange and completed interchange assessment , larger in size and complexity, did include interstate MOT, required 3rd party coordination, and the Lead Designer and Traffic Engineer as a key individual for traffic assessment.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was DB, Did include bridges over Interstate and included system to system interchange, larger in size and complexity, did include interstate MOT, and required 3rd party coordination on utilities. Project was for STV a major sub and the Prime designer. No key individuals we listed. No references received.	0.8	Average - 3	Project was DB, did include bridges over Interstate with interchanges, did not include a system to system interchange, similar in size and complexity, did include interstate MOT, and required 3rd party coordination on utilities. No key individuals were on the job.	
Subtotal:		10	5.6				7.2				6.9			
Procurement Officer Initials			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	



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet											
		I-26 at I-95 Interchange Improvement											
		3/1/2023 -03/03/2023											
		Lane		Branch/Reeves			Crowder/Balfour Beatty			Archer Western			
<p>> For each of the projects identified per Section 3.5.1, provide the information requested in Sections H and I of the Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer that is included in the Appendix B.</p> <p>> The Proposer shall provide a Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer for all transportation projects, active or completed, within the last five years that has a “yes” response to any of the following questions. Sections A through G and Section J shall be completed.</p> <p>> Has the Lead Contractor or any member of the joint venture been declared delinquent or placed in default on any Project?</p> <p>> 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>> Have any projects been delayed more than 30 days such that liquidated damages were assessed?</p> <p>> Has the Lead Contractor been cited by OSHA for violations deemed serious, willful, or repeated?</p> <p>> 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>> Has an owner, a Lead Contractor, or any member of a joint venture filed a claim against the Lead Designer’s Errors and Omissions Insurance?</p> <p>> Has the Lead Designer filed legal proceedings against the Lead Contractor, or vice versa, on a design-build contract?</p>													
		Project 1	2.5	1.3	Average - 3	Did not address on time, on budget or whether or not it did have claims, dispute proceedings, litigation, and arbitration. The project also had these quality initiatives: Coordinated in contract utility work so it did not impact overall schedule, ROW was strategically organized to not delay construction, and Exit 106 was realigned to reduce utility delays. Contractor was cited for a OSHA violation. The reference for project was outstanding.	0.8	Below Average - 2	Project did not mention if it was on time, on budget, or had any claims. The project also had these quality initiatives: The progressive design build process allowed for the quality initiatives presented. Reference for the project was perfect.	1.7	Above Average - 4	Project was on time, no claims and under budget. The project also had these quality initiatives: Coordination to avoid obstacles with 3rd parties and maintained the CPM. Project completed on a very aggressive schedule. No references received.	1.3
Project 2	2.5	1.3	Average - 3	Did not address on time, on budget or whether or not it did have claims, dispute proceedings, litigation, and arbitration. The project also had these quality initiatives. They did ATC for new interchange and improved staging, utility and environmental coordination. Provided access for utility through work zone to provide for season access. Reference for project was slightly above average.	2.1	Excellent - 5	Project did finish 7 months ahead of schedule but did not say on budget, or had any claims. Project did win an award. The project also had these quality initiatives: No environmental citations with significant exposure. Reference for the project was perfect. Early MOT coordination resulted in a safer and more efficient route without impacting schedule. A reference that was average to outstanding.	1.7	Above Average - 4	This large project was safe, on schedule and within budget, including client-directed changes. Included early works packages to allow construction to begin while design finished. No references received.	1.7	Above Average - 4	The project was completed on time and on budget with zero claims. ATC resolve a conflict with a transmission line. Include ground improvements, T-walls, and gravity walls to reduce day on critical. Added additional scope for the owner and finished project on time. Reference on project was average to outstanding.
Project 3	2.5	1.3	Average - 3	Project was on time and on budget. Did not show any items in section J. The projects quality initiatives were standard practice.	1.3	Average - 3	Project did not address time, on budget, or if had any claims. Worked with design teams to modify MOT to save 5 months on critical path. The project also had these quality initiatives: All indicatives were standard practice. The reference that was outstanding.	2.1	Excellent - 5	Project was open to traffic ahead of time and project overall was on schedule. Project won multiple awards. Worked with utility and RR to mitigate 1 year worth of schedule impacts. Reference for this project was almost perfect.	1.3	Average - 3	The project was completed on time with zero claims. Quality initiatives were standard requirements. Project did not have any references.



