

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|-----------------------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------|---|---------------|--------------------------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------|--|
| SCDOT Design-Build | | SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 0040308 US 301 over Four Hole Swamp | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Monday, May 2, 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Cape Romain - NS | | | | Crowder - TranSystem | | | Dellinger - CarolinaTEA | | | UIG - ICE | |
| 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 D-U-N-S Number 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 | | CW | | | |
| 3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution | | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments |
| 3.3.1 Organizational Chart, Team Structure, and Team Integration | Point Weight | 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 . | 5 | 1.7 | Below Average - 2 | Communications lines are not clear between SCDOT District 7 and the Project Management Team. The Hierarchy is unclear on the QM Team and the PM Team. It appears PM and APM report to D7 through the Public Relations Team. Design QC and Construction QC are showing relationships with Lead Design Engineer and Construction Manager, but it is unclear if this is referring to the entire QM Team. | 3.3 | Above Average - 4 | Easy to read and determine relationships. Potential DBE sub opportunities listed. | 1.7 | Below Average - 2 | No Road Construction listed on Org Chart, Dellinger is listed for the Bridge Superintendent. Document Control has no communication line to PM. PM does not communicate with SCDOT RCE. QM and QC report to the CM, the goal is to have these independent of each other. SCDOT has no communication line with the RCE. No mention of Earthwork in the org Chart. | 1.7 | Below Average - 2 | Chart is logically organized. Shows organization down to the design discipline. No legend given for the lines connecting members or the key individuals. RCE shows no lines of communication with the CM, PM, or SCDOT. |
| 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 integration on page 3 is just a clarification of the Org chart and duties of each member. The functional relationships are lacking clarity. | 2.0 | Above Average - 4 | Thorough description of Team Structure and functional relationships. PM authority limited to 10k. Utilizing the PDCM-22 Quality Control Checklist, Pre-Submittal Constructability Reviews from Construction Team. | 1.5 | Average - 3 | simple 3 person chain of command. No design-build integration techniques or strategies included in the relationships. | 1.0 | Below Average - 2 | Generic description with no specific integration strategies listed. Present DB Coordinator as an integration strategy. Relying on an unidentified DB Coordinator to communicate between Lead Designer and Contractor on a daily basis. |



| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---------------------|--|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| SCDOT Design-Build | | | SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 0040308 US 301 over Four Hole Swamp | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Monday, May 2, 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Cape Romain - NS | | | Crowder - TranSystem | | | Dellinger - CarolinaTEA | | | UIG - ICE | | |
| Identify in tabular form if any of the firms and/or Key Individuals have worked together on the same team (not just on the same job) in the past. Describe the types of projects they worked on, the year(s) they worked together, the level of participation, and a reference contact name, email address, and phone number for that project. | 2 | | 0.7 | Below Average - 2 | Designer and Contractor do not have a history of working together on Design-Build projects. The asterisk on Page 4 was not attached to any projects, but it clearly states that some of the projects were not in the 7 year limitation in the RFQ. There is no mention of years worked together for any of the team members. | 1.0 | Average - 3 | Table is limited, no further description given for level of participation or details of project. Table shows a history of working together, just not in this capacity on SCDOT highway bridges. | 0.7 | Below Average - 2 | limited overlap of lead designer and contractor on a constructed bridge project. | 2.0 | Outstanding - 6 | Extremely consistent working history as a team with Key individuals working together multiple times on successful projects. |
| Subtotal: | | 10 | | 3.3 | | 6.3 | | | 3.8 | | | 4.7 | | |
| Procurement Officer Initials | | | | CW | | CW | | | CW | | | CW | | |
