

SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet										
	I-95 over Lake Marion Bridge Replacement										
	12/10/2024 - 12/12/2024										
	Balfour Beatty/McLean			Mas Tec Civil			United/Traylor				
Responsiveness	Yes/No	Comments		Yes/No	Comments		Yes/No	Comments			
Is Proposer considered responsive?											
3.2 Introduction	Balfour Beatty/McLean			Mas Tec Civil			United/Traylor				
	Yes/No	Comments		Yes/No	Comments		Yes/No	Comments			
	Yes			Yes			Yes				
	Yes			Yes			Yes				
	Yes			Yes			Yes				
	Yes			Yes			Yes				
	Yes			Yes			Yes				
Procurement Officer Initials											
CW											
CW											
CW											
3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution	Balfour Beatty/McLean			Mas Tec Civil			United/Traylor				
	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments		
	3.3.1 Organizational Chart, Team Structure, and Team Integration	Point Weight	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.	2	1.0	Average - 3	The reporting structure was clear and covered the required organizational structure. Very minor irregularities were noted to include communication lines were shown between Design Quality Manager and SCDOT but not PM, and no communication lines shown from DB Coordinator to the Lead Designer and Construction Manager.	0.7	Below Average - 2	Org. chart does not list key individuals by full legal name. Key individuals will operate as displayed without splitting duties. The DB Coordinator is also coordinating with design and construction which is a good thing. CM is not a key individual employed by the Prime nor is the Lead Structural Engineer a member of the Lead Design firm which could reduce the prime contractor's control over key individuals.	1.3	Above Average - 4	Very clear and well organized org chart. Adding the Complex Bridge Reviewer in the right location is a plus. APM is not required on project. Noted the DB coordinator will be communicating with both design and construction.
Provide a brief, written description of significant functional relationships and how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team.	3	1.0	Below Average - 2	Includes description of functional relationships and lines of communication. Did not demonstrate how the team would integrate other than coordination. No discussion of co-location, over the shoulder reviews, etc.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Like that it is clear that PM and CM will be involved with the design process and doing constructability reviews. The DBC does show coordination with the CM and Lead Designer. Clearly laid out the DBIAs best practices that they will follow.	2.0	Above Average - 4	Demonstrated well the functional relationships between each member however the DB Coordinator is not included as shown in the Org. Chart. Design quality review team included for QC. Complex Bridge Independent Peer Review shown and is above the requirements. They also include the description of the zipper strategy which insures that they are coordinating.	
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	6 of the projects were DB projects that had some parts of this team participating. None of the projects showed that all teams were involved. Did show McLean and RK&K working together. Only project with contractors working together was in the early 2000's. PM and CM were not on many of these projects as key individuals.	1.0	Below Average - 2	Team has multiple projects where they have worked together as teams but did not indicate and key individual participation. The I-95 project was listed as DB and is not. There are other relationships scattered throughout the charts. No work history shown between Prime and Orion. Prime and Lead Designer do not show past experience on projects that included large water crossings.	2.0	Above Average - 4	United and the Lead Designer have worked on 20 design build projects with the JV and LD only having worked together on a few. Key individuals are sprinkled in throughout but none with all key individuals.	
Subtotal:											
8											
3.0											
CW											
CW											
CW											
3.3 Team Structure & Project Execution	Balfour Beatty/McLean			Mas Tec Civil			United/Traylor				
	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments		
	3.3.2 Project Resources, Strategies, and Execution	Point Weight	12	Use the Likert Scale		12	Use the Likert Scale		12	Use the Likert Scale	
	Demonstrate the team's capacity and available resources including personnel for this project.	4	2.0	Average - 3	Team has demonstrated they have the necessary resources to include barge mounted cranes, manpower, and nearby resources. However resources not specific to project.	2.7	Above Average - 4	Gave very specific resources committed to and available for the project. Also addressed additional resources if needed for construction and design.	3.3	Excellent - 5	They show that they clearly have the staff to complete both the design and construction. They also say what is needed for the project. Along with that they show what equipment they have to complete the job. A member of the JV is experienced marine contractor who owns a large barge and crane fleet ready to mobilize.
