

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet													
Carolina Crossroads Phase 3C - Phase 3C—Replacement of I-20 bridges over the Saluda River and CSX Railroad, and I-20 widening between Exits 61 and 63 - Project ID P043325 - Lexington County													
Tuesday, July 23, 2024 through Thursday, July 25, 2024													
SCDOT Design-Build		Archer-Western Construction		Balfour Beatty Reeves JV		Crowder Construction Company		The Lane Construction Company		United Infrastructure Group - Blythe Development JV			
Responsiveness		Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments
Is Proposer considered responsive?		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
3.2 Introduction		Archer-Western Construction		Balfour Beatty Reeves JV		Crowder Construction Company		The Lane Construction Company		United Infrastructure Group - Blythe Development JV			
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	
3.2.2 Identify the two Proposer Points of Contact for the procurement for this Project including mailing addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses.		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		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	
3.2.4 Provide Unique Entity ID for the Lead Contractor and Lead Designer or documentation indicating that an application was submitted in Appendix I.		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		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 RFO.		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	
Procurement Officer Initials		AP		AP		AP		AP		AP		AP	
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
* 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.		7	2.0	Above Average - 4	7	2.0	Above Average - 4	7	1.5	Average - 3	7	2.5	Excellent - 5
* Provide a brief, written description of significant functional relationships and how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team.		3	1.0	Average - 3	3	1.3	Above Average - 4	3	0.7	Below Average - 2	3	1.3	Above Average - 4
* 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. Any references documented in the section must also be tabulated in a form that shall be provided in Appendix H. The Key Individual Reference Form and Contractor Designer Reference Form may be downloaded from the SCDOT design-build website under SCDOT Design-Build Standard Forms Section at <a href="https://www.scdot.org/business/design-build.aspx">https://www.scdot.org/business/design-build.aspx</a>		2	1.7	Excellent - 5	2	1.0	Average - 3	2	0.7	Below Average - 2	2	1.7	Excellent - 5
Subtotal:		7	AP		7	AP		7	AP		7	AP	
3.3.2 Critical Risks													
SCDOT has identified the following risks as critical risks for this project: • Limitations on in-water and over-water construction and demolition • Limited site access • Utility relocations • Geotechnical subsurface conditions • Railroad coordination • Skilled labor availability • Maintenance of traffic Discuss the strategies the Proposer's team will implement to mitigate or eliminate each risk, and other risks that may be identified by Proposer, including how the proposed personnel and organizational structure would aid in the mitigation of the risks. Describe the role that the Proposer expects SCDOT or other agencies to have in addressing these project risks.		5	4.2	Excellent - 5	5	3.3	Above Average - 4	5	4.2	Excellent - 5	5	3.3	Above Average - 4
Subtotal:		5	AP		5	AP		5	AP		5	AP	
3.3.3 Project Resources, Strategies, and Execution													
* Demonstrate the team's capacity and available resources to include personnel but not construction equipment, for this project.		2	1.7	Excellent - 5	2	1.0	Average - 3	2	0.7	Below Average - 2	2	1.0	Average - 3
* 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 firm's responsible.		7	1.3	Above Average - 4	7	1.3	Above Average - 4	7	1.3	Above Average - 4	7	1.0	Average - 3







SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet													
Carolina Crossroads Phase 3C - Phase 3C—Replacement of I-20 bridges over the Saluda River and CSX Railroad, and I-20 widening between Exits 61 and 63 - Project ID P043325 - Lexington County													
Tuesday, July 23, 2024 through Thursday, July 25, 2024													
SCDOT Design-Build		Archer-Western Construction		Balfour Beatty Reeves JV		Crowder Construction Company		The Lane Construction Company		United Infrastructure Group - Blythe Development JV			
<p>Independent Quality Manager (IQM) (5 points)</p> <p>The IQM shall be responsible for ensuring that all workmanship and materials are in compliance with the contract requirements, and for carrying out the IQF responsibilities of the Quality Acceptance (QA) portion of the Quality Assurance Program (QAP) for the Carolina Crossroads Project. The QAP is available at <a href="https://www.scdot.org/business/CarolinaCrossroads3C.aspx">https://www.scdot.org/business/CarolinaCrossroads3C.aspx</a>.</p> <p>The IQM shall coordinate quality acceptance activities with the SCDOT Construction Manager for Carolina Crossroads or their designee for all owner verification testing and inspection activities and Independent Assurance Program compliance.</p> <p>The IQM shall have a minimum of 15 years of progressive experience and expertise in the Quality Acceptance (QA) of highway transportation projects including at least one project of similar magnitude and complexity.</p> <p>The IQM shall be a licensed professional engineer in the state of South Carolina and an employee of the Proposer's Independent Quality Firm.</p> <p>The IQM shall report jointly to the Proposer's Project executive committee (construction joint venture or construction company if only one prime contractor) and SCDOT. IQM shall have the authority to stop substantial construction work.</p> <p>The IQM shall have no other assigned Project responsibilities.</p> <p>For the duration of construction, the IQM shall be dedicated solely to Project QA, shall have no other assigned Project responsibilities, and shall not be utilized on any other projects.</p> <p>The IQM shall be on-site during Project construction and be available for weekly status meetings during the construction phase, and at the request of the SCDOT.</p>	5	4.2	Excellent - 5	3.3	Above Average - 4	2.5	Average - 3	3.3	Above Average - 4	4.2	Excellent - 5		
	Subtotal:	12	4.2		5.7		6.0		6.5		6.5		
Procurement Officer Initials		Archer-Western Construction		Balfour Beatty Reeves JV		Crowder Construction Company		The Lane Construction Company		United Infrastructure Group - Blythe Development JV			
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		10		Use the Likert Scale	10		Use the Likert Scale	10		Use the Likert Scale	10		Use the Likert Scale
<p>Provide 4 projects awarded within the last 15 calendar years that identify the previous work experience by the Lead Contractor or any Major Subcontractors using the Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer, Sections A through G. Projects that have reached substantial completion are preferred. For each of these projects, if any Key Individuals being proposed for this RFO worked on the project, identify in Section G, the Key Individual name, role, and time on the project. The required Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer may be downloaded from the SCDOT Design-Build website under the SCDOT Design-Build Standard Forms Section at <a href="https://www.scdot.org/business/design-build.aspx">https://www.scdot.org/business/design-build.aspx</a>. This information shall be included in the Appendix B and will not be counted against the specified page limit in Section 5.2.2.</p>													
Project 1	1	0.7	Above Average - 4	Project was DB on Interstate. No railroad coordination required. Limited utility coordination. Site access was limited. Not particularly environmentally sensitive. MOT had some level of complexity. Lead Designer was Key Individual involved in project as Structural Engineer. Lead Contractor and Lead Design Firm were in same roles on this project.	0.3	Below Average - 2	Project was not DB and not on Interstate. No railroad coordination required. Some utility coordination. Site access was limited. Bridge over water. Environmentally sensitive. MOT had some level of complexity at be-ins. No Key Individuals on project.	0.5	Average - 3	Project was not DB. Was not Interstate work. Did not have RR coordination. Was a major bridge construction overwater with project site maintained traffic with traffic shifts. Required utility coordination. Limited site access. Environmentally sensitive. CM was Key Individual on this project. Project used vibration monitoring.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project is DB interstate large system interchange project. No RR coordination, was not bridge construction over water. Required utility coordination, did not mention limited site access, environmentally sensitive, complex MOT, and coordination with adjacent projects. Key Individuals listed as PM in APM role on reference project. Part of JV in same role in another JV, but different Lead Designer.
Project 2	1	0.5	Average - 3	Project was not DB but was on Interstate. Railroad coordination was required. Limited utility coordination. Site access was limited. Project exhibited environmental sensitivity. MOT was complex. CM was Key Individual involved in project as Senior Project Superintendent. Lead Contractor and Lead Design Firm were not in same roles on this project.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project was DB on Interstate. Railroad and utility coordination present. Environmentally sensitive site. Complex MOT. Proposed PM was Key Individual in the CM role on this project. BBI was lead construction firm in JV. Project had multiple interchange reconstruction and 14 bridges reconstructed/widened.	0.5	Average - 3	Project was not DB, surface road overpass over Interstate. No railroad. Some utility coordination present. Limited access. Not environmentally sensitive site. Shoulder strengthening to utilize shoulders. Non-complex MOT. Proposed PM was Key Individual in the Senior PM role on this project.	0.7	Above Average - 4	Project is DB interstate interchange project, no RR coordination, no bridge construction over water, required utility coordination, not particularly limited site access, not environmentally sensitive, complex MOT. No Key Individuals on proposed Phase 3C team. Same JV.
