

SCDOT Design-Build																				
SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet																				
Bridge Package 27																				
Monday, May 5, 2025																				
Dane/Summit		Dellinger/P&P		ESW/Holt		Lee/D&F		Reeves/RK&K		Crowder/ICE		Thalhe/Moffatt								
Response/Venues	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments						
Is Proposer considered responsive?														Yes						
3.2 Introduction																				
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		Yes		Yes						
3.2.2 Identify the two Proposer Points of Contact for the procurement for the Project including mailing addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses.		Yes		Yes		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		Yes		Yes						
3.2.4 Provide Unique Entity ID for all firms.		Yes		Yes		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 the RFP.		Yes		Yes		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		Yes		Yes						
3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution																				
3.3.1 Organizational Chart, Team Structure, and Team Integration		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	
3.3.1.1 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.		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	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.		3	1.5	Average - 3	1.5	Average - 3	1.5	Average - 3	1.5	Average - 3	1.5	Average - 3	1.5	Average - 3	1.0	Below Average - 2	1.5	Average - 3	1.5	Average - 3
Provide a brief, written description of significant functional relationships and how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team.		2	1.3	Above Average - 4	1.3	Above Average - 4	1.3	Above Average - 4	1.3	Above Average - 4	1.3	Above Average - 4	1.3	Above Average - 4	1.3	Above Average - 4	0.7	Below Average - 2	0.7	Below Average - 2
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.		3	1.0	Below Average - 2	1.0	Below Average - 2	3.0	Outstanding - 6	2.5	Excellent - 5	3.0	Outstanding - 6	2.0	Above Average - 4	1.5	Average - 3	1.5	Average - 3	1.5	Average - 3
Subtotal		8	3.8		8	3.8		8	3.8		8	3.8		8	3.8		8	3.8		8
3.3.2 Project Resources, Strategies, and Execution																				
3.3.2.1 Project Resources, Strategies, and Execution		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	
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.		12		Use the Likert Scale	12		Use the Likert Scale	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	4.0	Above Average - 4	6.0	Excellent - 5	4.0	Above Average - 4	3.0	Average - 3	4.0	Above Average - 4	3.0	Average - 3	3.0	Average - 3	3.0	Average - 3

SCDOT Design-Build														SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet																																																																																			
Bridge Package 27 Monday, May 5, 2025																																																																																																	
Dane/Summit				Dellinger/P&P				ESW/Holt				Lee/D&F				Reeves/RK&K				Crowder/ICE				Thalhe/Moffatt																																																																									
Indicate how the geographical location of the firms will enhance integration, communication, issue resolution and project execution.														<div> <div>6</div> <div>5.0</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> <div>Team provides a map of office locations in proximity to bridge locations. Team intends to place mobile field offices at each site. Regular DB Team meetings will occur in person to promote collaborative problem solving. Called out Material supplies and SCDOT District Staff Team is already in the area doing work for SCDOT.</div> <div>2.0</div> <div>Below Average - 2</div> <div>3.0</div> <div>Average - 3</div> <div>3.0</div> <div>Average - 3</div> <div>3.0</div> <div>Average - 3</div> <div>5.0</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> <div>3.0</div> <div>Average - 3</div> </div>																																																																																			
Subtotal: 12 2.0 RCF														Subtotal: 12 2.0 RCF																																																																																			
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals														3.4 Experience of Key Individuals																																																																																			
3.4.1 Project Management Team				3.4.2 Project Management Team				3.4.3 Project Management Team				3.4.4 Project Management Team				3.4.5 Project Management Team				3.4.6 Project Management Team				3.4.7 Project Management Team																																																																									
<div> <div>20</div> <div>16.7</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> <div>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 of 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 must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar: 1. Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables; 2. Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project; 3. Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering uncertainty and risk.</div> <div>20</div> <div>16.7</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> </div>														<div> <div>20</div> <div>16.7</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> <div>The PM has 24 years of experience showing a progressive career from Project Manager all the way to President of the company. Projects listed on resume are all design-build projects of similar scope and magnitude including bridge bundles. Experience references received.</div> <div>6.7</div> <div>Below Average - 2</div> <div>16.7</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> </div>														<div> <div>20</div> <div>16.7</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> <div>PM is new to company with a little over 23 years of experience. Progressive career through past companies. Most projects listed are DB/DBB and of much larger scale and magnitude. References received were slightly below average and referenced the individual leaving before the project was complete. As shown on the resume, the PM has been through 10 companies in less than 20 years which is concerning as a recent hire to this company. Previous SCDOT projects listed were not good examples of partnering and Design-Build principles. PM is represented as a PE with inactive registration.