| 3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution | | | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments |
| 3.3.2 Critical Risks | | Point Weight | 4 | Use the Likert Scale | | 4 | Use the Likert Scale | | 4 | Use the Likert Scale | | 4 | Use the Likert Scale | |
| SCDOT has identified the following risks as critical risks for this project: > Wetland and stream mitigation > Geotechnical subsurface conditions > Market conditions > Maintenance of traffic Discuss the strategies the Proposer's team will implement to mitigate or eliminate each risk including how the proposed personnel and organizational structure would aid in the mitigation of the risk. Describe the role that the Proposer expects SCDOT or other agencies to have in addressing these Project risks. | 4 | | 2.0 | Average - 3 | MOT - more research needed into the transition location, need to develop a strategy for handling the crossover - this led to categorizing as low risk which SCDOT believes to be higher. Good discussion on the Wetland and Stream Mitigation. Minimal strategies presented for mitigating geotechnical conditions. Good clarification of project specific risks based on the list given. | 3.3 | Excellent - 5 | Thorough description for each of the given risks. Referenced the sensitive soils and previous project history with similar soils. Conducted research to identify existing construction speed limit and the width of the existing culvert to determine that it would hold the required 11ft lanes for MOT. Previous early works package as used on SC4 to mitigate the Material Lead times risk. | 1.3 | Below Average - 2 | Detailed description of how Palustrine process for Mitigation. Broad stroke response to Geotech (ideas mentioned, but not presented), Market Conditions, and MOT. Format could be easier to read and understand. | 2.7 | Above Average - 4 | detailed discussion of risks and mitigation methods. Prior research done on the MOT of the project as well as the Geotech. Ongoing project experience with market conditions in the region to avoid many of the risks associated with market conditions. Proposed drilled piles to mitigate geologic conditions. Specific environmental sub to help with wetland mitigation risks. |
| Subtotal: | | 4 | | 2.0 | | 3.3 | | | 1.3 | | | 2.7 | | |
| Procurement Officer Initials | | | | CW | | CW | | | CW | | | CW | | |
| 3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution | | | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments |
| 3.3.3 Project Resources, Strategies, and Execution | | Point Weight | 6 | Use the Likert Scale | | 6 | Use the Likert Scale | | 6 | Use the Likert Scale | | 6 | Use the Likert Scale | |
| Demonstrate the team's capacity and available resources including personnel for this project. | 1.5 | | 0.8 | Average - 3 | ample staff and availability for this project. Clarity not given for staff and equipment available for this specific project. Team mentions specific references to flat slab bridge knowledge and required equipment available for this project. | 1.3 | Excellent - 5 | Called out required labor and equipment for the project. Noted they will have two crews for structures and two roadway crews committed to the project. | 0.3 | Poor - 1 | Did not demonstrate capacity and available resources. No specific amount of equipment or bridge crews presented. | 1.0 | Above Average - 4 | shows committed personnel for construction and design relative to capacity. Committing 5 crews for the project to achieve the schedule. |
| 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. | 1.5 | | 0.5 | Below Average - 2 | No specific number of bridge or roadway crews given. Limited information provided for this specific section of the SOQ. Major tasks performed by others are not clearly identified. (Road and Geotech) | 1.3 | Excellent - 5 | Clearly described the strategy for implementation of resources and who will perform specific tasks. Noted they will use the Story-Board planning session to define the critical path, this is a DBIA best practice. No strategies listed were Geotechnical related, this would have insured that driven precast piles would be an appropriate foundation type. | 0.5 | Below Average - 2 | generic ideas presented with no real details of the proposers strategy for implementation of resources to execute the contract. No Discussion given. Major tasks not identified like roadwork and paving not shown in "strategy for Implementation of resources" table. | 0.8 | Average - 3 | List of what UIG and ICE would perform as well as the major subs. Many self performed tasks between UIG and ICE. Paving is being performed by a major subconsultant that is unidentified. No other discussion given other than the table. |
