

SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet					
	Bridge Package 16					
	5/23/2023-5/24/2023					
	Palmetto		URJV		ESW	
Preliminary Responsiveness and Responsibility	Pass/Fail	Comments	Pass/Fail	Comments	Pass/Fail	Comments
Were the Proposals submitted in accordance with the Milestone Schedule?	Pass		Pass		Pass	
Is a Technical Proposal Narrative provided?	Pass		Pass		Pass	
Are Conceptual Plans provided?	Pass		Pass		Pass	
Is Proposer still considered responsible?	Pass		Pass		Pass	
Procurement Officer Initials	CW		CW		CW	
Responsiveness	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments
Is the Stipend Acknowledgement Form provided?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
Is the Stipend Agreement provided?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
Is the EEO Certificate provided?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
Is the Non-Collusion Certificate provided?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
Is the Addendum Receipt provided?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
Is the Org Chart and Availability of Key Individuals documents provided?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
Procurement Officer Initials	CW		CW		CW	
Technical Proposal Narrative	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments
1. Describe Project Delivery and Approach by discussing/providing the following:						
1a) Describe the Project Delivery & Approach to include assurances and ability to complete the Project within the required timeframe.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirments of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
1b) Describe your approach to design and how it minimized the need for new right-of-way on the project.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirments of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
1c) Describe the proposed design submittal process and include a chart showing anticipated deliverables in sequence that will allow SCDOT to conduct efficient and complete reviews. Include discussion of how the design review process is related to any proposed project phasing. Dates do not need to be included in the chart showing anticipated deliverables.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirments of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
CPM Schedule; include at a minimum: Design phases/breakdown Start and finish milestones for all segments, sections, or phases Details of traffic control plans Traffic shifts Utility windows Right-of-Way acquisitions/right-of-entry Special contract Requirements Known or expected risks		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirments of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
	Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score	
Overall Adjectival Score:	A		A		A	
Procurement Officer Initials	CW		CW		CW	
Technical Proposal Appendices	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments
A.1) Provide Conceptual Roadway Plans: The intent of conceptual roadway plans is for the proposer to clearly demonstrate their understanding of requirements of the RFP and the Team's approach to meet those requirements. The quality of the plans will be reviewed and scored for design content and compliance with RFP requirements, including ATC's, if any, rather than plan development/preparation conformance. The following shall be provided.						
a) Typical sections for all roadways shall include as a minimum (11"x17" plan sheets): • Design speed • Functional classification • Lane configuration and widths • Shoulder and median widths • Cross slopes • Point of grade • Notes and details as necessary		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
b) Plan and profile for the entire project limits including interchange layouts  Plan view shall include as a minimum: • Geometric layout with reference data • Superelevation data • Taper lengths • Deceleration/acceleration lengths • Construction limits • Existing and proposed Right of Way • Clear zone limits • Roadside barriers (location and type) • Bridge and box culverts • Approximate limits of retaining walls • Horizontal clearance at obstructions (any critical locations) • Indicate any design exceptions approved in the RFP • Material Staging and Laydown Areas  Profile view shall indicate:  • Grades & elevations • Vertical curvature (PI station & elevation, length & K value, stopping site distance design speed met) • Bridge clearance envelopes	Multiple	Plans missing required SSD label 4.1.3b in profile view. Non-MASH compliant guardrail used at SC 183 over Gregory Creek. Cross Sections and plan views are inconsistent where multiple items are shown on one or the other.	Omitted Items	Omitted the requirement of RFP Section 4.1.3b to label stopping sight distance design speed met.	Omitted Items	Omitted the requirement of RFP Section 4.1.3b to label stopping sight distance design speed met. K values not labeled on Holder Knob Road, SC 183 (over Twelve Mile Creek), All Good Farm Road, & Holder Knob Road do not tie into the existing conditions & require additional impacts that are not depicted in the technical proposal. SC 183 Gregory Creek End of Bridge, Twelve Mile Creek Begin Bridge: Construction/excavation limits on plan sheet do not encompass existing embankment (per Exhibit 4b Section 2.1.24).
c) Cross sections only where necessary to indicate a significant difference from the conceptual plans in the Project Information Package. These should be limited to only those showing a significant change and may be segmented for only the areas where changes occur (11"x17" plan sheets). However, for US 123 Northbound and Southbound designs, cross sections at 50' intervals and at the begin/end bridge stations are required.	Multiple	Plans did not consider the interfaces between US 123 SB and US 123 NB medians. Clearzone requirements not met on SC 183 over Twelve Mile Creek. SC 183 Box culvert extension length shown short of fill slope requirement in RFP culvert criteria (projection 1' below top slab at end of culvert).		Meets the requirements of the RFP.	RFP Conformance Issues	Use of 1.5:1 slopes in multiple locations do not meet the requirements of the RFP and no ATC was submitted for this deviation.