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/team members responsible.	4	2.0	Average - 3	Team to self perform 70% of the work. Team identifies each work item to be performed. Lacks details in construction of the structures specifically for sub/super structure responsibilities. Org. Chart identifies major tasks performed by others. JV provides availability of personnel, crews, and equipment to complete the project.	1.3	Below Average - 2	Prime contractor is showing major work to be completed by major subcontractor which could lessen Prime's control over the project. Unclear why team chose accelerated construction schedule and use of double shifts.	3.3	Excellent - 5	JV plans to do the majority of construction work themselves to ensure control quality. They are not splitting up major work items between contractors instead performing as a unified team. Specialty subs will be contracted as design progresses rather than naming in the SOQ. For design they are doing all the major items.	
Indicate how the geographical location of the firms will enhance integration, communication, issue resolution and project execution.	4	1.3	Below Average - 2	JV provided regional locations and support, but did not mention designer location or team integration.	2.0	Average - 3	Clearly discussed the teams approach during design and construction to successfully execute the project. Beneficial that all assets have offices really close to DOT and can co-location during design.	2.7	Above Average - 4	They did discuss how the PM would be available to attend design meetings at ICEs office. Designer is located close to Columbia. Team is familiar with the D7 office with recent projects and has established fabrication shop in close proximity. Field office shown in graphic will improve integration.	
Subtotal:											
12											
5.3											
CW											
CW											
CW											

SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet										
I-95 over Lake Marion Bridge Replacement										
12/10/2024 - 12/12/2024										
SCDOT Design-Build		Balfour Beatty/McLean			Mas Tec Civil			United/Traylor		
		Balfour Beatty/McLean			Mas Tec Civil			United/Traylor		
		Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
		20	Use the Likert Scale		20	Use the Likert Scale		20	Use the Likert Scale	
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals	Point Weight									
3.4.4 Project Management Team	20	13.3	Above Average - 4	Keith has 33 years of experience with 25 years being with Balfour. 3 of the 4 projects presented where DB. 2 of the projects had major bridge crossings and one he was the project executive and not PM and the other was the PM only at the end to save the project. All of Keith's references were very good except on one project.	6.7	Below Average - 2	Brian has 28 years experience and less than one year with current firm. Project 1 was a ped bridge and is early in the contract and not really similar. The Port Access road project was very complex. However, there was not a great reference when it came to coordination, conflict resolution, and partnering on project. Project 3 was a very large DB but unclear if there was a bridge that had the same complexities. Reference on project said there were issues with coordination. Project 4 was complete 20 plus years ago and Brian was not a PM on that one. Unclear if the project had similar bridges to this one on it. The only significant water crossing referenced was the ARC ped bridge. Overall noted some interstate work but not over a major waterway.	10.0	Average - 3	William has 32 years of experience with 5 years being with United. Two of the four projects are not clearly designated as design build project. One of the 4 projects presented is clearly labeled as a design build project. One project was a deck replacement. All of the projects had major water crossings. He was PM or DPM on all of the projects. Williams's one reference was very good.
Subtotal:	20	13.3			6.7			10.0		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW		
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals	Point Weight	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.4.5 Design Engineering Team	10	Use the Likert Scale			10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale	
<b>• Lead Design Engineer (6 points)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The Lead Design Engineer shall be in charge of and responsible for all aspects of the design of the Project, subject to oversight of the Project Manager.</li> <li>o The Lead Design Engineer must have a minimum of 10 years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects;</li> <li>o The Lead Design Engineer must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables;</li> <li>□ Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project;</li> <li>□ Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk.</li> </ul> </li> <li>o For the duration of the design phase, the Lead Design Engineer will attend all routine project meetings in person, be primarily dedicated to design of the Project, and be available as needed by SCDOT.</li> <li>o The Lead Design Engineer shall be a full time employee of the lead design firm.</li> </ul>	6	5.0	Excellent - 5	David has 42 years of experience and 19 years with his current firm. All projects were design build and all project were bridge water crossings. He served as a manager on each project. David was responsible for making sure all design was completed on 3 of 4 projects listed. All project references were well above average to excellent.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Ariel has over 30 years of experience with 19 years with current firm. Project 1 is a very similar bridge structure that is much larger than this project. All projects listed were design build interstate linear widening or interchange improvement projects with one major water crossing. The resume did not list his responsibilities on these projects only his title. Positive reference for the one project received. Responsible for overseeing all Alternative Delivery projects in Florida since 2005.	4.0	Above Average - 4	Cameron has 24 years of experience. Only 1 year with this company. 3 of the 4 projects were DB, but one was as the owner rep. The DB projects shown were not similar in project scope but comparable in magnitude. Only one project included a bridge over a navigable waterway. Demonstrated experience with interstate design and MOT. References were above average to excellent.
