

SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet																
	Bridge Package 16 2/13/2023-2/14/2023																
	ESW				Dane			URJV			IPC			Palmetto			
	Responsiveness		Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments		Yes/No	Comments		Yes/No	Comments		Yes/No	Comments		
Is Proposer considered responsive?		Yes		Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes				
3.2 Introduction		ESW				Dane			URJV			IPC			Palmetto		
		Yes/No	Comments		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			Yes			
3.2.2 Identify the two Proposer Points of Contact for the procurement for this Project including mailing addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses.		Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes			
3.2.3 Identify the full legal name of both the Lead Contractor and Lead Designer for the Project. The Lead Contractor is defined as the Proposer that will serve as the prime/general contractor responsible for construction of the Project. The Lead Designer is defined as the prime design consulting firm responsible for the overall design of the Project.		Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes			
3.2.4 Provide Unique Entity ID for the Lead Contractor and Lead Designer or documentation indicating that an application was submitted in Appendix I .		Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes			
3.2.5 Provide a statement confirming the commitment of Key Individuals identified in the submittal to the extent necessary to meet SCDOT's quality and schedule expectations, and that they are available for the duration of the Project. Key Individuals are those persons holding specific positions required by this RFQ.		Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes			
3.2.6 Limit the Introduction to one page which counts towards the specified page limit in Section 5.2.2.		Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes			
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			
3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution		ESW				Dane			URJV			IPC			Palmetto		
		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	8	Use the Likert Scale		8	Use the Likert Scale		8	Use the Likert Scale		8	Use the Likert Scale		8	Use the Likert Scale	
Provide an organizational chart showing the flow of the "chain of command" with lines identifying Key Individuals (by full legal name and firm) and any other disciplines (firm name only) the Proposer deems critical . The chart must show the functional structure of the organization down to the design discipline and construction superintendent level. Identify the critical support roles and relationships of project management, project administration, executive management, construction management, quality management, safety, environmental compliance, and subcontractor administration. The organizational chart shall be limited to one page and counts towards the specified page limit in Section 5.2.2.		2	1.0	Average - 3	Organizational Chart is clear showing direct lines of reporting and communication.	1.0	Average - 3	Organizational chart is clear with direct lines of reporting and communication.	1.0	Average - 3	Organizational chart is clear showing direct lines of reporting and communication.	1.0	Average - 3	The organizational chart is clear showing lines of direct reports/chain of command and coordination/communication.	1.0	Average - 3	The organizational chart shows clear lines of direct reports and communication.
Provide a brief, written description of significant functional relationships and how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team.		3	1.0	Below Average - 2	Team provided a detailed table on the cohesive team strategies. However, Figure 1 failed to conform with the requirements of the RFQ (pg. 22) which states text on illustrative information "shall be no smaller than 10-point Time [sic] New Roman" font. Therefore, the portion of response that failed to adhere with this mandatory requirement—as evidenced by use of the word "shall"—were not considered in this score.	1.5	Average - 3	Key individual roles were listed out giving general details of each person. Bullets were given on team integration.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Team provided a detailed table on how the team/individuals will be integrated and their specific responsibilities.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Team gave a graphic and detailed write up on the teams functional relationships and how the team will be integrated. The IPT (integrated project team) brings the contractor and designer together early to collaborate and maximize value to the owner.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Team provided a detailed write up on how the team knows each other and has worked well together on previous projects showing the team will functionally integrally. Construction team intends to co-locate during plan development.



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet															
		Bridge Package 16 2/13/2023-2/14/2023															
		ESW			Dane			URJV			IPC			Palmetto			
Identify the following in tabular form: o if any of the firms and/or Key Individuals have worked together on the same team (not just on the same job) in the past. Describe the types of projects they worked on, the year(s) they worked together, the level of participation, and a reference contact name, email address, and phone number for that project. o if no previous direct working relationship, provide projects that the firms and/or Key individuals have worked on that demonstrates how their past experience supports a successful teaming arrangement. Describe the types of projects, the year(s) worked on them, the level of participation, and a reference contact name, email address, and phone number for that project.	3	2.0	Above Average - 4	Despite no previous teaming arrangements, two detailed tables were provided highlighting what team members and / or sub consultant companies have worked together. While the two companies haven't worked together, the team members on numerous accounts have.	2.0	Above Average - 4	The team has not worked together in the past but gave specific examples on why they can be successful in this teaming arrangement. Past experiences listed of the two companies help support their teaming arrangement.	2.5	Excellent - 5	Team has extensive previous working relationships. Reeves/RKK currently are working on SCDOT bridge packages 2020-1 and 2021. The proposed JV has experience together on the Monroe Bypass as well. Key individuals overlap from those projects to this proposed team.	1.5	Average - 3	Table provided shows while the contractor and lead designer have not worked together previously, the Lead Designer has worked with the sub consultants on past projects and the contractor has also worked with sub consultants on the team previously. Section lacked discussion on these relationships and how they could be a successful teaming arrangement.	3.0	Outstanding - 6	Team lists table of previous working history together including SCDOT design-build emergency bridge bundle experience. Lead Designer and Contractor have decades of project experience in both NC and SC.	