Project 3	1	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project was DB on Interstate. Railroad coordination required. Utility coordination required. Site access was limited. Environmentally sensitive. Very complex MOT. No Key Individuals involved in project. Lead Contractor was in same role on this project.	0.5	Average - 3	Project was DB new location to Interstate standards. Railroad not listed. Utility coordination present. Environmentally sensitive site. Complex MOT. No Key Individuals. Proposed member of JV was a major road bridge construction subcontractor on listed project.	0.7	Above Average - 4	Project was not DB, not on Interstate. Significant railroad coordination required. Significant utility coordination. Site access was limited. Not particularly environmentally sensitive. Multi-agency coordination. Coordination with adjacent projects. MOT had some level of complexity. No Key Individuals involved in project. Lead Contractor was in same role on this project.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project is DB interstate large system interchange project. RR coordination present. Was not bridge construction over water. Required utility coordination. Project required environmental permitting and had complex MOT. Did not mention limited site access. Project included coordination with adjacent projects. Key individual proposed as PM was in the same role. Proposed CM was listed in Superintendent role. Lead Contractor in same role, but different Lead Designer.
Project 4	1	0.7	Above Average - 4	Project was DB to Interstate standards. No railroad coordination required. Utility coordination required. Site access was limited. Environmentally sensitive. MOT not particularly complex and only at be-ins as new alignment project. No Key Individuals involved in project. Lead Contractor was in same role on this project.	0.5	Average - 3	Project was not DB and was not on Interstate. Railroad and utility coordination present. Bridge construction over railroad. Complex MOT with temporary bridge. Site access was limited. No Key Individuals listed. Not similar size and complexity.	0.7	Above Average - 4	Project was not DB, not on Interstate. Constrained urban environment with significant railroad coordination required. Limited utility coordination. Site access was limited. Not particularly environmentally sensitive. MOT had some level of complexity. CM was Key Individual involved in project as Superintendent. Lead Contractor was in same role on this project.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project was DB interstate widening with RR coordination that included bridge construction over water and mainline bridges. This project required utility coordination, required environmental permits, and had complex MOT. Narrative did not mention limited site access. Work included coordination with adjacent projects. Proposed PM Key individual was Senior Project Engineer on listed project. Proposed Lead Contractor was included in a JV for approximately half the project cost. Team lists different Lead Designer.
<p>Provide 4 projects for which a design services contract was executed within the last 15 calendar years that identify the previous work experience by the Lead Designer or any Major Design Subcontractors on the Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer, Sections A through G. Projects for which the design services have been completed and accepted by the owner are preferred. The required Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer may be downloaded from the SCDOT Design-Build website under the SCDOT Design-Build Standard Forms Section at <a href="https://www.scdot.org/business/design-build.aspx">https://www.scdot.org/business/design-build.aspx</a>. This information shall be included in the Appendix B and will not be counted against the specified page limit in Section 5.2.2.</p>													
Project 5	1	1.0	Outstanding - 6	Project was DB on Interstate. Railroad coordination required. Extensive utility coordination. Site access was limited. Environmentally sensitive. Complex MOT. All Key Individuals were involved in this project. Lead Contractor was part of JV and Lead Design Firm was in same role on this project. Listed project has very similar geotechnical, environmental, and hydrologic conditions.	0.7	Above Average - 4	Project was DB on Interstate. No railroad coordination required. New alignment. Limited utility coordination. Environmentally sensitive. Complex geotechnical engineering. MOT had some level of complexity. Lead Designer was Key Individual involved in project as Deputy Lead Design Engineer. Lead Design Firm was in same role on this project.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project was DB on Interstate with interchanges. Railroad coordination required. Extensive utility coordination. Site access was limited. Environmentally sensitive. Complex MOT. Lead Designer was Key Individual involved in project as Water Resources Manager. Similar scope and magnitude. Noise wall construction. Lead Design Firm was in same role on this project.	0.5	Average - 3	Project is not DB but is interstate interchange project. Project did not have RR coordination, was not bridge construction over water and was not mainline bridge. This project required utility coordination, environmental permitting and complex MOT. Write-up did not mention limited site access. Coordination with third party adjacent major industry. Proposed Lead Design Engineer was PM/Lead Structural Engineer on the listed project.
Project 6	1	0.7	Above Average - 4	Project was DB. Not Interstate standards but was over waterway. No railroad coordination required. Limited utility coordination required. Site access was limited. Environmentally sensitive. MOT not particularly complex and only at be-ins as new alignment project. Lead Designer was Key Individual as Structural Engineer involved in project.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project was DB on Interstate. No railroad coordination required. Noise walls constructed. Bridge over similar river. Limited utility coordination. Environmentally sensitive. Complex MOT. Extensive coordination with three adjacent and overlapping projects. Significant third-party governmental coordination. Robust public relations campaign. No Key Individuals. Lead Design Firm was Lead Design Firm on this project.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project was DB on Interstate with interchanges. Railroad coordination required. Extensive utility coordination. Site access was limited. Environmentally sensitive. Complex MOT. Lead Designer was Key Individual involved in project as Water Resources Manager. Similar scope and magnitude. Noise wall construction. Bridge over water. Lead Design Firm was in same role on this project.	0.7	Above Average - 4	Project is not DB but is interstate widening project with interchanges. Project did not have RR coordination, included bridge construction over water, and included mainline bridges. This project required utility coordination, environmental permitting, adjacent project coordination, and complex MOT. Write-up did not mention limited site access. Proposed Lead Design Engineer was Lead Structural Engineer on the listed project. Proposed Lead Designer was lead design firm for listed project.