| Discuss any innovative approaches or unique outreach or marketing concepts used successfully by the Proposer to encourage DBE participation. | 1.5 | | 0.3 | Poor - 1 | no discussion of innovative approaches or unique outreach or marketing concepts. Only listed one DBE firm that will be utilized. What is your DBE approach and what are the opportunities in construction. | 1.5 | Outstanding - 6 | DPE participation is a standard operating procedure at Crowder. Very clear DBE solicitations and advertising. History of participating on CAGC HR Committee for over 20 years shows a commitment to the industry. | 0.3 | Poor - 1 | Discussion revolved around work being assigned to DBEs, No discussion of outreach or marketing used to attract DBEs. | 0.8 | Average - 3 | Minimal Discussion, but meet the requirements of the RFQ. The team will provide mentoring and financing to the selected firms for the project. |
| Indicate how the geographical location of the firms will enhance integration, communication, issue resolution, and project execution. | 1.5 | | 0.8 | Average - 3 | All of the team is located within an hour of the project site. Project is centrally located to the Team. No mention of other features to enhance integration or communication such as a field office or web meetings. | 1.0 | Above Average - 4 | Large mobile office will be located on site for the contractor and designer team members. Entire Team is within 2 hours of the job site. | 0.5 | Below Average - 2 | Dellinger and CTEA are located 30 min apart in NC, but the SC location of CTEA is the one located 5 min from SCDOT. This is a bit misleading/deceptive. Contractor's Resources are 2 hours from the project site. | 1.0 | Above Average - 4 | Description of how the team will collaborate. Crews are mobilizing from the nearby Jedburg Road project. Included a Graphic to show the geographical location of the collaboration office and recent jedburg road as well as the project location. |



| SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--|-------------------------|----------------------|---|-----------|----------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 0040308 US 301 over Four Hole Swamp | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monday, May 2, 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Crowder - TranSystem | | | Dellinger - CarolinaTEA | | | UIG - ICE | | | | | | | | |
| 5.0 | | | 1.5 | | | 3.5 | | | | | | | | |
| CW | | | CW | | | CW | | | | | | | | |
| Crowder - TranSystem | | | Dellinger - CarolinaTEA | | | UIG - ICE | | | | | | | | |
| Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments | | | | | | |
| 20 | Use the Likert Scale | | 20 | Use the Likert Scale | | 20 | Use the Likert Scale | | | | | | | |
| 8.3 | Excellent - 5 | Patrick Buckley - 14 years progressive experience in managing SCDOT Design-Build bridge replacements. DBIA Certified. Entire career at Crowder. Positive references. | 6.7 | Above Average - 4 | Ronnie Melker - 20 years bridge building experience including 15 years in management roles on bridges that were more complex than 301. Full Authority to make decisions. Positive reference received. | 6.7 | Above Average - 4 | Wayne Whiting - 25 years progressive experience. Extensive SCDOT DB Experience in primarily bridge projects. Full authority to make decisions. Been with UIG for over 20 years. One reference received, responder had no real interaction with Wayne. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| SCDOT Design-Build | | | SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--|---|----------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---|-----------|----------------------|--|--|
| | | | 0040308 US 301 over Four Hole Swamp | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Monday, May 2, 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Cape Romain - NS | | | Crowder - TranSystem | | | Dellinger - CarolinaTEA | | | UIG - ICE | | | |
| <p>o 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.</p> <p>o The Assistant Project Manager must have a minimum of five years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects;</p> <p>o The Assistant Project Manager shall provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar:</p> <p>o Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables;</p> <p>o Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project;</p> <p>o Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk.</p> <p>o For the duration of the contract, the Assistant Project Manager shall be dedicated solely to assisting in managing this Project, shall have no other assigned Project responsibilities, and shall not be utilized on any other projects.