<b>• Structural Engineer (4 points)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The Structural Engineer shall have a minimum of 10 years of progressive experience in the design of bridge and roadway structures with particular emphasis on projects of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity.</li> </ul>	4	3.3	Excellent - 5	David has 42 years of experience and 19 years with his current firm. All projects were design build and all project were bridge water crossings. He served as structural engineer on each project. David was responsible for design and preparation of structure plans and noted as the EOR on two of the projects listed. All project references were well above average to excellent.	2.7	Above Average - 4	Derek has 32 years of experience and 8 years with his current firm. One of the projects listed was a DB project. All projects contained very large bridge structures in which Derek was either heavily involved in or was the EOR to include seismic and vessel collision. References were mixed.	4.0	Outstanding - 6	Rafi has 57 years of experience. 13 years with current firm. 3 of the 4 projects were DB projects. 3 of the projects are major water crossings that are very similar to the Lake Marion project. The other project was an interstate project. He was the structural engineer on all projects. 2 of the projects were completed with this contractor. Experience with vessel collision, bridges over navigable waterways, complex bridge design. Received positive references
Subtotal:	10	8.3			6.7			8.0		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW		
3.4 Experience of Key Individuals	Point Weight	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments	Points	Scale ID	Comments
3.4.6 Construction Management Team	10	Use the Likert Scale			10	Use the Likert Scale		10	Use the Likert Scale	
<b>• Construction Manager (10 points)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The Construction Manager shall be responsible for all aspects of the construction of the Project, subject to oversight of the Project Manager.</li> <li>o The Construction Manager must have a minimum of 10 years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the management of highway transportation projects;</li> <li>o The Construction Manager must provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of projects with similar:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Scope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables;</li> <li>□ Magnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project;</li> <li>□ Complexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk.</li> </ul> </li> <li>o For the duration of construction, the Construction Manager shall be dedicated solely to managing the construction of the Project, shall have no other assigned Project responsibilities, and shall not be utilized on any other projects.</li> <li>o The Construction Manager shall be on-site during all construction activities for the Project and attend status meetings during the construction phase.</li> <li>o For the duration of construction, the Construction Manager shall attend weekly status meetings and be available at the request of the SCDOT.</li> </ul>	10	6.7	Above Average - 4	Michael has 40 years of experience and 13 years with Balfour Beatty. All of the projects submitted were complex bridge projects where he was superintendent or PM on them. None of the projects were DB. Assigned duties were consistent with a construction manager position. References were very positive	5.0	Average - 3	Tyler has 14 years of experience and only 1 with current firm. Not clear if any of the projects were Design Build or not. Project 1 was a four lane divided facility over a waterway. Unclear if the other four projects included bridges of similar complexity to this project however references were very positive.	5.0	Average - 3	Jeremy has 18 year of experience. 17 years with the current firm. 4 of the 5 projects were DB projects that show progressive experience. Was listed as a manager of different disciplines on all of the projects. References were mixed.
Subtotal:	10	6.7			5.0			5.0		
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW		

SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet												
		I-95 over Lake Marion Bridge Replacement												
		12/10/2024 - 12/12/2024												
		Balfour Beatty/McLean			Mas Tec Civil			United/Traylor						
3.5 Past Performance of Team		Balfour Beatty/McLean			Mas Tec Civil			United/Traylor						
		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			
* Provide three projects awarded within the last 12 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 RFQ worked on the project, identify in Section G, the Key Individual name, role, and time on the project.														