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet																			
		Carolina Crossroads Phase 3C - Phase 3C—Replacement of I-20 bridges over the Saluda River and CSX Railroad, and I-20 widening between Exits 61 and 63 - Project ID P043325 - Lexington County																			
		Tuesday, July 23, 2024 through Thursday, July 25, 2024																			
		Archer-Western Construction				Balfour Beatty Reeves JV				Crowder Construction Company				The Lane Construction Company				United Infrastructure Group - Blythe Development JV			
Project 7	1	0.3	Below Average - 2	Project was not DB. Railroad coordination was not required. No listed utility coordination. Site access was limited. Project exhibited environmental sensitivity. MOT was not complex. No Key Individuals involved in project. Lead Design Firm was in same role on this project. Emergency bridge project.	0.3	Below Average - 2	Project was not DB and not Interstate. No railroad coordination limited utility coordination. Bridge over water. Not particularly challenging site access. Environmentally sensitive wetlands. Not complex MOT. Challenging geotechnical environment. Lead Designer was Key Individual as structural engineer on the project and Lead Design Firm was bridge design subconsultant on project.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project was DB design to Interstate standards with interchanges. Railroad coordination required. Extensive utility coordination. Partially greenfield project. Environmentally sensitive. Complex MOT. Noise wall construction. Bridge over water. Similar scope and magnitude. Lead Designer was Key Individual involved in project as Water Resources Manager. Lead Design Firm was in same role on this project.	0.7	Above Average - 4	Project is not DB but is interstate widening project with interchanges. Project has two RR bridges and includes RR coordination, included bridge construction over water and included marine bridges. This project required utility coordination, environmental permitting, adjacent project coordination, and complex MOT. Write-up did not mention limited site access. Proposed Lead Design Engineer was Lead Structural Engineer on the listed project. Proposed Lead Designer was lead design firm for listed project.	0.3	Below Average - 2	MBI was subconsultant to prime consultant to SCDOT on DB prep contract. DB prep is not particularly relevant to CCR Phase 3C, since most of DB prep has already been completed. Project included interstate widening, no RR coordination, no bridge construction over water, required utility coordination, limited site access, environmentally sensitive, complex MOT, and adjacent project coordination. Lead Design Engineer was the PM on the DB prep subconsultant contract. Lead Designer was subconsultant to DB prep prime consultant on listed project. The designer's services included drainage inspection, mapping, hydraulic design, roadway plan reviews, and RFP development support.					
Project 8	1	0.5	Average - 3	Project was DB. Railroad coordination was not required. Limited utility coordination. Site access was not limited. Project exhibited environmental sensitivity with bridge over water. MOT was not complex. Lead Designer was Key Individual as Structural Engineer involved in project. Lead Design Firm was in same role on this project.	0.3	Below Average - 2	Project as railroad bridge design was not DB. Project was railroad bridge over Interstate. Complex and involved railroad coordination. Major utility coordination. Limited site access. Complex MOT. Environmentally sensitive. No Firm or Key Individual is listed on this example project as it pertains to the RFO. CTEA project experience as written describes the experience of an individual who is not identified as a key value added individual in the SOQ.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project was DB not on Interstate, but included interstate interchanges. Railroad coordination required. Extensive utility coordination. Environmentally sensitive. Complex MOT. Lead Designer was Key Individual involved in project as Water Resources Manager. Lead Design Firm was in same role on this project.	0.5	Average - 3	Project is DB and is interstate system interchange project. Stardec was major design subconsultant for MOT plans for system interchange and Roper Mountain Road overpass over I-85. Proposed Lead Design Engineer was Lead Engineer for major subconsultant on the listed project. Proposed Lead Designer was major subconsultant for listed project.	0.3	Below Average - 2	Project was DB, non-interstate, large bridge over water, no RR coordination, no mention of utility coordination, no limited site access, environmentally sensitive, not complex MOT. Lead Designer provided design review and CEI services for owner but not similar to scope needed on CCR Phase 3C. Lead Design Engineer was the Hydraulic Quality Reviewer. The designer's services included oversight on environmental permitting, public relations, reviewing project design, and CEI during the construction phase.					
