

SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet					
	Carolina Crossroads Phase 3C - I-20 Widening and Saluda River and CSX Bridge Replacements					
	04/07/25 to 04/09/25					
	Archer Western Construction / ICE		Balfour Beatty Reeves JV / JMT		United-Blythe JV / MBI	
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	NCP		NCP		NCP	
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	
Are the signed Notices of Receipt for Addenda provided?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
Is the Org Chart and Availability of Key Individuals documents provided?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
Is the Confidential and Proprietary Information Page List provided?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
Are the Prequalification Certificates for Proposer, individual entities and JV if required provided?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
Is a copy of the Joint Venture organizational agreement provided demonstrating its joint and several liability?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
Is the Quality Credit Matrix provided?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
Is the CPM Schedule provided in the format as described in RFP Section 4.1?	Yes		Yes		Yes	
Procurement Officer Initials	NCP		NCP		NCP	
Technical Proposal Narrative	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments
1. Describe Project Delivery and Approach by discussing/providing the following:						
1a) Identify the proposed schedule for implementing the Project. Include the sequence of construction. Describe methods that will allow a reduction in the overall construction schedule for the Project. As part of the Technical Proposal Appendices, provide Critical Path Method (CPM) Schedule, graphically, that shows the expected plan. Include the following items at a minimum: • Design phases/breakdown • Start and finish milestones for all segments, sections, or phases • Details of traffic control plans • Traffic shifts • Utility windows • Right of way acquisitions/right of entry • Special contract requirements • Known or expected risks • Other activities or relationships that are critical to the Proposer's Project design or construction		Met requirements of the RFP.	Omitted Items	Sewer force main design missing from CPM schedule. No ability to discern whether this item is on critical path. CPM schedule is missing 5-day SCDOT review of responses to initial comments in several places. NTP1 is more than 45 days after Contract Execution. Final Completion not shown in CPM schedule.	Omitted Items	CPM schedule missing NTP 2 milestone.
1b) Describe Team's approach for maintaining traffic on interstate mainline while avoiding and minimizing impacts to the traveling public.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.
1c) Describe the proposed design Submittal process and include in the CPM schedule in Appendices all 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.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.
1d) Describe how the design of this Project ties to Phase 3E of Carolina Crossroads Schematic Design. Discuss any changes needed to Phase 3E due to the Proposer's design.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.
1e) Describe the proposed approach to quality control and understanding of the Quality Assurance Program. Discuss the roles of the Proposer and SCDOT for all aspects of design and construction of the Project. Discuss compliance with required standards, testing laboratories, mix designs and material certifications processes. Discuss staffing levels required to meet the sampling, testing, and inspection requirements of the Quality Assurance Program.		Met requirements of the RFP.	Deficiencies	Description of IA process is not accurate and misapprehended with IQF and OV functions.	Deficiencies	Description of IA process is not accurate and misapprehended with IQF and OV functions.
1f) Discuss the strategies the Proposer's team will implement to mitigate or eliminate what the Proposer's team deems to be the top three risks on the Project. Describe the role that the Proposer expects SCDOT or other agencies to have in addressing these Project risks.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.
	Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score	
Technical Narrative Overall Adjectival Score:	A		C		B	
Procurement Officer Initials	NCP		NCP		NCP	
Technical Proposal Narrative	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments
3. Appendix A.1: Provide Conceptual Roadway Plans. The intent of 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						
Carolina Crossroads Phase 3C - I-20 Widening and Saluda River and CSX Bridge Replacements						
04/07/25 to 04/09/25						
SCDOT Design-Build						
a. Typical sections for all roadways shall include as a minimum (11"x17" plan sheets): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Design speed <input type="checkbox"/> Functional classification <input type="checkbox"/> Lane configuration and widths <input type="checkbox"/> Shoulder and median widths <input type="checkbox"/> Cross slopes <input type="checkbox"/> Point of grade <input type="checkbox"/> Notes and details as necessary 		Met requirements of the RFP.	Multiple	The detail of concrete curb shown on p. 12 of the PDF does not meet current design standards and requirements of the TP, AASHTO Green Book 4.7.3 & SCDOT RDM 7.2.8.2. Typical section shows use of the gutter pan to achieve 12' paved shoulder width, which does not meet TP 200.3.3 criteria. (RFP Conformance Issue) The detail of guardrail behind curb shown on page 12 of the PDF does not meet current design standards and requirements of the TP. The use of MGS2C guardrail does not meet Test Level Evaluation for I-20 as noted in Std. Dwg. 805-001-01 Section 7.00. Test Level 3 criteria is required at a minimum. Also, MGS2C GR placement does not meet Std. Dwg. 805-220-00. (Unsuitable Quality)		Met requirements of the RFP.