</div> <div>16.7</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> </div>														<div> <div>20</div> <div>16.7</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> <div>PM has 22 years of experience and is the Senior Vice President and General Manager of the company. At 22 years have been with ESW Projects listed on resume are a mix of DB and DBB that are of similar scope and magnitude. Reference received was excellent.</div> <div>16.7</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> </div>														<div> <div>20</div> <div>13.3</div> <div>Above Average - 4</div> <div>PM has 44 years of experience with 27 years with Lee. President of the company and has full authority for decision making. Projects on resume include both DBB and DBB projects. He was previously the lead design-build coordinator (APM) for CLRB 2021 - bridge replacement package (B bridges) as well as project manager on other bridge projects. PM currently has Package 17 and Package 30 in construction. There is concern for his availability to attend and lead all regularly scheduled meetings due to the project work load. References received were outstanding to excellent.</div> <div>16.7</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> </div>														<div> <div>20</div> <div>13.3</div> <div>Above Average - 4</div> <div>PM has over 20 years of experience showing a strong background in project management and bridge replacement projects. Resume shows projects both DBB and DBB projects. He was previously the lead design-build coordinator (APM) for CLRB 2021 - bridge replacement package (B bridges) as well as project manager on other bridge projects. PM currently has Package 17 and Package 30 in construction. There is concern for his availability to attend and lead all regularly scheduled meetings due to the project work load. References received were outstanding to excellent.</div> <div>16.7</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> </div>																											
Subtotal: 20 16.7 RCF														Subtotal: 20 16.7 RCF																																																																																			
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals														3.4 Experience of Key Individuals																																																																																			
3.4.5 Design Engineering Team				3.4.6 Design Engineering Team				3.4.7 Design Engineering Team				3.4.8 Design Engineering Team				3.4.9 Design Engineering Team				3.4.10 Design Engineering Team																																																																													
<div> <div>10</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> <div>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 seven 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.</div> <div>10</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> <div>Lead Designer has 20 years of experience in a background of roadway and transportation design. LD held roles of both Project Engineer and Project Manager on past projects. Projects listed on resume are both DB and DBB of similar scope and magnitude. Reference received was excellent.</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> <div>The LD has over 19 years of experience. Listed as project manager and lead bridge engineer on projects of similar scope and magnitude both DB and DBB (including Bridge Packages 15&20). References received were outstanding.</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> <div>The LD has over 17 years of experience. Listed as lead roadway engineer and lead designer on projects of similar scope and magnitude both DB and DBB. References received were outstanding.</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> <div>LD has 30 years of experience and 7 of those with Davis & Floyd. Heads the firm as the transportation market sector lead with a progressive career in bridge design. Projects on resume are heavy in design-build projects of similar scope and magnitude including the current lead design role for Package 30. He was ALICE on CLRB20, CLRB21, Bridge Package 17, and I-77 New Exit 26. References received were near perfect.</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>3.3</div> <div>Below Average - 2</div> <div>Lead Designer has over 20 years experience. 18 with ICE. DB and DBB project listed on resume of similar scope and magnitude. Over 101 bridge replacements in SC. Received outstanding References. DB and DBB project listed on (3 were DB) No applicable References Received. Only one reference responded and indicated they do not know Santiago.</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> </div>																											
Subtotal: 10 8.3 RCF														Subtotal: 10 8.3 RCF																																																																																			
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals														3.4 Experience of Key Individuals																																																																																			
3.4.6 Construction Management Team				3.4.7 Construction Management Team				3.4.8 Construction Management Team				3.4.9 Construction Management Team				3.4.10 Construction Management Team				3.4.11 Construction Management Team																																																																													
<div> <div>10</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> <div>The Construction Manager shall be responsible for all aspects of the construction of the Project, subject to oversight of the Project Manager. The Construction Manager shall have a minimum of five years of progressive experience and expertise in the construction of highway transportation projects and must include experience and expertise in the management of the construction phase of projects of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity. For the duration of the 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. The Construction Manager shall be on-site during all construction activities for the Project.</div> <div>10</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>6.7</div> <div>Above Average - 4</div> <div>CM has 25 years of progressive experience being a construction manager with Dane for all projects listed. DB experience. Projects listed are representative bridge types and greater scope and magnitude. Managing multiple bridges in one contract. Average to above average references received.