d) Special emphasis details (where needed to clearly demonstrate understanding and approach - isolated locations such as ramp ties, wall types, etc.) (11"x17" plan sheets).		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
	Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score	
Overall Adjectival Score:	C		B		C	
Procurement Officer Initials	CW		CW		CW	
Technical Proposal Appendices	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments
A.2) Provide Maintenance of Traffic Plans which shall consist of the following:						
a.) Plan for areas deemed critical by the design team for staging concerns. These areas may require cross sections for more detail.	Omitted Items	Cross-over cross sections are omitted from the plans. This should have been provided as this is a critical element of the MOT plans.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.	Omitted Items	Minimum 2' barrier offset not provided for SC 183 Twelve Mile Creek, Phase 1 Typical Section 2 and for US 123 EB/NB, Phase 2 Typical.
b.) Plan for access to the work zone (ingress and egress).		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
c.) Plan for maintaining traffic, including driveway access.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
d.) Plan for maintaining positive temporary drainage during stages.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
e.) Plan for notifying the traveling public of upcoming stages.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
	Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score	
Overall Adjectival Score:	B		A		B	
Procurement Officer Initials	CW		CW		CW	

SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet						
Bridge Package 16						
5/23/2023-5/24/2023						
SCDOT Design-Build						
Technical Proposal Appendices	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments
A.3) Provide Conceptual Bridge Plans which shall consist of the following:						
a) Plan and profile of bridge, including but not limited to: horizontal and vertical clearances, hydrology data, intent for bridge deck and bridge end drainage, anticipated foundation type, approximate toe of slope with abutment grading and riprap, expansion joint locations and type, and bearing conditions at each bent.	RFP Conformance Issues	US 123 NB & SC 183 Gregory Creek: Proposed bridge width exceeds 1' requirement in Exhibit 4b Section 2.1.4.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.	RFP Conformance Issues	US 123 Georges Creek: Additional deck width for straight bridge with roadway curvature exceeds 1-foot (Exhibit 4b, 2.1.4). US 123 Georges Creek: Deck drainage intent not shown.
b) Superstructure cross sections and substructure elevations showing pertinent structural elements and dimensions.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.	Omitted Items	US 123 Georges Creek: Anticipated deck thickness not shown. MASH barrier parapet not identified.
c) Construction staging plan for bridge work including dimensions of temporary roadway widths both on the bridges and, where applicable, on the roadway beneath the bridges (not required when traffic is detoured at the bridge site).	RFP Conformance Issues	SC 183 both bridges: 10' MOT lane widths shown (11' minimum required).		Meets the requirements of the RFP.	Lack of Engineering Judgement	US 123 Georges Creek: Conflict shown between proposed Stage 2 portion of new bridge and existing bridge. US 123 alignment will need to shift further north to eliminate conflict and provide a constructable design.
d) Bridge construction access plan showing areas used to access the bridge work and showing proposed equipment and material handling locations and staging (not required when traffic is detoured at the bridge site).	Omitted Items	BCA plans were omitted.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.	Omitted Items	BCA plans were omitted.
e) Retaining wall envelopes at the bridge ends showing top of wall, ground lines, and bottom of wall (required only if retaining walls are proposed).		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
	Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score	
Overall Adjectival Score:	C		A		C	
Procurement Officer Initials	CW		CW		CW	
Innovation and Added Value:	Comments		Comments		Comments	
a) Ability to meet project schedule goals including milestone schedule dates.	Reduction in overall contract time by 270 days.		Reduction in overall contract time by 412 days.		SC 124 contract time shortened 100 days.	
b) Avoid or minimize impacts to utilities. Credit will not be awarded in this section for paying prior rights, only for avoidance of impacts.	Avoidance of SC124 18" waterline relocation.		Avoidance of SC 124 18" waterline relocation.		Avoidance of SC 124 18" waterline relocation.	
c) Avoid or minimize impacts to right of way. Credit will not be awarded in this section for paying premiums, only for avoidance of impacts.	Reduction in ROW impacts.				Reduction in ROW impacts.	
d.) Minimizing impacts to traffic						
e.) Additional Items:			Removal of SC 124 bridge and intersection realignment.			
	Quality Credit Points		Quality Credit Points		Quality Credit Points	
Point Value:	15.26		38.02		12.69	
Procurement Officer Initials	CW		CW		CW	
<div> <div> I certify that the scores (weighted scores are rounded) shown on this sheet(s) accurately reflect the actions of the Committee on May 23-24, 2023 and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFP. </div> <div> <div> <div>Michael Pitts</div> <div>Chairperson</div> </div> <div> <div>Levi McLeod</div> <div>Voting Member</div> </div> <div> <div>Maddy Barbian</div> <div>Voting Member</div> </div> <div> <div>Melissa Espinoza</div> <div>Voting Member</div> </div> <div> <div>-</div> <div>Voting Member</div> </div> <div> <div>Carmen Wright</div> <div>Procurement Officer</div> </div> <div> <div>Brian Gambrell</div> <div>Legal</div> </div> </div> </div>						