Provide 2 projects awarded within the last 10 calendar years that identify the previous work experience by the Lead Independent Quality Firm on a project of similar scope and complexity. The project experience may be working for a contractor that is responsible for performing quality acceptance testing similar to the requirements of the CCR GAP or working for a state department of transportation providing traditional CE&I services that include contract administration and acceptance testing for the owner. Identification of previous work experience for the Lead Independent Quality Firm shall be provided on the Work History and Quality Form - Contractor/Designer, Sections A through G. Projects for which services have been completed and accepted by the owner are preferred. The required Work History and Quality Form - Contractor/Designer may be downloaded from the SCDOT Design-Build website under the SCDOT Design-Build Standard Forms Section at <a href="https://www.scdot.org/business/design-build.aspx">https://www.scdot.org/business/design-build.aspx</a> . This information shall be included in the Appendix B and will not be counted against the specified page limit in Section 5.2.2.																					
Project 9	1	1.0	Outstanding - 6	Project was DB on Interstate. Railroad coordination required. Extensive utility coordination. Site access was limited. Environmentally sensitive. Complex MOT. All Key Individuals were involved in this project. Lead Contractor was part of JV and Lead Design Firm was in same role on this project. IOM is Key Individual in the same role. Listed project has very similar geotechnical, environmental, and hydrologic conditions.	0.7	Above Average - 4	Project was DB on Interstate. Railroad coordination required. Extensive utility coordination. Site access was limited. Environmentally sensitive. Complex MOT. No Key Individuals were involved in this project. Lead Contractor and Lead Design Firm were not involved on this project. Proposed IOF is serving as subconsultant to this project's IOF providing inspection and management support.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project was DB, not on Interstate. Signature Interstate Bridge over Hudson River. Construction over water. No railroad coordination required. Extensive utility coordination. Site access was limited. Environmentally sensitive. Complex MOT. No Key Individuals were involved in this project. Lead Contractor and Lead Design Firm were not involved on this project. Proposed IOF served as subconsultant to this project's Lead Contractor serving as IOF for design and construction.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project was DB and was Interstate widening with interchanges. No bridge construction over water listed. Railroad coordination required. No utility coordination listed. Site access was not listed as limited. Environmental compliance. Complex MOT. Proposed IOM Key Individual was CEI PM on this project (according to his resume). Lead Contractor was in same role on this project. Lead Design Firm was not involved on this project. Proposed IOF served as lead CEI firm working for owner.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project was DB on Interstate. Railroad coordination required. Extensive utility coordination. Site access was limited. Environmentally sensitive. Complex MOT. Lead Contractor was part of JV. IOM is Key Individual in the same role. Listed project has very similar geotechnical, environmental, and hydrologic conditions.					
Project 10	1	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project was DB to Interstate standards. No railroad coordination required. Extensive utility coordination. Site access was not limited. Complex MOT at tie-ins and interchanges. IOM is Key Individual in the same role.	0.7	Above Average - 4	Project was DB on Interstate. Extensive utility coordination. Site access was limited. Environmentally sensitive. Complex MOT. No Key Individuals were involved in this project. Lead Contractor and Lead Design Firm were not involved on this project. Proposed IOF is serving as subconsultant to this project's IOF providing inspection and management support.	0.5	Average - 3	Project was DB, designed to Interstate standards. Signature Interstate Bridge over Indian Inlet. Construction over water. No railroad coordination required. Extensive utility coordination. Site access was limited. Environmentally sensitive. Complex MOT. Proposed IOM was Key Individual was involved in this project as the Quality Manager with DeDOT for Park Enhancement. Lead Contractor and Lead Design Firm were not involved on this project. Proposed IOF served as subconsultant to this project's Lead Contractor serving as QA firm.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project was DB and was Interstate project with interchanges. Project includes bridge construction over water. Railroad coordination required. No utility coordination listed. Site access was not listed as limited. Environmental compliance and environmentally sensitive. Complex MOT. Proposed IOM Key Individual was CEI/CC Manager on this project (according to his resume). Lead Contractor was in same role on this project. Lead Design Firm was not involved on this project. Proposed IOF served as lead CEI firm working for owner.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project was DB to Interstate standards. No railroad coordination required. Extensive utility coordination. Site access was not limited. Complex MOT at tie-ins and interchanges. IOM is Key Individual in the same role.					
Subtotal: 10		7.0			5.7			7.0			7.2			6.7							
Procurement Officer Initials																					
3.5 Past Performance of Team																					
3.5.2 Quality of Past Performance		Point Weight	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments				
		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				