</div> <div>6.7</div> <div>Above Average - 4</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>10.0</div> <div>Outstanding - 6</div> <div>CM has 15 years of experience being a construction manager for all projects listed. Projects listed on resume are DBB and mostly maintenance repairs and replacements. Many project examples are on primary routes. No Reference received.</div> <div>10.0</div> <div>Outstanding - 6</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>6.7</div> <div>Above Average - 4</div> <div>CM has 41 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 heavy in structures and construction. References received were excellent to perfect.</div> <div>6.7</div> <div>Above Average - 4</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> <div>CM has 22 years of bridge experience and 12 of those with Lee. Resume shows a progressive career in project management and listed as the PM which shows that he is capable of handling the role of construction manager. Projects listed are design-build emergency bridge replacements, and other bridge projects of similar scope and magnitude. References received were average.</div> <div>8.3</div> <div>Excellent - 5</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>6.7</div> <div>Above Average - 4</div> <div>CM has 25 years of experience. Design-Build Bridge experience. Progressive construction experience from Laborer to Construction Manager. References are outstanding.</div> <div>6.7</div> <div>Above Average - 4</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>3.3</div> <div>Below Average - 2</div> <div>CM has 18 years of experience. Resume shows progressive career moving through the ranks of construction on projects both DBB and DBB of similar scope and magnitude. Roles in projects were as superintendent. Satisfied with outstanding References. Information on construction management experience for relevant bridge times is limited. Roles in projects were as CM and superintendent. Reference showed weak performance to satisfied.</div> <div>6.7</div> <div>Above Average - 4</div> </div>													
Subtotal: 10 8.3 RCF														Subtotal: 10 8.3 RCF																																																																																			
3.5 Past Performance of Team														3.5 Past Performance of Team																																																																																			
3.5.1 Experience of Proposer's Team				3.5.2 Experience of Proposer's Team				3.5.3 Experience of Proposer's Team				3.5.4 Experience of Proposer's Team				3.5.5 Experience of Proposer's Team				3.5.6 Experience of Proposer's Team																																																																													
<div> <div>10</div> <div>10</div> <div>Use the Likert Scale</div> <div>Provide two 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 a Contractor/Designer. Sections a through g. Projects that have reached substantial completion are preferred.</div> <div>10</div> <div>10</div> <div>Use the Likert Scale</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>10</div> <div>Use the Likert Scale</div> <div>CM has 25 years of progressive experience being a construction manager with Dane for all projects listed. DB experience. Projects listed are representative bridge types and greater scope and magnitude. Managing multiple bridges in one contract. Average to above average references received.</div> <div>10</div> <div>10</div> <div>Use the Likert Scale</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>10</div> <div>Use the Likert Scale</div> <div>CM has 15 years of experience being a construction manager for all projects listed. Projects listed on resume are DBB and mostly maintenance repairs and replacements. Many project examples are on primary routes. No Reference received.</div> <div>10</div> <div>10</div> <div>Use the Likert Scale</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>10</div> <div>Use the Likert Scale</div> <div>CM has 41 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 heavy in structures and construction. References received were excellent to perfect.</div> <div>10</div> <div>10</div> <div>Use the Likert Scale</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>10</div> <div>Use the Likert Scale</div> <div>CM has 22 years of bridge experience and 12 of those with Lee. Resume shows a progressive career in project management and listed as the PM which shows that he is capable of handling the role of construction manager. Projects listed are design-build emergency bridge replacements, and other bridge projects of similar scope and magnitude. References received were average.</div> <div>10</div> <div>10</div> <div>Use the Likert Scale</div> </div>														<div> <div>10</div> <div>10</div> <div>Use the Likert Scale</div> <div>CM has 25 years of experience. Design-Build Bridge experience. Progressive construction experience from Laborer to Construction Manager. References are outstanding.</div> <div>10</div> <div>10</div> <div>Use the Likert Scale</div> </div>																											

SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet																							
		Bridge Package 27 Monday, May 5, 2025																							
		Dane/Summit			Dellinger/P&P			ESW/Holt			Lee/DAF			Reeves/RK&K			Crowder/ICE			Thalhe/Moffatt					
Project 1	2.5	1.7	Above Average - 4	NC11 DB Package: Design-Build Package of 3 bridges over waterways. Write up is generic. Key individual overlap - PM	0.8	Below Average - 2		1.7	Above Average - 4	Bridge Package 15: SCDOT Design-Build Bridge bundle with four secondary bridges over waterways. Cored Slab Bridges. Key individual overlap. Contractor Overlap.	0.8	Below Average - 2	03 Package Bridge Repairs (Spartanburg: DBB 26 bridge sites over water ways. Does not represent the work needed for scope and magnitude of Bridge Package 27. Key individual Overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	CLRB 2021-1: DB bridge bundle of 8 secondary bridges over waterways. Cored Slab Bridges. Key individual overlap.	2.1	Excellent - 5	301 over Four Hole: SCDOT DB bridge replacement of two primary route bridges over water ways. Similar bridge type to SC83. Full seismic analysis used. Key individual overlap.	1.3	Average - 3	NCDOT C203533 Bridge 42 and 43: DBB bridge replacement of two bridges over water ways. Concrete girder bridge on piles. No Key individual overlap.			