</p> <p>o The Assistant Project Manager shall be available to be on-site during all construction activities,</p> | 10 | | 5.0 | Average - 3 | Mickey O'Rourke - recent relevant experience with SCDOT flat slab bridges. Has worked with the PM on a past project. Adequate experience for the project. Good reference received. | 8.3 | Excellent - 5 | Mitchell Davis, 25 years experience in similar SCDOT Design-Build Bridge projects. Worked on SC4 which was a nearly identical project for SCDOT. History of delivering projects on tight time frames. His Design-Build experience is limited. Multiple positive references. | 6.7 | Above Average - 4 | PM Scores shown for APM to calculate correctly. | 6.7 | Above Average - 4 | PM Scores shown for APM to calculate correctly. | |
| Subtotal: | 20 | | 11.7 | | | 16.7 | | | 13.3 | | | 13.3 | | | |
| 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 | |
| 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 | | |
| <p>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.</p> <p>o The Lead Design Engineer must have a minimum of seven years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the design of highway transportation projects after acquiring a professional engineering registration;</p> <p>o The Lead Design Engineer shall provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the design of projects with similar:</p> <p>o Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables;</p> <p>o Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project;</p> <p>o Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>o The Lead Design Engineer shall be a full time employee of the lead design firm.</p> | 10 | | 8.3 | Excellent - 5 | Jeff Walters - 35 years experience managing complex bridge projects all over the country with greater scope and complexity than 301. Many were Design-Build Projects and a variety of different types of structures. Good References received. | 5.0 | Average - 3 | Walker Roberts - 13 years experience, 2 years with TranSystems and previous 11 with STV as Road Design Engineer. Majority of past experience is in Road Design. No References responded for Walker. | 8.3 | Excellent - 5 | Derek Staton - 20 years experience in management of DB projects including SCDOT Bridge packages. Structures background. Multiple positive references. | 8.3 | Excellent - 5 | Rafi Jamaluddin - Extensive experience in the industry and on multiple projects of similar scope and complexity. Some of the projects listed were of Lead Bridge Engineer. Multiple positive references. | |
| Subtotal: | 10 | | 8.3 | | | 5.0 | | | 8.3 | | | 8.3 | | | |
| Procurement Officer Initials | | | | CW | | | CW | | | CW | | | CW | | |



| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|-------------|--|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| SCDOT Design-Build | | | SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 0040308 US 301 over Four Hole Swamp | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Monday, May 2, 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Cape Romain - NS | | | Crowder - TranSystem | | | Dellinger - CarolinaTEA | | | UIG - ICE | | | |
| 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 | | |
| <p>o The Construction Manager shall be responsible for all aspects of the construction of the Project, subject to oversight of the Project Manager.</p> <p>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;</p> <p>o The Construction Manager must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of the construction of projects with similar:</p> <p>o Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables;</p> <p>o Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project;</p> <p>o Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>o The Construction Manager shall be on-site during all construction activities for the Project and attend status meetings during the construction phase.</p> | 10 | | 6.7 | Above Average - 4 | Jimmy Bragg - 27 years experience with Cape Romain, recent work on Bainbridge Connector, SOQ lists no DB experience as the prime. Superintendent on past projects, not CM. Similar scope and complexity. One positive reference received. | 8.3 | Excellent - 5 | William Culbertson - 35 years experience for multiple bridge contractors. Multiple SCDOT Design-Build Bridge projects. Positive references given, in addition 2 additional reference response said they were unfamiliar with him or his work. Positive Internal reference from SC4. | 5.0 | Average - 3 | Christopher McCray - 30 years CM experience - minimal DB experience. No mention of the two projects currently assigned to. Recent projects are not similar structure type to 301. Satisfactory references received. | 8.3 | Excellent - 5 | Chris Fennell - Relevant recent experience on DB projects. Good references received. Assigned to multiple projects in the recent time frame. Extensive experience in the industry with Flat Slab Bridges and precast concrete piles recently. | |