		For each of the projects identified per Section 3.5.1, provide the information requested in Sections H through J of the Work History and Quality Form - Contractor/Designer that is included in the Appendix B. The Proposer shall provide Work History and Quality Forms - Contractor/Designer for each transportation projects, other than those previously provided in Section 3.5.1, 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 design-build projects or projects of similar scope involving the Lead Contractor or Lead Designer 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 pursued compensation from the Lead Designer due to errors and omissions? Has the Lead Designer filed legal proceedings against the Lead Contractor, or vice versa, on a design-build contract?																			
Project 1	1.5	0.8	Average - 3	Substantial completion achieved within extended contract time. There are no existing claims, disputes, or litigation ongoing. Quality initiatives were as expected on a DB project.	1.3	Excellent - 5	Project completed ahead of schedule by 1 year and on original budget. Project had no claims. Contractor implemented strategies to remedy some structural issues. Instead of pre-drilling, they probed ahead of work. Also demonstrated innovation with the use of alternative materials.	1.0	Above Average - 4	Project completed within the contract time and budget. Project had no claims. Contractor value engineered the foundations of the bridge to mitigate environmental and FERC requirements. Reconstructed an historic wall in the downtown area.	1.0	Above Average - 4	No mention of finishing on time, budget, or claims. Innovative interchange ATC eliminated third level bridges, reduced environmental impacts, helped overcome hurdles to obtain 401/404 permits, and utilized on-site concrete plants. Proactive utility coordination avoided wetland disturbances, eliminated additional permitting, provided safe ingress/egress, and accommodated seasonal utility relocation restrictions. Project substantially complete.	0.5	Below Average - 2	Project is under construction. One member of JV worked with subcontractor to resolve issue on this project in order to resolve dispute without work stoppage. Since project is not finished, there is no definitive information about time, budget, or claims.					
Project 2	1.5	0.8	Average - 3	Project not complete. "Good Catch" safety program allows any worker to point out safety and quality issues. There are no existing claims, disputes, or litigation ongoing.	1.0	Above Average - 4	Project not complete. The project saw significant early owner-caused delays that the contractor worked with the department to prioritize and progress work. Included additional scope in the contract for widening. Negotiated a major owner-directed change. Added innovation with the conveyor system reducing traffic impacts.	0.8	Average - 3	Project was completed on time and almost on budget. Not a lot mentioned as far as quality initiatives. No liquidated damages. No claims.	1.0	Above Average - 4	No mention of finishing on time, budget, or claims. A proactive approach to utility relocations improved the overall schedule. Innovative site-built drainage boxes mitigated a COVID supply chain issue. An ATC shifting alignment in crossing route eliminated the need for a utility relocation. Project substantially complete.	0.8	Average - 3	No mention of finishing on time or budget. No claims, litigation, or disputes to date. Project was on accelerated schedule and is substantially complete. UBUV worked closely with SCDOT during construction to adapt and make multiple necessary changes to the project as a result of the late developer putting their project on hold and then abandoning it altogether.					
Project 3	1.5	1.3	Excellent - 5	Substantial completion achieved on time and budget. There are no existing claims, disputes, or litigation ongoing. Self-performed all items on critical path. Team tracked quantities in weekly meetings to control costs. Built trade to reduce construction costs, environmental impacts, and streamline permitting process. Project won multiple awards.	0.8	Average - 3	Five-month savings to critical path. Innovative use of materials and construction methods to reduce bridge construction duration.	0.8	Average - 3	Finished within contract time. No claims despite shortage of skilled workers. A proposed design change was accepted that allowed linear construction due to bus station constructability concerns.	0.8	Average - 3	Renegotiated completion date due to owner-directed scope additions and changes due to adjacent railroad project. Project completed on time with new duration. No LDs and no other issues.	0.8	Average - 3	Project is described as on track; substantial completion due late in August 2024. Gravit walls were an added value and innovation. Since project is not finished, there is no definitive information about time, budget, or claims.					
Project 4	1.5	1.3	Excellent - 5	Substantial completion achieved on time and budget. There are no existing claims, disputes, or litigation ongoing. Self-performed all items on critical path. Team tracked quantities in weekly meetings to control costs. Built trade to reduce construction costs, environmental impacts, and streamline permitting process. Project won multiple awards.	0.8	Average - 3	Project construction occurred during peak of COVID pandemic restrictions. Coordinated with railroad and state transportation department to resolve schedule conflicts. Project emphasized safety.	1.0	Above Average - 4	Finished 3 year contract under the original bid amount without claims, disputes, litigation or arbitration. Complex coordination with stakeholders, public, and active rail users.	1.0	Above Average - 4	No mention of budget, or claims. It reads that project did not finish on time. Insufficient details about meeting time and budget. No initiatives relative to quality and cost savings listed.	0.5	Below Average - 2						



SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet														
		Carolina Crossroads Phase 3C - Phase 3C—Replacement of I-20 bridges over the Saluda River and CSX Railroad, and I-20 widening between Exits 61 and 63 - Project ID P043325 - Lexington County														
		Tuesday, July 23, 2024 through Thursday, July 25, 2024														
		Archer-Western Construction			Balfour Beatty Reeves JV			Crowder Construction Company			The Lane Construction Company			United Infrastructure Group - Blythe Development JV		
Project 5	1.5	1.0	Above Average - 4	Project not complete. Submittal and design schedule met. RFC plans complete. Over-the-shoulder review process was beneficial to schedule and quality. Several ATCs were approved to enhance overall quality. IMR successfully modified and approved.	1.0	Above Average - 4	Successfully obtained permit quickly. Provided additional geotechnical expertise to buttress staff. No claims, disputes, or litigation. Project won several awards. Responsiveness to construction issues helped the Contractor finish on time.	0.8	Average - 3	Utilized overhead conveyor system to deliver construction materials minimizing traffic impacts. Removed from design large retaining wall after coordination with state due to maintenance concerns. No mention of project schedule, budget, or claims.	0.8	Average - 3	Plans were completed on time and within budget. Designer performed a noise study to eliminate a noise wall avoiding significant cost.	0.5	Below Average - 2	Information provided is outdated and incomplete. In section 11, it is written that "this project is scheduled for completion in March 2023." It is unknowable from the write-up whether this project is complete. The addition of a third-party independent plan reviewer is of value. There is no definitive information about time, budget, or claims.
Project 6	1.5	1.3	Excellent - 5	Bridge open to traffic 60 days early. Saved \$6 million on nine ATCs. Reduced nearly 30% of wetland impacts.	1.0	Above Average - 4	Completed plans ahead of schedule. Scored well with VDOT. Development of early phase plans during design phase helped finish ahead of schedule. Significant environmental coordination. Incorporated bridge design elements to reduce need for future inspection and maintenance.	0.5	Below Average - 2	Proposed a roadway shift to eliminate impacts to a neighborhood sports complex and history property. No description of quality initiatives or ATCs. No mention of project schedule, budget, or claims.	0.8	Average - 3	Plans were completed on time and within budget. All quality initiatives met the requirements in the design contract.	0.8	Average - 3	Construction claims, budget, and time are not applicable, since MBI was designer. No discussion present of time and budget for professional services contract or any other quality initiatives. In-depth geotechnical design of turn-back MSE walls reduced ground improvements saved significant budget. Won two awards.
Project 7	1.5	0.5	Below Average - 2	Emergency bridge project. Description was not specific about quality. Insufficient details about meeting time and budget. No initiatives relative to quality and cost savings listed.	0.8	Average - 3	Completed bridge design on schedule and on budget. Completed plan revisions to save MOT. Adjusted foundation design to address liquefiable soils but not increase project budget.	0.8	Average - 3	Team proposed 24 ATCs (with many implemented in final design) that reduced time and cost helping to win the project. Project design schedule was delayed for three years due to outside environmental litigation. Team was able to stop and restart twice. Interdisciplinary reviews were integral to design process. No mention of budget or claims.	0.8	Average - 3	RDW Plans were completed on time and within budget. Designer advanced RR bridge plans providing additional time to secure RR approval to deliver on time. Project not yet complete.	0.8	Average - 3	Construction claims, budget, and time are not applicable, since MBI was DB prep firm and design review firm. MBI met initial RFP schedule with design deliverables. Currently performing DB review services and is on schedule or ahead of schedule on these reviews.
Project 8	1.5	0.8	Average - 3	All designs completed and submitted on time. There are no existing claims, disputes, or litigation ongoing. Lead Designer was responsible for seven separate bridge sites.	0.8	Average - 3	The listed Firm was able to deliver railroad bridge plans on an accelerated schedule. Avoided major delay through shop drawing review process.	1.3	Excellent - 5	Won Pinnacle Carolinas AGC Partner Award. Project completed on time and within budget. Team redesigned to maintain traffic versus closing a roadway, utilizing single-span bridge to minimize interstate construction impacts. Minimized environmental impacts to reduce the need for an individual Permit to a Nationwide Permit. Redesigned slopes near gas main without impact to overall cost or schedule.	0.8	Average - 3	Close coordination with contractor and rapid response to issues.	0.5	Below Average - 2	Construction claims, budget, and time are not applicable, since MBI was DB Design Review and CEI. Self assessment of MBI's services are normal expectations of CEI and design-review professional services contracts. Quality initiatives listed were conducted by Lead Contractor of DB Team. Project received CEI award.
Project 9	1.5	0.3	Poor - 1	Team listed "Not Applicable" in each blank, which is not a non-response. Project not complete. Insufficient details about meeting time and budget. No initiatives relative to quality and cost savings listed.	0.8	Average - 3	The listed Firm is a support firm to the IOF process through providing inspection and management support staff. Adapted to IOF process quickly.	0.8	Average - 3	Reviews and other services completed in a timely manner and adhered to the OMP.	0.8	Average - 3	Project not complete. Railroad submittals from contractor were reviewed additionally by transit and rail unit prior to submittal to rail third party. All other quality initiatives met the requirements in the contract.	0.3	Poor - 1	Team listed "Not Applicable" in each blank, which is not a non-response. Project not complete. Insufficient details about meeting time and budget. No initiatives relative to quality and cost savings listed.
