

SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet						
	Bridge Package 27						
	Thursday, June 19, 2025						
	Crowder/ICE		ESW/Holt		Reeves/RKK		
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	RCF		RCF		RCF		
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	RCF		RCF		RCF		
Technical Proposal Narrative	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments	
1. Describe Project Delivery and Approach by discussing/providing the following:							
a. 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 requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.	
b. Describe your approach to design and how it minimized the need for new rightof-way on the project.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.	RFP Conformance Issues	The Low Chord and Superstructure depth requirements are not met resulting in inability to provide the ROW reduction as shown in Tech Proposal.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.	
c. 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.	RFP Conformance Issues	The Proposed design submittal schedule does not include a ROW submittal for both bridge sites as required in 4z. A final seismic summary report is not included in the submittal schedule as required in 4z.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.	
	Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score		
Overall Adjectival Score:	A		C		A		
Procurement Officer Initials	RCF		RCF		RCF		
Technical Proposal Appendices	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments	
3) Appendix A.1: Provide Conceptual Roadway Plans: The intent scoring Proposer's conceptual roadway plans is for SCDOT to understand that the proposer clearly demonstrates its 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 compliance with RFP requirements, including Formal ATC's authorized for inclusion in the proposal, if any, rather than plan development/preparation conformance. The following shall be provided.							

SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet						
SCDOT Design-Build	Bridge Package 27					
	Thursday, June 19, 2025					
a. Typical sections for all roadways shall include as a minimum (22"x36" plan sheets): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 layout (22"x36" plan sheets). Plan view shall include as a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Geometric layout with reference data• Superelevation data• Taper lengths• Deceleration/acceleration lengths• Construction limits• Control of Access Limits (mainline and interchange)• Existing and proposed Right of Way• Lane alignment• Clear zone limits• Horizontal clearance at obstructions (any critical locations)• Roadside barriers (location and type)• Bridge and box culverts• Limits of retaining walls• Indicate any design exceptions approved in the RFP• Material Staging and Laydown Areas Profile view shall indicate: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Grades & elevations• Vertical curvature (PI station & elevation, length & K value, stopping sight distance design speed met)• Bridge clearance envelopes (excavation limits included)		Meets the requirements of the RFP.	Multiple	Does not meet Low Chord requirement at SC-83. NPDES limits do not incorporate excavating existing embankment areas under the proposed bridge.	Deficiencies	NPDES limits do not incorporate excavating existing embankment areas under the proposed bridge.
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 (22"x36" plan sheets).		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
d. Special emphasis details (where needed to clearly demonstrate understanding and approach - isolated locations such as ramp ties, wall types, etc.) (22"x36" 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:	A		D		B	
Procurement Officer Initials	RCF		RCF		RCF	

SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet						
Bridge Package 27						
Thursday, June 19, 2025						
SCDOT Design-Build						
Technical Proposal Appendices	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments
5. Appendix A. 2: Provide Conceptual Bridge Plans for the overpass bridges 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 types of joint materials, and bearing conditions at each bent.	Deficiencies	SC83 Span E superstructure depth does not meet the minimum superstructure depth limits of BDM 12.2.2.2	RFP Conformance Issues	SC83 Span 3 superstructure depth does not meet the minimum superstructure depth limits of BDM 12.2.2.2		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
b. Superstructure cross sections and substructure elevations showing pertinent structural elements and dimensions.	Deficiencies	Cap depth does not comply with DM0312.	Omitted Items	No dimension of deck thickness		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
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		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
d. Bridge construction access plan showing areas used to access the bridge work and showing proposed equipment and material handling locations and staging.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.		Meets the requirements of the RFP.
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:	B		D		A	
Procurement Officer Initials	RCF		RCF		RCF	

SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet					
	Bridge Package 27					
	Thursday, June 19, 2025					
Innovation and Added Value:	Comments		Comments		Comments	
2. Describe the Proposer's Innovation and Added Value to the Project that clearly provides additional benefit to SCDOT or the public.						
a. Ability to meet project schedule goals including milestone schedule dates.						
b. Avoid or minimize impacts to utilities. Credit will not be awarded in this section for paying prior rights, only for avoidance of impacts.						
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.						
d. Minimizing impacts to traffic.						
Any other items					Increased durability and reduction in bridge debris removal cost over the life of the bridge. (4 pts)	
	Quality Credit Points		Quality Credit Points		Quality Credit Points	
Overall Quality Credit Score:			0.00		4	
Procurement Officer Initials	RCF		RCF		RCF	
	<div>I certify that the scores shown on these sheets accurately reflect the actions of the Committee on June 19, 2025 and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFP.</div> <div><div>Chairperson/Voting</div><div>Brooks Bickley Member</div><div>John Caver Voting Member</div><div>Michael Buck Voting Member</div><div>Will Fulton Voting Member</div><div>Renee Frazier Procurement Officer</div></div>					