Subtotal:	8	4.0			4.5			5.5			4.5			6.0			
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			
		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	
3.3.3 Project Resources, Strategies, and Execution	Point Weight	12	Use the Likert Scale			12	Use the Likert Scale			12	Use the Likert Scale			12	Use the Likert Scale		
Discuss the Proposer's strategy for implementation of resources to execute the contract. Identify tasks that the lead contractor and lead designer will self-perform. If a joint venture, identify work items each entity will perform. If major tasks will be performed by others, identify those tasks as well as the firms responsible.	6	4.0	Above Average - 4	Team provided tables breaking down equipment and staffing needs as well as a detailed teaming assignment table showing which entities will self perform the work. Team also gave site specific information on the work to be done.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Team provided detailed table on available resources for both the contractor and lead designer. Details provided on project phasing and approach showing most of the work will be self performed by the contractor.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Team gives a detailed list for project strategy, approach, and challenges. Capacity and resources listed out for what is available to be used on the project but did not go into detail for what will be utilized.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Team provided tables of available resources and what would be required. Team is dedicating 2 structure and 2 grading crews for the project. Another table is provided showing team responsibilities and what work will be self-performed.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Team proposes two bridge crews and one grading crews with additional resources if needed. Team is self performing the majority of the work.	
Indicate how the geographical location of the firms will enhance integration, communication, issue resolution, and project execution.	6	3.0	Average - 3	Team shows all sites are within 25 miles of an ESW office which promotes enhancing project execution but nothing listed provided how this will enhance integration as a team.	4.0	Above Average - 4	On-site offices with offices for all key individuals will be provided and moved once bridges are complete. Team provides information on how team will be integrated as a team.	3.0	Average - 3	Team gave details as to staffing and their proximity to the project sites. Bridge sites are all within range of Reeve's asphalt plant.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Team will use a mobile office along with the project offices being in proximity of the bridges to enhance integration, communication, and project execution. Team listed table for keys to successful project execution.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Team's offices are in close proximity of each other and within 30 miles from the bridge sites. Designer and Contractor plan to co-locate during procurement and into construction.	
Subtotal:	12	7.0			8.0			7.0			8.0			8.0			
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW			
		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	
3.4.4 Project Management Team	Point Weight	20	Use the Likert Scale			20	Use the Likert Scale			20	Use the Likert Scale			20	Use the Likert Scale		
> The Project Manager shall be the primary person in charge of and responsible for delivery of the Project in accordance with the contract requirements. The Project Manager should have full authority to make final decisions on behalf of the Proposer and have responsibility for communicating these decisions directly to SCDOT. After award of the Project, the Project Manager shall be the primary contact for communications with SCDOT. The SOQ must identify the Project Manager and the employing firm and, if the Project Manager does not have full authority, clearly define what authority the Project Manager has to finalize decisions, the role of the executive level in those decisions, and the role and responsibility of the Project Manager relative to the member firms. >The Project Manager must have a minimum of seven years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects; >The Project Manager shall provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar: o Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables; o Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project; o Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk. >The Project Manager shall attend and lead weekly status meetings during the design and construction phases, and be available at the request of the SCDOT. >For the duration of this procurement or if the proposer is successful, the Project Manager will be considered unavailable for other SCDOT Design-Build procurements if no Assistant Project Manager is provided.	10	8.3	Excellent - 5	PM has 20 years of experience and is the Senior Vice President and General Manager of the company. All 20 years have been with ESW. Projects listed on resume are a mix of DB and DBB that are of similar scope and magnitude. References received were excellent.	6.7	Above Average - 4	PM listed has 8.5 years of experience for Dane. Projects listed are for both DBB and DB of projects of similar scope and magnitude. Roles listed in APM and PM. References received were very good.	8.3	Excellent - 5	PM has 24 years of experience in a progressive career. Projects on resume are both DB and DBB. Experience with complex MOT/staged construction of bridges. Current PM on CLRB 2020-1. References received were very good to excellent.	5.0	Average - 3	PM has 17 years of experience and is the Division Manager & Special Projects Senior Manager. Previous roles on the projects listed in his resume include Project Manager and Division Manager. Projects listed on resume are design-bid-build and smaller in magnitude. Reference received was above average.	10.0	Outstanding - 6	PM has 39 years of experience and is the president of the company. Has full decision authority. Projects listed on resume are both DB and DBB as well as emergency design build bridge replacement experience. Projects listed show similar scope and magnitude. All roles on projects were listed as the PM. References received were above average.	



SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet

Bridge Package 16

2/13/2023-2/14/2023

SCDOT Design-Build

		ESW			Dane			URJV			IPC			Palmetto				
>The Assistant Project Manager shall be the person in charge of and responsible for daily coordination of the design-build Project under direction of the Project Manager. After award of the Project, the Assistant Project Manager will be the daily contact for communications with SCDOT, with primary Project contact remaining the responsibility of the Project Manager. >The Assistant Project Manager must have a minimum of 5 years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects; o The Assistant Project Manager shall provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar: o Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables; o Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project; o Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk. >For the duration of the contract, the Assistant Project Manager shall be dedicated solely to assisting in managing this Project, shall have no other assigned Project responsibilities, and shall not be utilized	10	8.3	Excellent - 5	APM listed has 32 years of experience and is the area manager of the company. Resume shows a progressive career with projects both DB and DBB. References received were very good to excellent.	5.0	Average - 3	APM listed has 8 years all within the same company showing progression in his career. Resume shows projects of DB and DBB bridges and bundles. References were satisfactory.	5.0	Average - 3	APM has 11 years of experience. Projects on resume are both DB and DBB. Previous roles on projects were listed as Project Manager and Project Engineer. References received were very good.	3.3	Below Average - 2	APM has 8 years of experience. Projects on resume include design-bid-build but no design-build experience. Projects include bridge replacements, bridge bundle interstate rehabs, and pedestrian bridges. References received were satisfactory.	8.3	Excellent - 5	APM has over 30 years of experience in various roles of crane operator, superintendent, and assistant project manager. Projects listed on resume are both DB and DBB where he managed as the APM/superintendent. References received were above average to outstanding.		
Subtotal:		20	16.7				11.7				13.3				8.3			
Procurement Officer Initials			CW				CW				CW				CW			
			Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	
3.4.5 Design Engineering Team	Point Weight	10	Use the Likert Scale			10	Use the Likert Scale			10	Use the Likert Scale			10	Use the Likert Scale			
> The Lead Design Engineer shall be in charge of and responsible for all aspects of the design of the Project, subject to oversight of the Project Manager. > The Lead Design Engineer shall have a minimum of 7 years of experience and expertise in managing the design of highway transportation projects after acquiring a professional engineering registration, and must include experience and expertise in the design of projects of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity. > For the duration of the design phase, the Lead Design Engineer will attend all routine project meetings in person, be primarily dedicated to design of the Project, and be available as needed by SCDOT. > The Lead Design Engineer shall be a full time employee of the lead design firm.	10	6.7	Above Average - 4	The LD has over 15 years of experience. Listed as lead roadway engineer and sub consultant lead on projects of similar scope and magnitude both DB and DBB. References received were very good.	10.0	Outstanding - 6	LD has over 37 years of experience. Background with a lot of experience with bridge design and design-build. Projects listed on resume were DB and DBB of much larger scale and magnitude. References received were outstanding.	10.0	Outstanding - 6	LD is new to the company but brings over 33 years of experience. He has held many roles and shown a progressive career. Projects listed on resume are DB and DBB of similar scope and magnitude. Reference received was excellent.	8.3	Excellent - 5	The LD has 32 years of experience leading the NC structures section and associate vice president of the company. Projects listed on his resume are both DBB and DB as well as design-build bridge bundles but of smaller magnitude. References received were above average to excellent.	8.3	Excellent - 5	The LD has over 30 years of experience. He is the president of his company with experience in both DB and DBB projects. Resume lists role of Lead Designer on past SCDOT DB emergency projects and structures engineer and designer. References received were average to slightly above average.		