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet											
		I-26 at I-95 Interchange Improvement											
		3/1/2023 -03/03/2023											
		Lane			Branch/Reeves			Crowder/Balfour Beatty			Archer Western		
Project 4	2.5	1.3	Average - 3	Project did not address if it was on time, on budget, did not have claims, dispute proceedings, litigation, and arbitration. The project also had these quality initiatives. Developed a detour plan for traffic that reduced reconstruction of bridge and traffic impacts by 6 months. All other items are standard practice.	1.3	Average - 3	Project did not address time, on budget, or if had any claims. Project is not complete. Accelerated schedule that received grading and drainage plans in 7 months. They adjusted the horizontal alignment to miss some utility impacts. No reference received for this one.	1.3	Average - 3	Project on schedule. Project not complete so do not know about claims, disputes, litigation and arbitration. Included standard practices for quality indicatives. Reference for project was outstanding.	1.7	Above Average - 4	The design was completed on time. They implemented plans to remove the contraflow for segments 2 and 3 that provided for a safer and more efficient project. Gave a innovative solution to CMRB to allow them to keep it for final pavement base course allowing completion of additional scope items. Overall the project had a above average
Project 5	2.5	1.3	Average - 3	The design portion that D &F participated in was on time, on budget, and does not indicate if it had claims, dispute proceedings, litigation, and arbitration. The project quality initiatives were considered to be standard for DB.	1.7	Above Average - 4	Project opened 1 month ahead of schedule. Did not address budget of claims. Quality initiatives were standard practice. Reference received for the project was nearly perfect.	1.7	Above Average - 4	Project finished ahead of schedule 2 months. Project on budget. They worked at risk ahead of NTP to allow the construction to start 3 months after NTP. The project included standard practices for quality initiatives. No reference received.	1.7	Above Average - 4	The design was completed on time. They have implemented Over the shoulder design meetings to handle comments. Submitted a list of cost savings ideas after the project started. Design team submitted a DDI Interchange ATC that was safer and more operationally efficient. Reference on the project was outstanding.
Project 6	2.5	2.1	Excellent - 5	Project was completed on time, on budget, no claims, or dispute proceedings. Several ATCs were approved that saved the project \$ 90 Million. Received incentive payment of \$4.7 Million for reductions in environmental impacts. The project other quality initiatives were considered to be standard for DB.	1.7	Above Average - 4	Project did address that the were allocating resources to critical task to be on time. Did not discuss on budget, or if had any claims. Quality initiatives were mostly standard practice. Did work with owner to determine large retaining walls were not needed to reduce future maintenance. Reference for the project was outstanding to excellent.	2.1	Excellent - 5	Did not address if the project was on time and on budget, or litigation. The implemented an ATC that had a significant estimated savings by the owner of \$50M. The project included standard practices for quality initiatives. No reference received.	1.3	Average - 3	The design was completed on time. The MOT phasing eliminated an entire row of temporary shoring for the entire 8 miles of the project, saving cost and eliminating a "canyon effect" for drivers traveling between parallel structures. No references on this project.
All other projects	5	4.2	Excellent - 5	Had one project with LDs assessed and 4 projects with OSHA violation. The score was based on the magnitude and complexity of these projects and the overall amount of work the contractor completes.	4.2	Excellent - 5	Had 1 errors and omissions claim and it was settled at mediation.	5.0	Outstanding - 6	No other projects listed.	2.5	Average - 3	Had one project with 3 OSHA violation. Ultimately one violation deemed serious resulting in 2 fatalities. The score was based on the magnitude and complexity of the projects and the overall amount of work the contractor completes.
Previous Contractor Performance Evaluation System and Consultant Performance Evaluation Scores. Other available information related to past performance.	10	6.7	Above Average - 4	CPE - 79.70, CPES - No current score, DB Performance Score - Lane was well above average score on one project and below average on one teamed with as a JV. The additional references for Lane that we received overall achieved above average scores. No additional references received on Dewberry.	8.3	Excellent - 5	CPE - 78.5 (default) Reeves - 72.13, CPES - 7.94, DB Performance Score - Reeves has an average score on the one project they have. No score for Branch. RK&K above average scores on their two projects. The additional references for Branch were well above average to perfect for a couple projects. Reeves references were average to slightly above average overall with a lot of references. RK&K was above average to outstanding overall on references.	8.3	Excellent - 5	CPE - 78.43 CC, 84.65 BB CPES - 7.61, DB Performance Score - Crowder has an well above average score on the one project they have. No score for BB. MB has a slightly above average score on their one project. The additional references for Crowder was above average to perfect and was for a substantial number of projects. BB references were above average overall and MB was above average overall.	8.3	Excellent - 5	CPE - 77.77, CPES - 7.93, DB Performance Score - Archer has above average scores on 4 of 5 of their projects and slightly below average on one. ICE has above average on thier DB projects. The additional references for Archer were above average overall and ICE was Outstanding overall.
Subtotal:		30	19.2		21.3			23.8			19.6		
Procurement Officer Initials			CW			CW			CW			CW	
Total Score		Lane			Branch/Reeves			Crowder/Balfour Beatty			Archer Western		
Points		100.0			100.0			100.0			100.0		
Total:		100.0	61.1		71.6			62.7			73.4		
Procurement Officer Initials			CW			CW			CW			CW	



SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet			
	I-26 at I-95 Interchange Improvement			
	3/1/2023 -03/03/2023			
	Lane	Branch/Reeves	Crowder/Balfour Beatty	Archer Western
	I certify that the scores (weighted scores are rounded) shown on this sheet(s) accurately reflect the actions of the Committee on March 1, 2023 to March 3, 2023 and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFQ.			
	Brad Reynolds Chairperson		<i>Brad Reynolds</i>	
	Levi McLeod Voting Member		<i>Levi W. McLeod</i>	
	David Rister Voting Member		<i>David Rister</i>	
	Scott McElveen Voting Member		<i>Scott McElveen</i>	
	Ron Hinson Voting Member		<i>Ronny C. Hinson Jr.</i>	
	Voting Member*			
	Carmen Wright Procurement Officer		<i>Carmen Wright</i>	
	Brian Gambrell Legal		<i>Brian Gambrell</i>	
	Rickele Gennie FHWA		<i>Rickele Gennie</i>	