Project 1	1.67	0.8	Average - 3	Project was Large Bridge/Water crossing. Project was completed by the Prime. Scope of project is similar in nature with bridge replacement and overwater crossing. Complexity of bridge components very similar to Lake Marion. CM proposed on this project was the PM on Project 1. Project included demolition and work in a Environmentally sensitive area. Coordination with 3rd party for pedestrian bridge and public boat ramp. Project is not design build, non interstate, and not of similar magnitude.	0.8	Average - 3	Project was a new two lane bridge over a long Water crossing on new alignment to maintain traffic during construction. Project was completed by the Prime. Complexity of bridge construction not similar to Lake Marion. No indication that key individuals worked on this project from Prime or Lead Designer. Project was DB Procurement. Project had an expedited schedule and work in a Environmentally sensitive area earning a couple of awards.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was Large Bridge/Water crossing. Project was completed by United with ICE as the Lead Designer. Project was DB Procurement. Complexity of bridge very similar to Lake Marion. Same Structural Lead and Deputy PM as proposed for this project. Project included demolition and work in an environmentally sensitive area. Project was non-interstate and not of similar magnitude.				
Project 2	1.67	0.8	Average - 3	Project was Large Bridge/Water crossing. Project was completed by the Prime. Complexity of bridge components very similar to Lake Marion. CM and PM for this project were the Operations Manger and PM on this project respectively. Project included demolition and work in a Environmentally sensitive area. Project is not design build, non-interstate, and not of similar magnitude.	0.8	Average - 3	Project includes very complex bridge structures but not over water crossings. Project was completed by the Prime. No indication that key individuals worked on this project from Prime or Lead Designer. Project was DB Procurement.	0.8	Average - 3	Project was Large Bridge over navigable waterway. Project was completed by United. Project was DBB and non-interstate. Same PM as proposed for this project.				
Project 3	1.67	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was Large Bridge/Water crossing. Project was completed by Major Sub McLean who is doing the marine work. Project was DB Procurement. Complexity of bridge construction very similar to Lake Marion. Project included demolition and work in a Environmentally sensitive area. Included Traffic Control. No key individuals, non-interstate, but of similar magnitude.	0.6	Below Average - 2	Project was a new high level bridge over water crossing to replace existing bascule bridge completed by subcontractor. Project included MOT, environmental concerns, and bridge demolition. Project was not design build and bridge was on a non-interstate route and lesser magnitude than the proposed Lake Marion Bridge project. No mention of Key Individuals or teaming with Prime or Designer.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project was large interstate bridge/Water crossing. Project Constructed by Traylor Brothers through a JV. Project was DB Procurement. Complexity of bridge construction very similar to Lake Marion. Project includes a pedestrian path, and work in a Environmentally sensitive area, and interstate widening. No key personnel involved.				
* Provide three projects for which a design services contract was executed within the last 12 calendar years that identify the previous work experience by the Lead Designer or any Major Design Sub-consultants on the Work History and Quality Form – Contractor/Designer. Projects for which the design services have been completed and accepted by the owner are preferred.														
Project 4	1.67	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was Large Bridge/Water crossing. Scope of project is similar in nature with bridge replacement and overwater crossing. Key individual held the same role on this project. Project included demolition and work in an environmentally sensitive area. Coordination with local municipality. Project is design build, mainline interstate, but not of similar magnitude or complexity.	1.4	Excellent - 5	Project is a major design build project over water crossing to replace the existing northbound bridge to add capacity, mixed use path, and a future light rail. Bridge included high level and low level spans with piers designed for vessel collision forces. Designer was also the Engineer of Record on the project and responsible for structures, roadway, drainage, ITS, utilities, signs and pavement markings, MOT, and environmental permitting. Lead Designer was Principal in Charge on this project. Project did not include seismic	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was Large Bridge/Water crossing. Project was completed by United with ICE as the Lead Designer. Project was DB Procurement. Complexity of bridge very similar to Lake Marion. Same Structural Lead as proposed for this project. Project included demolition and work in an environmentally sensitive area. Included Seismic design and vessel collision. Project was non-interstate and not of similar magnitude.				