Subtotal:		10	6.7				10.0				10.0				8.3			
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	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			
The Construction Manager shall be responsible for all aspects of the construction of the Project, subject to oversight of the Project Manager. o The Construction Manager must have a minimum of five years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of the construction of highway transportation projects; o The Construction Manager must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of the construction of projects with similar: o Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables; o Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project; o Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk. o For the duration of construction, the Construction Manager shall have a construction superintendent onsite during all construction activities for each bridge site	10	8.3	Excellent - 5	CM has 39 years of experience showing progression throughout his career. Projects listed are both design-build and design-bid-build. Projects listed are of similar scope and magnitude. Roles listed were in a structures role and not overall construction of the project. References received were excellent.	6.7	Above Average - 4	CM listed has 23 of experience all with Dane. Resume shows major progression moving up in the company. Projects on resume are DB and DBB of similar scope and magnitude. References received were good to very good.	8.3	Excellent - 5	CM has over 31 years of experience. Resume lists experience on both DB and DBB projects of similar scope and magnitude. References received were very good.	3.3	Below Average - 2	The CM has 18 years of experience showing a progressive career with previous companies. Resume lists previous roles as foreman and one job being a superintendent on a single bridge replacement. Projects listed are design-bid-build and showing no design-build experience. References received ranged from poor to above average.	8.3	Excellent - 5	CM has 32 years of experience showing a progressive career through past work experience. Resume lists projects both DB and DBB of similar scope but not all in the same magnitude. Previous roles on the projects list him as the CM. Reference received was above average.		
Subtotal:		10	8.3				6.7				8.3				3.3			
Procurement Officer Initials			CW				CW				CW				CW			



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet																
		Bridge Package 16 2/13/2023-2/14/2023																
		ESW			Dane			URJV			IPC			Palmetto				
		ESW			Dane			URJV			IPC			Palmetto				
3.5 Past Performance of Team		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments		
3.5.1 Experience of Proposer's Team	Point Weight	10	Use the Likert Scale			10	Use the Likert Scale			10	Use the Likert Scale			10	Use the Likert Scale			
Provide no more than 2 projects awarded within the last 10 calendar years that identify the previous work experience by the Lead Contractor or any Major Subcontractors using the Work History and Quality Form o Contractor/Designer. Sections a through g. Projects that have reached substantial completion are preferred.																		
Project 1	2.5	2.1	Excellent - 5	Mount Lebanon: Project was design-bid-build. Two bridges over water. Similar bridge size and scope. Significant key personnel overlap.	2.1	Excellent - 5	13B DB: Design-Build Project, 11 bridge bundle over waterways. 7 of the bridges were staged constructed while the rest were closed and detoured/off-alignment. Key Individual overlap.	2.1	Excellent - 5	CLRB 2020-1: SCDOT DB Project. 16 secondary road bridge bundle over waterways. Project not yet complete. Key Individual overlap.	0.8	Below Average - 2	DBB P041150: Design-Bid-Build project. Single span primary route bridge which is not the same scope and magnitude. Project is not complete nor has the bridge work been started. Key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	EBP 2020-1: Design-Build emergency bridge replacement project. Two bridge bundle over waterways. Secondary routes. Included significant key individual overlap.		
Project 2	2.5	1.7	Above Average - 4	US29 SB: Project was design-bid-build, primary route bridge. 1 bridge. Significant key personnel overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	10B DB: Design-Build Project, 10 bridge bundle of bridges not of the same magnitude. Significant Key Individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	US 521: Project is design-bid build. Single bridge is a primary route over water. Staged construction. No key personnel overlap.	1.3	Average - 3	DBB P039469/P041775: Design-Bid-Build project. Two primary emergency bridge replacements over water ways. Closed and Detoured. Key Individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	SC 34 over Little River: Design-bid-build. New alignment with one primary route bridge replacement. Significant key individual overlap.		
Provide no more than 2 projects for which a design services contract was executed within the last 10 calendar years that identify the previous work experience by the Lead Designer or any Major Design Sub-consultants on the Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer. Projects for which the design services have been completed and accepted by the owner are preferred.																		