Project 10	1.5	0.3	Poor - 1	Team listed "Not Applicable" in each blank, which is not a non-response. Project not complete. Insufficient details about meeting time and budget. No initiatives relative to quality and cost savings listed.	0.8	Average - 3	The listed Firm is a support firm to the IOF process through providing inspection and management support staff. Adapted to IOF process quickly.	1.0	Above Average - 4	Reviews and other services completed in a timely manner and adhered to the OMP. QA team provided support for dispute resolution. Used partnering to avoid claims and delays. Managed project schedule and tracked project item costs to avoid overruns.	0.8	Average - 3	Phase 1 of the project opened within one week of the revised substantial completion date, and Phase 2 opened on the substantial completion date. All quality initiatives met the requirements in the CEI contract.	0.3	Poor - 1	Team listed "Not Applicable" in each blank, which is not a non-response. Project not complete. Insufficient details about meeting time and budget. No initiatives relative to quality and cost savings listed.
All other projects	5	2.5	Average - 3	In 2018 in Miami, two worker fatalities associated with a concrete barrier wall collapse associated with an excavation. Only one violation of three noted was deemed serious.	4.2	Excellent - 5	For the two projects listed with claims, one pending and one resolved, they are minor in nature. No conclusion can be drawn about the unresolved claim.	4.2	Excellent - 5	Lead Designer - Delaware River - The owner and Lead Designer had disagreements over design errors and omissions. The parties resolved in mediation.	3.3	Above Average - 4	Two projects listed delayed for over 30 days with prenegotiated LDs near \$3M total. Two OSHA violations due to overhead line safety and aerial lift safety.	4.2	Excellent - 5	UIG DDOT bridge Batch 1 LD's assessed for a few sites, overall project completed on time. Minor delays and LD's Batch 2 LD's assessed for a few sites, overall project finished on time. Minor delays on three of the bridges. Blythe - project delayed due to COVID impacting a concrete paving crew and supply chains. Contractor worked to mitigate where they could, but the overall project was late by an unspecified number of days.
Previous Contractor Performance Evaluation System and Consultant Performance Evaluation Scores. Other available information related to past performance.	10	8.3	Excellent - 5	CPES = 79.35 CPE = 8.08 Archer-Western had four projects with an above-average overall DB performance. On a couple of projects, their DB score dropped slightly over the last performance period, although these projects are not complete. AWC's references are outstanding to perfect. ICE's consultant scores are above average. ICE's CPE is well above average for a large number of projects.	6.7	Above Average - 4	CPES = 83.38 and 74.24 CPE = 6.62 Stoan/Reeves had average to above average DB scores. BBI had no DB scores. For both construction team members, the CPES scores rate from average to above average. For JMT, recent projects show slightly above average overall performance. Stoan/Reeves references are outstanding to excellent. BBI had no references. JMT's references are outstanding, mostly excellent, and some perfect.	6.7	Above Average - 4	CPES = 74.99 CPE = 7.99 Crowder had above average DB scores and CPES scores. For RK&K, recent projects show slightly above average overall performance. Crowder's references are satisfactory to excellent. RK&K's references are all excellent.	5.0	Average - 3	CPES = 76.18 CPE = 8.12 Lane had below average to average DB scores. Lane had above average CPES scores. For Startec had no DB performance scores. Startec's CPE scores are above average. Lane's references are very weak to excellent. Startec's references are outstanding to perfect.	8.3	Excellent - 5	CPES = 81.67 and 78.68 CPE = 8.25 UIG had average to above average DB scores. Blythe had slightly above average to above average DB scores. MBI had slightly above average DB scores. UIG had above average CPES score. Blythe had above average CPES score. MBI's CPE scores are above average. UIG's references are satisfactory to outstanding averaging to outstanding. Blythe's references are weak to above average. MBI's references are satisfactory to excellent.
Subtotal:	30	19.8			19.8			19.3		18.8		18.8				
Procurement Officer Initials																
Total Score																
Points																
Total:	100.0															
Procurement Officer Initials																
		Archer-Western Construction			Balfour Beatty Reeves JV			Crowder Construction Company			The Lane Construction Company			United Infrastructure Group - Blythe Development JV		
		100.0			100.0			100.0			100.0			100.0		
		69.7			61.6			57.8			56.4			68.5		

SCDOT Design-Build

SCDOT Design-Build SDO Evaluation Score Sheet

Caroline Crossroads Phase 3C - Phase 3C—Replacement of I-20 bridges over the Saluda River and CSX Railroad, and I-20 widening between Exits 61 and 63 - Project ID P043325 - Lexington County  
Tuesday, July 23, 2024 through Thursday, July 25, 2024

Archer-Western Construction

Balfour Beatty Reeves JV

Crowder Construction Company

The Lane Construction Company

United Infrastructure Group - Blythe Development JV

I certify that the scores shown on this sheet(s) accurately reflect the actions of the Committee on DATE and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFO.

Brian Klauk, Chairperson  
Tony Magwood, Voting Member  
David Rogers, Voting Member  
Ron Hinson, Voting Member  
Kit Scott, Voting Member  
Brad Reynolds, Voting Member  
Nick Pizzuti, Procurement Officer  
Brian Gambrell, Legal  
Jim Martin, FHWA

*[Handwritten signatures]*