| Subtotal: | | 10 | | 6.7 | | | 8.3 | | | 5.0 | | | 8.3 | | |
| Procurement Officer Initials | | | | CW | | | CW | | | CW | | | CW | | |
| | | | Cape Romain - NS | | | Crowder - TranSystem | | | Dellinger - CarolinaTEA | | | UIG - ICE | | | |
| 3.5 Past Performance of Team | | | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments | |
| 3.5.1 Experience of Proposer's Team | Point Weight | | 10 | Use the Likert Scale | | 10 | Use the Likert Scale | | 10 | Use the Likert Scale | | 10 | Use the Likert Scale | | |
| <p>Provide no more than three projects awarded within the last seven 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.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project 1 | 1.67 | 2.50 | 1.1 | Above Average - 4 | Bainbridge Connector - Flat slab bridge, DB, prime was doing the same work. Cape Romain was a Sub on the project and it was on new location. Utilized Top down Construction to avoid environmental impacts. | 1.4 | Excellent - 5 | EMBP 2020-2 - SC4 very similar DB project for SCDOT. Same PM and Construction Manager as 301. MOT was a detour. Flat slab bridge. | 1.3 | Average - 3 | Bridge Package - Bolton Branch and Old Chestnut Ferry Road - DBB - Flat Slab Bridges of similar span lengths. | 1.1 | Above Average - 4 | US 15 over Indian Field Swamp - DBIA Award, Similar seismic design conditions, similar type structure. Close and Detour. No Key individuals being shared with this 301 proposal. | |
| Project 2 | 1.67 | 2.50 | 1.1 | Above Average - 4 | HLT Wharf - Similar complexity with precast driven piles. Not similar schedule constraints. PM and Assistant PM worked together on this project. | 1.1 | Above Average - 4 | SC9/49 Multi BR - One Flat Slab bridge over a canal, phased MOT, DBB, PM and William Culbertson worked on the project. Shows Crowder's ability to deliver complex project. | 1.3 | Average - 3 | S101 over Turkey Creek - Top down construction methods, Flat slab bridge, DBB. Chris McCray was CM on this projet. | 1.1 | Above Average - 4 | US 176 - ACEC Engineering excellence award. Different bridge type, but Emergency DB Bridge Replacement. Rafi is overlapping Key Individual. | |
| Project 3 | 1.67 | | 0.8 | Average - 3 | Springmaid Pier - example of successful project with some similar design aspects (driven piles with concrete caps). Positive relationship with owner during and after the fact. | 1.1 | Above Average - 4 | EBP #6 - Flat Slabs on an Accelerated Design-Build Schedule. PM and William Culbertson worked on the project. Close and Detour, no MOT. | 0.0 | | Created Additional Column C to account for only 2 projects provided as allowed by the RFQ. All other weights with the exception of C95 and C96 will pull from Column B. | 0.8 | Average - 3 | I77 SB over Catawba - MOT Crossover relevant to 301. Project was a Rehab project, not new bridge construction. Bridge over Waterway. Construction manager Chris Fennel was CM on this project. | |



| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|--------------|--|-------------------|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------|--|------------------|-------------------|--|----------|
| SCDOT Design-Build | | | SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 0040308 US 301 over Four Hole Swamp | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Monday, May 2, 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Cape Romain - NS | | | Crowder - TranSystem | | | Dellinger - CarolinaTEA | | | UIG - ICE | | | |
| Provide no more than three projects for which a design services contract was executed within the last seven 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 | 1.67 | 2.50 | 0.8 | Average - 3 | Pio Nono - DB project, but the Design lead was not present on this project, but the Bridge Designer (Justin Wood) will be used on 301. More complex structure than 301 but lacking similar elements of the scope in MOT, environmental, and geotechnical. Quality provided for the time constraints of building the superstructure over the railroad. | 0.8 | Average - 3 | CSX Bridge over I-85 - Not flat slab, not highway bridge, over traffic/not water, RR bridge. Not a similar project to 301. Structural Lead for 301 provided construction support on this project. Same PM for 301. | 1.3 | Average - 3 | EBP 2018-2A - cored slab bridges, 2 single spans, 1 3 span bridge. Top down Construction, emergency DB on accelerated schedule, F&ME and Lead Designer were on this and proposed on 301. Successful project. | 1.1 | Above Average - 4 | EBP #4 - SCDOT DB Project on an accelerated schedule. Low volume cored slab bridges with driven piles on some interior bents. Same project team UIG/ICE as proposed 301. | |