Project 5	1.67	0.8	Average - 3	Project was a long bridge over waterway. Scope of project is similar in nature with bridge replacement and overwater crossing. Key individual held the same role on this project. Designer teamed with a member of the JV. Project included demolition and work in an environmentally sensitive area. Complex project with use of swing bridge and alignment. Project is design build, not interstate, and not of similar magnitude.	0.8	Average - 3	Project includes very complex bridge structures but not over water crossings. Project was completed by the Prime with BCC as EOR. No indication that key individuals worked on this project from Lead Designer. Project was DB Procurement.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was an interstate off-ramp crossing navigable waterway, railroad, and interstate. Bridge was completed by United with ICE as the Lead Designer. Project was DB Procurement. Complexity of bridge was more complex than Lake Marion. Same Structural Lead and Deputy PM as proposed for this project. Project included work in an Environmentally sensitive area. Included Seismic design but no vessel collision.				
Project 6	1.67	0.6	Below Average - 2	Project included bridge construction. Unclear on bridge complexity. Key individual held the same role on this project. A member of the JV and a design subconsultant teamed together. Project is design build, interstate, but not of similar magnitude and scope.	0.8	Average - 3	Project includes simple to complex bridge structures but not over water. Project was completed by the Prime with BCC as EOR. No indication that key individuals worked on this project from Lead Designer. Project was DB Procurement.	1.1	Above Average - 4	Project was Large Bridge/Water crossing. Bridge was completed by United with ICE as the Lead Designer. Project was DB Procurement. Complexity of bridge was very similar to Lake Marion but does not include high level spans. Same Structural Lead as proposed for this project. Project included demolition and work in an environmentally sensitive area. Project is non-interstate and did not include vessel collision.				
Subtotal:		10	5.6				5.3				6.7			
Procurement Officer Initials			CW				CW				CW			

SCDOT Design-Build		SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet											
		I-95 over Lake Marion Bridge Replacement											
		12/10/2024 - 12/12/2024											
		Balfour Beatty/McLean			Mas Tec Civil			United/Traylor					
3.5 Past Performance of Team		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		
<p>• 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.</p> <p>• 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.</p> <p>o Has the Lead Contractor or any member of the joint venture been declared delinquent or placed in default on any Project?</p> <p>o 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>o Have any design-build projects or projects of similar scope been delayed more than 30 days such that liquidated damages were assessed?</p> <p>o Has the Lead Contractor been cited by OSHA for violations deemed serious, willful, or repeated?</p> <p>o 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>o Has an owner, a Lead Contractor, or any member of a joint venture pursued compensation from the Lead Designer due to errors and omissions?</p> <p>o Has the Lead Designer filed legal proceedings against the Lead Contractor, or vice versa, on a design-build contract?</p>													
Project 1	1	0.7	Above Average - 4	Project won multiple awards. The design-bid-build project was complete 1 year ahead of schedule. Was completed under the original budget. No indication on disputes on the project but does mention good communication to resolve issues was used. There were potential claims which were resolved on the project. Coordination with using unfamiliar materials and successful communication reduced potential risk to improve overall quality.	0.5	Average - 3	Project won multiple awards and was on time and on budget. The project does mention good communication and issue resolution. Came up with a design change that helped with the cost and accelerate the construction schedule.	0.8	Excellent - 5	Project won multiple awards. The design-build project was complete 3 months ahead of schedule. Was completed on budget. No disputes or claims. Contractor provided extended warranty from 3 years to 5 years.			
Project 2	1	0.5	Average - 3	Project won multiple awards. The design-bid-build project was completed 10 months ahead of schedule. No indication if project was on budget or had any claims that they had to work through. Did have to work through quite a few challenges on project. Quality initiatives not very explicit.	0.7	Above Average - 4	Project won multiple awards. Team was able to provide the maximum scope for the project as a part of procurement and under owner's budget. Major reduction in the allowed time on the project. No indication of claims.	0.5	Average - 3	Project won an award. The design-bid-build project was complete ahead of schedule. Was completed on budget. No disputes or claims. Contractor worked well with major subcontractor. Used innovations during construction to ensure quality and schedule.			
Project 3	1	0.7	Above Average - 4	Design Build project won multiple awards. Bridge was complete and opened up 64 days ahead of schedule. Was completed under the original budget. McLean has there on quality initiative program that prioritizes cost control, schedule, and risk/opportunity meetings. No mention of any claims on the project.	0.3	Below Average - 2	Project won multiple awards. Contractor worked well with owner on the DBB project. Project was completed on time, on budge, and no indication of claims. No distinct quality initiatives provided.	0.5	Average - 3	Self-assessment is general. Project is not complete and unclear if project is on schedule. Only owner directed change orders. Review initiatives streamline construction and deliverables to maintain project schedule.			