Project 2	2.5	2.1	Excellent - 5	138 DB Package: Project delivered on time and under budget. Two of eleven sites had value engineering studies completed to save additional cost to the owner. No references received. Key Individual Overlap.	0.8	Below Average - 2		1.7	Above Average - 4	Leesburg Road Widening: DBB one mile slab bridge over water. Not consistent with project scope and magnitude. Using a modular form system to construct various length slab slabs. Key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	NCDOT Express Year 6: NC Express Design-Build of 6 bridges over waterways. Cored slab and Box beams on piles. Key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	Emergency Bridge Package 2: Design-Build two bridges over water. Key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	CLRB 2020-1: DB bridge bundle of 16 secondary bridges over waterways. Key individual overlap.	2.1	Excellent - 5	EB 2020-2: SCDOT DB bridge replacement 607 bridge over water. SC4 is very similar to the SC83 bridge type, similar aggressive schedule. Key individual overlap.	0.8	Below Average - 2	NCDOT C204106 Alamance: DBB new 2 mile alignment road with one 2 lane bridge. No Key individual overlap until closed. Lack of information on bridge type used.
Provide two 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	0.8	Below Average - 2	Emergency Express DL00283: 1 express design build box beam single span bridge over water. Key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4		1.7	Above Average - 4	185 77-68: Design-Build 21 miles of widening and 6 concrete girder bridge replacements with MSE walls. Key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	Bridge Package 15: SCDOT Design-Build Bridge bundle with four secondary bridges over waterways. Key individual overlap. Contractor Overlap. No Seismic Design. Box beam and cored slabs.	1.7	Above Average - 4	Package 14: Design-Build 6 secondary route bridge replacements over waterways. Key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	CLRB 2021-1: DB bridge bundle of 8 secondary bridges over waterways. Key individual overlap.	2.5	Outstanding - 6	Bridge Package 29: SCDOT DB bridge replacement. 2 bridges on accelerated schedule. Full seismic design of 3 span full slab bridges. Similar Scope and Magnitude. Design needed to be extremely accelerated. Internal comments on plans and reports. RFC plans complete. Construction complete on 1 bridge. Key individual overlap.	0.8	Below Average - 2	NCDOT Em Express DB D 13: Emergency Express DB project with 2 bridges. No Key Individual Overlap. No specific information on bridge types used. Limited information given on the project overall.
Project 4	2.5	1.3	Average - 3	NCDOT Express DB Year 6/D6: DB in bridge and culvert bundle over waterways. Key individual overlap.	2.1	Excellent - 5		1.7	Above Average - 4	Emergency Bridge Package 3: Emergency Design-Build Project. Multiple Secondary and Primary Bridges over water. Order bridge as well as Cored Slabs. Similar Region to this project. Key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	Bridge Package 20: SCDOT Design-Build Bridge bundle of 7 secondary bridges over waterways. Box Beam and cored slabs. No Seismic Design. No primary routes. Key individual overlap.	1.3	Average - 3	US 378 over Twelve Mile: Design-Build single primary route bridge replacement over water. Staged construction. Key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	CLRB 2020-1: DB bridge bundle of 16 secondary bridges over waterways. Key individual overlap.	1.7	Above Average - 4	Bridge Package 2018-26: SCDOT DB 4 cored slab bridge replacement project. Key individual overlap.	0.8	Below Average - 2	NCDOT Em Express DB D 13: DB Emergency Express DB project with 5 bridges. No Key Individual Overlap. No specific information on bridge types used. Limited information given on the project overall.