| Project 5 | 1.67 | 2.50 | 1.1 | Above Average - 4 | DB Bridge Replacements 4 and 5 - Express Design-Build projects. Less complex structures, but there were 11 of them completed on time and budget. Same lead structural engineer given for 301. Lacking similar elements of MOT. | 1.1 | Above Average - 4 | Mt. Gallant BR - Flat Slab Bridge over water on an accelerated schedule with MOT. Lead Design Engineer proposed for 301 was in that position here. | 1.3 | Average - 3 | EBP 2020-1 - 2 cored slab bridges, 1 single span, 1 3 span, Top down Construction, Emergency DB on accelerated schedule. F&ME and Lead Designer were on this and proposed on 301. Successful project. | 1.1 | Above Average - 4 | EBP 2018-1 - Interstate overpass and love volume cored slab bridge. SCDOT Design-Build with same project team UIG/ICE with multiple key individuals of proposed 301. | |
| Project 6 | 1.67 | | 1.1 | Above Average - 4 | DB Bridge Replacement 1 - Express Design-Build precast bridges. Similar complexity with 6 bridge replacements in North GA. Same lead structural engineer given for 301. Lacking Geotechnical specifics as indicated as a risk for 301. | 0.8 | Average - 3 | GDOT SR 135 Bridge - complex geotechnical analysis similar to what will be needed for 301. | 0.0 | | Created Additional Column C to account for only 2 projects provided as allowed by the RFQ. All other weights with the exception of C101 and C102 will pull from Column B. | 1.1 | Above Average - 4 | EBP 2018-2B - SCDOT DB with the same UIG/ICE Team. 4 low volume cored slab bridges on an accelerated schedule. | |
| Subtotal: | | 10 | | 6.1 | | | 6.4 | | | 5.0 | | | 6.4 | | |
| Procurement Officer Initials | | | | CW | | | CW | | | CW | | | CW | | |
| 3.5 Past Performance of Team | | | | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments | Points | Scale ID | Comments |
| 3.5.2 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 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------------------|---|-------------------|---|-----|-----------------|---|-----|-------------------|---|-----|-------------------|---|
| | | | 0040308 US 301 over Four Hole Swamp | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Monday, May 2, 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Cape Romain - NS | | | Crowder - TranSystem | | | Dellinger - CarolinaTEA | | | UIG - ICE | | | |
| > 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 | 3.75 | 0.8 | Below Average - 2 | Bainbridge Connector - No reference to completion times given for this project. Unclear how the work on this job affected the project schedule. No Claims and No LDs. | 2.5 | Outstanding - 6 | EMBP 2020-2 SC4 - No Claims and No LDs, finished three weeks in advance of the original substantial completion deadline. | 2.5 | Above Average - 4 | Bridge Package - Bolton Branch and Old Chestnut Ferry Road - No Claims, No LDs, demonstrated ability to adapt and overcome challenges. | 2.1 | Excellent - 5 | US 15 over Indian Field Swamp - No Claims, No LDs, Finished 16 days ahead of schedule. |
| Project 2 | 2.5 | 3.75 | 1.7 | Above Average - 4 | HKLT Wharf - On Time, under budget, implemented VE initiative. No Claims and No LDs. | 2.1 | Excellent - 5 | SC9/49 Multi BR - No Claims and No LDs, On Time and Budget. | 1.9 | Average - 3 | S101 over Turkey Creek - No Claims, No LDs, on time, under budget. | 2.1 | Excellent - 5 | US 176 - No Claims, No LDs, . Excellent schedule coordination of major subs and fabrication to finish 18 days ahead of accelerated schedule. |
| Project 3 | 2.5 | | 1.3 | Average - 3 | Springmaid Pier - No Claims and No LDs. Team made design adjustments to improve quality. | 2.1 | Excellent - 5 | EBP #6 - No Claims, No LDs, On Schedule, no Change orders, | 0.0 | | Created Additional Column C to account for only 2 projects provided as allowed by the RFQ. All other weights with the exception of C113 and C114 will pull from Column B. | 2.5 | Outstanding - 6 | I77 SB over Catawba River - No LDs, No Claims, earned incentive. Delivered this accelerated schedule project on time while coordinating multiple subs and suppliers. |
| Project 4 | 2.5 | 3.75 | 1.7 | Above Average - 4 | Pio Nono - No Claims and No LDs, designed for superstructure construction within 25 day closure period. Preconstruction Quality Award from GDOT. | 1.3 | Average - 3 | CSX Bridge over I-85 - No Claims, No LDs, Cannot make a determination on this project because it is incomplete. | 2.5 | Above Average - 4 | EBP 2018-2A - No Claims, No LDs, ACEC Engineering Excellence Award, design deliverables submitted on original schedule. | 1.7 | Above Average - 4 | EBP #4 - No Claims, minimal RFIs and plan revisions during construction. Under budget. Design schedule exceeded expectations. |