Project 4	1	0.3	Below Average - 2	Provided a few items that helped with efficiency. Did not mention if the project was on time, on budget, or disputes/claims. Quality initiatives were very basic.	0.3	Below Average - 2	Project is not complete yet, but is currently on budget and time. Did not provide any quality initiatives. No mention of claims or disputes.	0.7	Above Average - 4	Project won an award. The design build project reduced nearly 30% of wetland impacts. ATCs reduced overall project cost. Innovated design eliminated the need of the closed drainage system.			
Project 5	1	0.5	Average - 3	Design Build Project won awards, was on time and on budget, and without claims or disputes. Reduced the impacts to the traveling public by utilizing existing bridge for a longer duration.	0.7	Above Average - 4	Designer developed a concept that allowed a major reduction in the days for construction and a major cost savings to the owner.	0.7	Above Average - 4	The designer ensured timely submission of all documents to meet the schedule. Very effective in utilizing the ATC process to include safety initiatives, cost savings, and schedule certainty. No mention of potential claims. Project is not complete.			
Project 6	1	0.3	Below Average - 2	Provided a few items that helped with efficiency. Did not mention on time and on budget or claims. Quality initiatives were very basic.	0.3	Below Average - 2	Provided a design that saved the owner 37 million. Project did not have any claims, litigation, or disputes. The narrative did not provide sufficient details to evaluate all quality initiatives.	0.5	Average - 3	Project included the design of 7 bridge sites and without claims or disputes. Quality initiatives are general.			
All other projects	4	4.0	Outstanding - 6	The only item they had was resolved in mediation so therefore they had none that were serious. Key individuals proposed on this project were not affiliated with this issue.	4.0	Outstanding - 6	No additional projects were submitted.	3.3	Excellent - 5	Both projects were assessed liquidated damages on several bridge sites within two bridge packages, however both projects were delivered on time.			
Previous Contractor Performance Evaluation System and Consultant Performance Evaluation Scores. Other available information related to past performance.	20	16.7	Excellent - 5	The Consultant Performance Evaluation score for RK&K was over 8 which is well above average scoring. There was no DB Performance Evaluation for the Contractors so that doesn't count against them, RK&K DBPEs were above average. The references we received from the projects and internal to SCDOT all had this team with outstanding to perfect scores with great comments.	10.0	Average - 3	The Consultant Performance Evaluation score for BCC was not available and will not count against them. There was no DB Performance Evaluation for the Contractor and Lead Designer so that doesn't count against them. Carolina Tea does have performance evaluations and most of them are average, but they do have a recent project that has scored below average. The reference we received from the projects and internal to SCDOT all had most of this team outstanding to perfect scores with great comments. There were a couple references for Carolina Tea that had them performing less than Average.	16.7	Excellent - 5	The Consultant Performance Evaluation score for ICE was 7.99 which is well above average scoring. There were many DB Performance Evaluations for United and the majority of those were above average. None for Traylor Brothers so that doesn't count against them, ICE's DB Performance Evaluations were above average. The references we received from the projects and internal to SCDOT all had this team with outstanding to perfect scores with great comments.			
Subtotal:	30	23.7				16.8				23.7			
Procurement Officer Initials		CW				CW				CW			
Total Score		Balfour Beatty/McLean			Mas Tec Civil			United/Traylor					
Points		100.0			100.0			100.0					
Total:		65.9			50.1			68.0					
Procurement Officer Initials		CW			CW			CW					



SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build SOQ Evaluation Score Sheet		
	I-95 over Lake Marion Bridge Replacement		
	12/10/2024 - 12/12/2024		
	Balfour Beatty/McLean	Mas Tec Civil	United/Traylor
	I certify that the scores shown on this sheet(s) accurately reflect the actions of the Committee on 12/10/2024 - 12/12/2024 & 12/16/2024 and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFQ.		
	Brad Reynolds	Chairperson	
		/Voting Member	
	Ben McKinney	Voting Member	
	John Burns	Voting Member	
	Bobby Usry	Voting Member	
Carmen Wright	Procurement Officer		
Brian Gambrell	Legal		
Rickelle Gennie	FHWA		