Subtotal:	19	8.8			8.4			8.7			8.4			8.7			8.5			8.8					
Procurement Officer Initials		RCS			RCS			RCS			RCS			RCS			RCS			RCS					
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	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	30	Use the Likert Scale	30	Use the Likert Scale	30	Use the Likert Scale	30	Use the Likert Scale	30	Use the Likert Scale	30	Use the Likert Scale			
<p>For each of the projects identified per Section 3.5.1, provide the information requested in Sections H 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>Have 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	5	1.7	Below Average - 2	NC11 DB Package: Write up is unclear if project was on time or on budget. Section lacks details on quality initiatives other than working through supply chain issues on box beams. No references received.	3.3	Above Average - 4		5.0	Outstanding - 6	Bridge Package 15: To date each site has been on time and under budget. Project not complete. ESW worked to accelerate another bridge in another package while maintaining this schedule. References received were excellent to perfect.	2.5	Average - 3	District 3 Package Repairs: Good communication and met SCDOT expectations.	3.3	Above Average - 4	CLRB 2021-1: Project plans were delivered to RFC on schedule. Team did a good job designing to SCDOT standards. Designed to minimize new acquisitions. No references received.	4.2	Excellent - 5	301 over Four Hole: On time and on budget despite impacts from TS Debris. Reference received was excellent.	2.5	Average - 3	NCDOT C203533 Bridge 42 and 43: On time, on budget, proactively avoided claims.			
Project 2	5	3.3	Above Average - 4	138 DB Package: Project delivered on time and under budget. Utility conflicts were recognized early to avoid delay. No references received.	1.7	Below Average - 2		3.3	Above Average - 4	Leesburg Road Widening: Ongoing but not complete. Schedule is being maintained. Multiple challenges noted on this project.	3.3	Above Average - 4	NCDOT Express Year 6: Delivered each project on time and under budget. No reference received on project.	3.3	Above Average - 4	Emergency Bridge Package 2: no delays, claims, disputes, litigations, or arbitrations. On schedule and under budget. No references	4.2	Excellent - 5	CLRB 2020-1: Project completed within budget and finished 141 days ahead of the contract completion date. Project references were outstanding to excellent.	4.2	Excellent - 5	EB 2020-2 SCDOT DB: On Time Completion with no claims, disputes. Above average DB performance rating on this project.	2.5	Average - 3	NCDOT C204106 Alamance: On Time, on budget after owner directed change orders.
Project 3	5	1.7	Below Average - 2	Emergency Express DL00283: Plans were delivered on time for the project. No other quality initiatives listed. Third Party risks created delays on the project. Overall write up is very generic.	2.5	Average - 3		4.2	Excellent - 5	185 77-68: RFC plans were delivered to contractor on time or ahead of schedule and under budget. 1 Claim from Contractor - Settled outside of Arbitration June 2023.	4.2	Excellent - 5	Bridge Package 15: CO 001 accelerated design schedule to eliminate Pretest and ROW plans (7) delays. Quality of concept plans allowed for this change. CO 002 reduced bridge length and provided credit to SCDOT and reduced construction duration.	4.2	Excellent - 5	Package 14: All project designs released for construction one month ahead of schedule with no issues. Team presented ATCs for different foundation types to keep project costs down. Designed unique pile to meet driving conditions at interior bents. Contractor has worked well with the additional bridge added on for prep and design. References received was outstanding.	2.5	Average - 3	CLRB 2021-1: Project plans were delivered to RFC on schedule. Team did a good job designing to SCDOT standards. Designed to minimize new acquisitions. As-Builts are still not complete on this project. Team is currently assessing LDI's.	5.0	Outstanding - 6	Bridge Package 29: Advanced design are bid in order to submit final plans on both bridges one month after NTP. Geotech investigation complete 65 days after NTP. Incorporated new structural design standards and details on accelerated schedule.	2.5	Average - 3	NCDOT Em Express DB D 13: on schedule in some instances ahead of schedule.

SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet																				
		Bridge Package 27 Monday, May 5, 2025																				
		Dane/Summit			Dellinger/P&P			ESW/Holt			Lee/D&F			Reeves/RK&K			Crowder/ICE			Thalhe/Moffatt		
Project 4	5	2.5	Average - 3	SCDOT Express DB Year 6/D6: Plans were delivered on time. No other quality initiatives listed. Overall write up is very generic.	2.5	Average - 3	Emergency Bridge Package 3: RFC Plans delivered on time. No delays, claims, disputes. Met requirements.	4.2	Excellent - 5	Bridge Package 20: Project is currently on time and under budget. RFC Plans are complete. ESW worked to accelerate a bridge in this package while maintaining this schedule. References received on project was excellent.	2.5	Average - 3	US 378 over Twelve Mile: Design was completed on time and under budget. Construction not started. No references received for this project	3.3	Above Average - 4	CLRB 2020-1: Project completed within budget and finished 141 days ahead of the contract completion date. LD delivered plans on schedule working to minimize impacts. Developed and implemented Box Beams on multibridge corred slab bridges.	4.2	Excellent - 5	Bridge Package 2018-2B: Advanced design to complete design and construct investigations 63 days from NTP. RFC plans accelerated. First DB bridge package to include Load Ratings is RFP requirement on an accelerated schedule.	2.5	Average - 3	SCDOT Em Express DB D 13: on schedule in some instances ahead of schedule.