Project 3	2.5	1.3	Average - 3	US 76 over 601: Project was design-bid-build. Project was two primary route bridges, one over water and one over a roadway. Key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	2018 DB Batch 1: Design-Build, six bridge bundle over waterways of similar magnitude. No key individual overlap.	2.1	Excellent - 5	CLRB 2020-1: SCDOT DB Project. 16 secondary road bridge bundle over waterways. Project not yet complete. Key Individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	NCDOT Emergency Express DB Package: Five single span bridge replacements over water ways utilizing staged construction. Bridges are not of same magnitude. Key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	EBP 2020-1: Design-Build emergency bridge replacement project. Two bridge bundle over waterways. Secondary routes. Included significant key individual overlap.		
Project 4	2.5	1.7	Above Average - 4	24 Rapid Replacement: Design-Build project with 24 bridges over water ways and grade seperation. No key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	2016 DB Batch 4/5: Design-Build, 11 bridges over water crossings. Team member overlap but not any key individuals.	2.1	Excellent - 5	Monroe Bypass: Design-Build Project. 37 bridges and 8 interchanges, new roadway alignment. No key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	Emergency Bridge Package 2016 1A: SCDOT Emergency Design-Build procurement with four bridges over waterways. Closed and detoured. No key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	I95 0-8: Design-bid-build. Interstate widening with multiple bridges over water, railroad, and roadways utilizing staged construction. Key Individual overlap.		
Subtotal:		10	6.7				7.1				7.9				5.4			
Procurement Officer Initials		CW					CW					CW					CW	
3.5 Past Performance of Team	Point Weight	30	Use the Likert Scale			30	Use the Likert Scale			30	Use the Likert Scale			30	Use the Likert Scale			
3.5.2 Quality of Past Performance																		
> For each of the projects identified per Section 3.5.1, provide the information requested in Sections H and I of the Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer that is included in the Appendix B. > The Proposer shall provide a Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer for all transportation projects, active or completed, within the last five years that has a "yes" response to any of the following questions. Sections A through G and Section J shall be completed. > Has the Lead Contractor or any member of the joint venture been declared delinquent or placed in default on any Project? > Has the Lead Contractor or any member of the joint venture submitted a claim on a project that was litigated? If litigated, explain the results. > Have any projects been delayed more than 30 days such that liquidated damages were assessed? > Has the Lead Contractor been cited by OSHA for violations deemed serious, willful, or repeated? > Have any projects under contract with the Lead Contractor or any member of the joint venture been subject to remediation actions, stop work orders, or project delays in excess of 30 days as a result of Section 404/Section 401 permit violations? > Has an owner, a Lead Contractor, or any member of a joint venture filed a claim against the Lead Designer's Errors and Omissions Insurance? > Has the Lead Designer filed legal proceedings against the Lead Contractor, or vice versa, on a design-build contract?																		
Project 1	2.5	2.5	Outstanding - 6	Mount Lebanon: Project was completed 4 months ahead of schedule with no claims or LDs. Contractor completed additional scope and finished \$200k under original contract amount.	1.7	Above Average - 4	13B DB: Project completed on time. VE study completed on two bridges for a cost savings to the owner. No claims or LDs.	2.1	Excellent - 5	CLRB 2020-1: 15 of 16 structures are now complete and open to traffic. Project is tracking 5 months ahead of schedule. To date no claims. Project is not complete.	1.3	Average - 3	DBB P0414150: Project currently is not complete. Project is tracking to be completed on time with no claims to date.	1.7	Above Average - 4	EBP 2020-1: On time and on budget. Above average performance scores from SCDOT. Included additional scope and rework on one of the bridges due to another significant rainfall event. No claims or LDs.		



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet														
		Bridge Package 16 2/13/2023-2/14/2023														
		ESW				Dane		URJV		IPC		Palmetto				
Project 2	2.5	1.3	Average - 3	US29: Project was completed on time with an extension due to supply chain issues. No claims or LDs assessed.	1.7	Above Average - 4	DIV10: On time and on budget. Project had a tight schedule. One bridge was incentivized and was fully paid. No claims or LDs.	1.3	Average - 3	US 521: Staged construction with significant MOT work. Write up is generic. Project is not complete.	1.7	Above Average - 4	DBB P039469/P041775: Completed on time under an aggressive schedule with additional emergency repair worked added. No LDs or claims assessed.	1.7	Above Average - 4	SC 34 over Little River: On time and under budget. No claims or LDs.