| Project 5 | 2.5 | 3.75 | 1.7 | Above Average - 4 | DB Bridges Batches 4&5 - No LDs and No Claims, On Time, On Budget. NS developed DQMP on this project and has continued to use due to success. | 1.3 | Average - 3 | Mt. Gallant BR - unfinished project with third party involvement. Cannot make a determination on this project because it is incomplete. | 2.5 | Above Average - 4 | EBP 2020-1 - No Claims, No LDs, cooperative team that communicated well. Overcame issues on the fly and the project finished on time. | 1.7 | Above Average - 4 | EBP 2018-1 - No Claims, All plan submittals were made on time, met UIG's expectations for Design work. |
| Project 6 | 2.5 | | 1.3 | Average - 3 | DB Bridges Batch 1 - No LDs and No Claims, On Time, On Budget. Used the DQMP on this project. No other specific quality initiatives. | 1.3 | Average - 3 | GDOT SR 135 Bridge - design submitted on time and on budget. | 0.0 | | Created Additional Column C to account for only 2 projects provided as allowed by the RFQ. All other weights with the exception of C116 and C117 will pull from Column B. | 1.7 | Above Average - 4 | EBP 2018-2B - No Claims, No LDs, Substantially Complete within 200 days of NTP. Designs and reviews completed within 63 days of NTP. First DB project to utilize the new Load Rating procedures. Design submitted to UIG ahead of schedule. |
| All other projects | 5 | | 5.0 | Outstanding - 6 | No additional projects added with section j concerns. | 5.0 | Outstanding - 6 | No additional projects added with section j concerns. | 5.0 | Outstanding - 6 | No additional projects added with section j concerns. | 3.3 | Above Average - 4 | Quantity and magnitude of LDs presented better than anticipated with volume of work completed. |



| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|-------|---|-------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------|---|-----------|-------------------|--|
| SCDOT Design-Build | | | SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 0040308 US 301 over Four Hole Swamp | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Monday, May 2, 2022 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Cape Romain - NS | | | Crowder - TranSystem | | | Dellinger - CarolinaTEA | | | UIG - ICE | | |
| Previous Contractor Performance Evaluation System and Consultant Performance Evaluation Scores. Other available information related to past performance. | 10 | | 6.7 | Above Average - 4 | CPE Cape Romain- 78 out of 100 CPE NS - 7.71 out of 10 Based on the scores above and the references received the past performance would be considered above average. | 6.7 | Above Average - 4 | CPE Crowder - 79.75 out of 100 CEP TranSystems - 7.39 out of 10 Design-Build PE - 6.1 out of 10 Based on the scores above and references received, both the contractor and consultant are valued above average on past performance. | 5.0 | Average - 3 | CPE Dellinger - 71.05 out of 100 CPE CTEA - 7.45 out of 10 Design-Build PE - 5.65 out of 10 Based on the scores above and references received the contractor is below average on past performance and the designer is above average. | 6.7 | Above Average - 4 | CPE UIG - 80.54 out of 100 CPE ICE - 7.94 out of 10 DB PE - 5.6 out of 10 Based on the scores above and references received, both the contractor and consultant are valued above average on past performance. |
| Subtotal: | | 30 | | 20.0 | | 22.1 | | 19.4 | | 21.7 | | | | |
| Procurement Officer Initials | | | | CW | | CW | | CW | | CW | | | | |
| Total Score | | | Cape Romain - NS | | | Crowder - TranSystem | | | Dellinger - CarolinaTEA | | | UIG - ICE | | |
| Points | | | 100.0 | | | 100.0 | | | 100.0 | | | 100.0 | | |
| Total: | | 100.0 | 60.4 | | | 73.1 | | | 57.7 | | | 68.9 | | |
| Procurement Officer Initials | | | CW | | | CW | | | CW | | | CW | | |
| | | | I certify that the scores (weighted scores are rounded) shown on this sheet(s) accurately reflect the actions of the Committee on 5/2/2022 and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFQ. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Brooks Bickley Chairperson | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | John Caver Voting Member | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Tyler Clark Voting Member | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | David Rister Voting Member | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Brian Heape Voting Member | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Carmen Wright Procurement Officer | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Brian Gambrell Legal | | | | | | | | | | | |