All other projects	5	5.0	Outstanding - 6	no other projects listed	5.0	Outstanding - 6	no other projects listed	5.0	Outstanding - 6	no other projects listed	4.2	Excellent - 5	One Bridge Project with LDs but resolved and LDs were slightly reduced.	5.0	Outstanding - 6	no other projects listed	4.2	Excellent - 5	no other projects listed.	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.	5	3.3	Above Average - 4	No SCDOT DB Performance Evaluation scores for Contractor or Lead Designer. There are no Consultant Performance Evaluation Scores (CPES) available in the last 3 years for Summit Design and Engineering. References for the Lead Designer are slightly below average to outstanding.	1.7	Below Average - 2	Design-Build Performance Scores for this Designer were average. No Design-Build Performance scores for the Contractor. CPES (P&P) - 3 year average is 7.29 out of 10 and this is above standard to very good. References for the Contractor are negative to average. References for the Lead Designer are above average.	5.0	Outstanding - 6	Design-Build Performance Scores for Contractor were average to slightly above average and Lead Designer are slightly above average to above average. CPES (H&I) - 3 year average is 7.82 out of 10 and this is above standard to very good. The Contractor references were outstanding to excellent and the Lead Designer references were excellent.	3.3	Above Average - 4	Design-Build Performance Scores for Contractor were average and Lead Designer were above average. CPES (DP) - 3 year average is 8.02 out of 10 and this is very good. Contractor references varied from poor to outstanding over the past few years but recent SCDOT design-build work references are slightly above average and Lead Designer references were slightly above average to outstanding.	4.2	Excellent - 5	Design-Build Performance Scores for Contractor were average and Lead Designer were above average. CPES (RK&K) - 3 year average is 8.12 out of 10 and this is very good to excellent. Contractor references were slightly below average to outstanding and Lead Designer references were outstanding to excellent.	4.2	Excellent - 5	Design-Build Performance Scores for Contractor were above average and Lead Designer were below average to above average. CPES (ICE) - 3 year average is 7.99 out of 10 and this is above standard to very good. Contractor references were outstanding to excellent and Lead Designer references were satisfied to above average.	2.5	Average - 3	No Design-Build Performance Scores for Contractor or Lead Designer available. No CPES (MN) - 3 year average available. No applicable Contractor or Lead Designer references were received.
Subtotal	38	17.8			18.7			26.7			20.0			22.8			25.8			17.8		
Procurement Officer Initials		RCF			RCF			RCF			RCF			RCF			RCF			RCF		
Total Score				Dane/Summit			Dellinger/P&P			ESW/Holt			Lee/D&F			Reeves/RK&K			Crowder/ICE			Thalhe/Moffatt
Points				100.0			100.0			100.0			100.0			100.0			100.0			100.0
Total	100.0			69.5			53.8			82.2			68.4			71.0			75.2			50.9
Procurement Officer Initials				RCF			RCF			RCF			RCF			RCF			RCF			RCF
I certify that the scores shown on this sheet(s) accurately reflect the actions of the Committee on May 2 & 5, 2025 and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFP.																						
<div>Brooks Bickley Chairperson John Caver Voting Member Carolyn Fisher Voting Member Will Fulton Voting Member Renee Frazier Procurement Officer</div> <div>Brooks Bickley Digitally signed by Brooks Bickley Date: 2025.05.06 09:07:24 -0400 John Caver Digitally signed by John Caver Date: 2025.05.06 09:07:24 -0400 Carolyn Fisher Digitally signed by Carolyn Fisher Date: 2025.05.06 10:51:25 -0400 Will Fulton Digitally signed by Will Fulton Date: 2025.05.06 10:50:52 -0400 Renee Frazier Digitally signed by Renee Frazier Date: 2025.05.06 10:57:14 -0400</div>																						