Project 3	2.5	1.3	Average - 3	US 76 over 601: Project design complete but not yet constructed. LD was a sub to the project and designed the bridge over the roadway and not over water. On time and on budget.	1.7	Above Average - 4	2018 Batch 1: Project was completed on time and on budget with no claims. Designer was heavily involved with the Contractor to help stay on schedule.	2.1	Excellent - 5	CLRB 2020-1: 16 bridges all have RFC plans complete. 15 of 16 bridges are complete and open to traffic and are tracking 5 months ahead of schedule completion.	1.3	Average - 3	NCDOT Emergency Express DB Package: Plans delivered on time and project completed on time. Project lacked discussion on quality initiatives.	1.7	Above Average - 4	EBP 2020-1: On time and on budget. Above average performance scores from SCDOT. Plans delivered on time.
Project 4	2.5	1.3	Average - 3	24 Rapid Replacement: Team subconsultant performed the work on time and on budget. Multiple design teams utilized to complete the project on time. Pending legal proceedings, lawsuits, or claims are ongoing but not apart of the design team for this project.	1.3	Average - 3	2016 DB Batch 4/5: Project completed on time. No claims or LDs listed. Write up was generic.	1.7	Above Average - 4	Monroe Bypass: Complex design of 37 bridges and eight interchanges. Project design complete on time with the exception of project delay.	1.7	Above Average - 4	Emergency Bridge Package 2016 1A: Early team coordination managing concurrent bridge designs working on critical key areas first. Plans completed on time utilizing multiple design offices. Project completed on time and on budget.	1.3	Average - 3	I95 0-8: Aggressive design schedule that was completed on time. References note the plan quality was below average. Discusses innovated MOT patterns developed as well as risk management for the project. The project is not complete.
All other projects	5	5.0	Outstanding - 6	No other projects listed.	5.0	Outstanding - 6	No other projects listed.	3.3	Above Average - 4	Three bridge packages were listed with LDs on the contractor's side. Two of the bridge packages still were completed on time. The designer has one E&O claim that are working through mediation.	3.3	Above Average - 4	Lead Designer lists two error and omissions claims. One claim has been fully resolved.	5.0	Outstanding - 6	No other projects listed.
Previous Contractor Performance Evaluation System and Consultant Performance Evaluation Scores. Other available information related to past performance.	15	10.0	Above Average - 4	No Design Build Performance scores provided for Contractor or Lead Designer. CPES (Holt)- 3 year average is 7.61 out of 10 and this is above average to very good. CPS (ESW) - 80.42 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for the Contractor are excellent. References for the Lead Designer are above average.	10.0	Above Average - 4	No Design Build Performance scores on record for Contractor or Lead Designer. CPES (NS) - 3 year average is 7.85 out of 10 and this is above average to very good. CPS (Dane) - 78.26 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for the Contractor are very good. References for the Lead Designer are very good.	12.5	Excellent - 5	Design Build Performance Scores for this Designer were above average. DBPS for this contractor both United and Reeves were slightly above average in design phase and went to above average. during construction. CPES (RKK) - 3 year average is 7.94 out of 10 and this is above average to very good. CPS (United) - 83.34 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. CPS (Reeves) - 72.13 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for United are average to above average. References for Reeves are average to above average. References for the Lead Designer are above average.	7.5	Average - 3	Design Build Performance Scores for this Designer were slightly above average to above average. No Design Build Performance scores on record for the Contractor. CPES (JMT) - 3 year average is 6.81 out of 10 and this is slightly above average to average. CPS (IPC) - 78.50 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. This is based on default scores except safety. References for the Contractor are above average. References for the Lead Designer are slightly above average.	10.0	Above Average - 4	Design Build Performance Scores for this Designer were above average. DBPS for this contractor were slightly above average in design phase and went to above average during construction. CPES (CTEA) - 3 year average is 7.39 out of 10 and this is above average to very good. CPS (Palmetto) - 76.92 based on safety index and is well above the threshold established by DOC. References for the Contractor are slightly above average. References for the Lead Designer are average to slightly above average.
Subtotal:	30	21.3			21.3			22.9			16.7			21.3		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW			CW			CW		
Total Score			ESW			Dane			URJV			IPC			Palmetto	
Points			100.0			100.0			100.0			100.0			100.0	
Total:	100.0		70.6			69.2			75.0			54.6			76.9	
Procurement Officer Initials			CW			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 February 13-14 and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFQ.																
Michael Pitts Chairperson																
Levi Mcleod Voting Member																
Brooks Bickley Voting Member																
David Rister Voting Member																
Melissa Espinoza Voting Member																
Carmen Wright Procurement Officer																
Brian Gambrell Legal																