b. Plan and profile for the entire Project Limits including interchange layout (11"x17" plan sheets). Plan view shall include as a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Geometric layout with reference data <input type="checkbox"/> Superelevation data <input type="checkbox"/> Geometric information including stations, PCs, PTs, alignment names, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Taper lengths <input type="checkbox"/> Deceleration/acceleration lengths <input type="checkbox"/> Construction limits <input type="checkbox"/> Control of Access Limits (mainline and interchange) <input type="checkbox"/> Existing and proposed Right of Way <input type="checkbox"/> Lane alignment <input type="checkbox"/> Clear zone limits <input type="checkbox"/> Horizontal clearance at obstructions (any critical locations) <input type="checkbox"/> Roadside barriers (location and type) <input type="checkbox"/> Bridge and box culverts <input type="checkbox"/> Limits of retaining walls <input type="checkbox"/> Noise Barrier Walls <input type="checkbox"/> Indicate any Design Exceptions approved in the RFP <input type="checkbox"/> Material Staging and Laydown Areas Profile view shall indicate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Grades & elevations <input type="checkbox"/> Vertical curvature (PI station & elevation, length & K value, stopping sight distance design speed met) <input type="checkbox"/> Bridge clearance envelopes <input type="checkbox"/> Lower Saluda River Path 		Met requirements of the RFP.	Multiple	The guardrail shown over crossline pipe outlet on I-20 EB around Sta. 2036+00 does not meet the requirements of TP200.3.14. (Deficiency) Missing items: bearing, taper length, and PI angle with no curve. RFP Section 4.1, 3B list of plan view minimum items includes taper lengths. (Omission)	Multiple	PI with no curve utilized in developing the horizontal geometry for I-20 WB, p. 12 of the PDF. Break with complicated geometry – TP200.3.4 requirement. (RFP Conformance Issue) Horizontal geometry shown on p. 12 of the PDF does not meet the minimum length of curves per RDM 5.2.5 for I20WB_MBI1, I20WB_MBI2, I20WB_MBI3, & I20WB_MBI4. (Minimal Design Values)
c. Cross sections in accordance with the Roadway Design Manual.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.
d. Special emphasis details (where needed to clearly demonstrate understanding and approach – tying to adjacent Carolina Crossroads Program Schematic Design) (11"x17" plan sheets). Colonized prints will be accepted for the Submittal of these special emphasis details.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.	Omitted Items	Did not provide any detail showing how this project would tie to the adjacent Phase 3E future project.
e. Plan and profile roll plots for the entire Project Limits including interchange layout. The plans should be at a scale of 1" = 150' on 36" x 8" length sheets. Plan view shall include as a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geometric layout with reference data • Superelevation data • Geometric information including stations, PCs, PTs, alignment names, etc. • 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 • Noise Barrier 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 • Lower Saluda River Path 		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.
	Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score	
Overall Adjectival Score, Appendix A.1:	A		E		D	
Procurement Officer Initials	NCP		NCP		NCP	
Technical Proposal Appendices	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments
4. Appendix A.2: Provide Conceptual Maintenance of Traffic Plans. The plans shall depict the number of construction stages and a staging narrative within those plans to include duration of each stage. The plans may be color coded and can be provided on roll plots at a minimum scale of 1" = 150' on 36" width x 8" length sheets for the entire Project Limits including interchanges. Plan scale and detail for critical areas shall be appropriate for demonstrating transitions, directional flow, and all items below.						
a. Plan for areas deemed critical by the design team for staging concerns. These areas may require cross sections for more detail.	Omitted Items	Median Ingress/Egress between the Saluda River bridge and the CSX bridge identified as a critical area by Team. Insufficient detail of river crossing and access via frontage roads.		Met requirements of the RFP.	Omitted Items	Stage 1 MOT plan does not show locations for outside work zone ingress/egress. Narrative discusses access from Riverchase Way and Davega Drive as critical for Stage 1 west of the Saluda River.



SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet						
Carolina Crossroads Phase 3C - I-20 Widening and Saluda River and CSX Bridge Replacements						
04/07/25 to 04/09/25						
SCDOT Design-Build						
b. Plan for access to the median work zone (ingress and egress).	Omitted Items	Ingress/Egress Locations for Stage 1 & 2B and 3 (east of river) missing. Plans missing method for river crossing. Tech Proposal PDF pp. 113 & 115.	RFP Conformance Issues	Shoulder ingress shown on pp. 157 & 158 of the PDF does not meet the requirements of TPA 600-1, section 10.4. Median ingress shown on p. 158 of the PDF does not meet the requirements of TPA 600-1, section 10.4. Median egress shown on p. 160 of the PDF does not appear to meet current design standards. No ATCs were submitted or approved to allow these deviations from these requirements.		Met requirements of the RFP.
c. Plan for maintaining ramp traffic.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.
d. Plan for maintaining positive temporary drainage during stages.	Omitted Items	Drawing showing positive drainage in median missing in MOT Stages 2B and 3A. Table row "d" for MOT Stages 2B and 3A do not address temporary drainage. Tech Proposal PDF pp. 115-116.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.
e. Plan for placing girders over the Saluda River and CSX railroad.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.
f. Plan for demolition of bridges over the Saluda River and CSX railroad.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.
g. Plan for conceptual overhead signage needs along mainlines as necessary for traffic stages.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.
h. Narrative for notifying the traveling public of upcoming stages.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.
	Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score	
Overall Adjectival Score, Appendix A.2:	C		D		B	
Procurement Officer Initials	NCP		NCP		NCP	
Technical Proposal Appendices	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments
5. Appendix A.3: Provide Conceptual Bridge Plans which shall consist of the following:						
a. Plan and profile of bridge showing horizontal and vertical clearances and expansion joint locations and types of joint materials.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.		Met requirements of the RFP.
b. Superstructure cross sections and substructure elevations showing pertinent structural Elements, dimensions, and types of bearings.		Met requirements of the RFP.	Unsuitable Quality	RR Bridge Retaining Wall Details - Location of centerline of end bent not shown correctly in the Sections Thru Wall do not match Plan view, PDF p. 183.		Met 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.		Met requirements of the RFP.	RFP Conformance Issues	On Staging plans specifically, AT&T conduits shown on upstream side of the eastbound bridge, instead of downstream.		Met 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.		Met requirements of the RFP.	Multiple	I-20 WB over Saluda River - Construction access plan not clear/complete with respect to trestle location and girder erection sequence. No construction sequencing notes shown. (Deficiencies) Material handling/laydown locations not shown for the river bridges. (Omitted Items) Construction access plan sheets not provided for the railroad bridges. (Omitted Items)		Met requirements of the RFP.
e. Retaining wall envelopes at the bridge ends showing top of wall, ground lines, and bottom of wall (required only where retaining walls are proposed).		Met requirements of the RFP.	Omitted Items	Retaining wall envelopes not provided for the railroad bridges (full-height abutment walls and wing walls)		Met requirements of the RFP.
	Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score	
Overall Adjectival Score, Appendix A.3:	A		C		A	
Procurement Officer Initials	NCP		NCP		NCP	
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. Schedule Certainty <ul style="list-style-type: none">o Reduced schedule impacts to future Carolina Crossroads projectso Coordination with any active contracts within the areao Avoidance of delays associated with potential subsurface geologic conditions (i.e. challenging rock excavations)	Building a single structure instead of constructing an embankment between two bridges gives an improvement in schedule certainty. The risk of delayed drilled shaft construction for a single bridge is likely lower than possible delays from uncertain subsurface conditions in embankment construction.				The CPM provides schedule certainty for the drilled shafts in extremely hard rock, allowing nine days per drilled shaft for the Saluda River bridges and 10 days per shaft for the CSX bridges (using a 5-day workweek). The CPM also details coordination with CSX railroad, allowing seven months for coordination with CSX after RFC plans and before construction begins on the CSX bridges. Drilled shafts in the river will be installed using an additional outer temporary casing, to provide annular containment around the permanent casing and prevent the loss of material into the environmentally sensitive river. UBJV commits to revising Article 19.1(a) to establish Substantial Completion Liquidated Damages in the amount of \$15,000 per day.	
b. Minimizing and avoiding impacts to traffic during all construction and demolition activities.	Single structure removes approximately 15,500 truck deliveries from project. Nine- to Twelve-foot outside shoulders for trucks and vehicle refuge during construction creates better MOT operations.					
c. Improve safety within the Project and implement an effective Project safety program for workers and motoring public.	Use of SmartZone technology to provide additional safety enhancements.		HAAS (Safety Cloud) Work Zone Alert System FATC#8 provides wider work zone for construction and worker safety separated from traffic. Reduces number of construction vehicles entering/exiting median.			
d. Quality customer service, incident avoidance, response, and management during the construction of the Project.			Project design in conjunction with FATC#8 provides opportunity for maximized use of 10' outside shoulder within MOT during construction.			
e. Avoid or minimize impacts to Waters of the U.S.	Single structure eliminates 500 LF of stream impacts and 0.4 AC wetland impacts.					
f. Design and Construction techniques to mitigate limited site access.			Off-alignment construction enables mass grading during the initial construction phase.		Enhanced construction access to minimize Impacts to traffic and committed to resurfacing frontage roads.	
g. Avoid or minimize impacts to third parties. Discuss any railroad and/or in-contract utilities that are avoided or that have reduced impacts.						
Any other items	Single structure construction eliminates need for maintenance of 2H:1V or steeper slopes. Excavated soil that is suitable might potentially reduce borrow costs for the project.		Extend construction limits of CD in ultimate condition from STA 106+50 to 110+00.			



SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet					
	Carolina Crossroads Phase 3C - I-20 Widening and Saluda River and CSX Bridge Replacements					
	04/07/25 to 04/09/25					
	Quality Credit Points		Quality Credit Points		Quality Credit Points	
Overall Quality Credit Score:	8.60		9.60		2.50	
Procurement Officer Initials	NCP		NCP		NCP	
I certify that the scores shown on this sheet(s) accurately reflect the actions of the Committee on 04/07/25 to 04/09/25 and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFP.						
<div><div>Brian Klauk Chairperson</div><div>Anthony Lusk Voting Member</div><div>Kit Scott Voting Member</div><div>David Rogers Voting Member</div><div>Tony Magwood Voting Member</div><div>Brad Reynolds Voting Member</div><div>Ron Hinson Voting Member</div><div>Nick Pizzuti Procurement Officer</div><div>Brian Gambrell Legal</div><div>James Carsner FHWA</div></div>						