

SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet			
	P041130 I-95 over Lake Marion Bridge Replacement			
	9/30/2025 - 10/2/2025			
	BB-Mc JV / RKK		UT JV / ICE	
Preliminary Responsiveness	Pass/Fail	Comments	Pass/Fail	Comments
Were the Proposals submitted in accordance with the Milestone Schedule?	PASS	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	PASS	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
Is a Technical Proposal Narrative provided?	PASS	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	PASS	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
Are all appendices (conceptual plans, forms, and ATCs) provided?	PASS	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	PASS	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
Is Proposer still considered responsive?	PASS	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	PASS	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
Procurement Officer Initials	CW		CW	
Required Forms and Information	Yes/No	Comments	Yes/No	Comments
a. Is the Stipend Acknowledgement Form provided?	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
b. Is the Stipend Agreement provided?	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
c. Is the EEO Certificate provided?	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
d. Is the Non-Collusion Certificate provided?	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
e. Is the Notice of Receipt of Addendum provided?	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
f. Is the Org Chart and Availability of Key Individuals documents provided?	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
g. Confidential and Proprietary Information Page List?	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
h. Prequalification certification for Proposer identified in org chart?	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
i. Joint Venture Organizational Agreement?	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
j. Quality Credit Matrix?	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
Copies of approved Formal ATCs	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
Copy of approved Temporary Pavement Design	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
Copy of approved Complex Bridge Independent Peer Review Package	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP	YES	MEETS the requirements of the RFP
Procurement Officer Initials	CW		CW	



SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet			
	P041130 I-95 over Lake Marion Bridge Replacement			
	9/30/2025 - 10/2/2025			
Technical Proposal Narrative	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments
1. Describe Project Delivery and Approach by discussing/providing the following:				
<p>The Technical Proposal Narrative shall contain no more than 10 pages, excluding the required appendices. Charts, tables, and schedules used to explain or expand on the Technical Proposal are to be included within the page limit and shall not be inserted into the appendices. No additional information shall be accepted, including, but not limited to, links to external websites, video clips, or simulations/visualizations embedded within the Narrative.</p> <p>The Technical Proposal Narrative shall be in English on single sided 8.5"x11" letter sized paper, with minimum twelve-point Times New Roman font and double line spacing for text. Charts, tables, schedules, exhibits, or other illustrative information may be single spaced and shall be no smaller than 10 point font. Any Conceptual Plans shall be provided in black and white on single sided 22"x 36" paper unless otherwise noted herein.</p> <p>In the Technical Proposal Narrative, Proposers shall include a discussion on its Project Delivery and Approach or the proposal will be considered non-responsive. The Proposer may choose to include a discussion on Innovation and Added Value; however, the decision to not discuss Innovation and Added Value will not result in a non-responsive proposal. The Technical Proposal Narrative shall be developed in the following sequence:</p>		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
a. Identify the proposed schedule for implementing the Project. Include the sequence of construction. Describe methods that will allow a reduction in the overall construction scheduled for the Project. As part of the Technical Proposal Appendices, provide Critical Path Method (CPM) Schedule, graphically, that shows the expected plan.	Multiple	See Appendix A.4 for comments.		See Appendix A.4 for comments.
b. Describe Team's approach for maintaining traffic while avoiding and minimizing impacts to the traveling public.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
c. Describe the proposed design submittal process and include a chart showing anticipated deliverables in sequence that will allow SCDOT to conduct efficient and complete reviews. Include discussion of how any proposed Project phasing/segmentation will be addressed in the design submittal and review process. Dates do not need to be included in the chart showing anticipated deliverables.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
d. 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 construction of the Project. Discuss compliance with required standards, testing laboratories, mix designs and material certifications processes.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
e. Discuss the proposed approach to addressing any unique characteristics of the Project and mitigating any risk items identified by the Proposer.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
	Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score	
Overall Adjectival Score:	B		A	
Procurement Officer Initials	CW		CW	



SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet				
P041130 I-95 over Lake Marion Bridge Replacement				
9/30/2025 - 10/2/2025				
SCDOT Design-Build				
Technical Proposal Appendices	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments
<b>3) Appendix A.1: Provide Conceptual Roadway Plans:</b> The intent scoring Proposer's conceptual roadway plans is for SCDOT to understand that the proposer clearly demonstrates its understanding of requirements of the RFP and the Team's approach to meet those requirements. The quality of the plans will be reviewed and scored for compliance with RFP requirements, including Formal ATC's authorized for inclusion in the proposal, if any, rather than plan development/preparation conformance. The following shall be provided.				
a. Typical sections for all roadways shall include as a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design speed</li> <li>• Functional classification</li> <li>• Lane configuration and widths</li> <li>• Shoulder and median widths</li> <li>• Cross slopes</li> <li>• Point of grade</li> <li>• Notes and details as necessary</li> </ul>	Multiple	<b>RFP Conformance Issues:</b> On Typical Sections 9 & 10, shared use width SHALL be 10' wide with 2' shoulders on each side (14' total), show railing within Shoulder (i.e. not 14' clear).  <b>RFP Conformance Issues:</b> On Typical Section 14: Asphalt SUP pavement shown when concrete is required. Steel pedestrian rail is required where clear zone is not provided (non-standard concrete barrier shown on outside of path).  <b>Deficiency:</b> Typical Section 13 is shown incorrectly (i.e. mirrored) or the flow arrow is in wrong direction  <b>RFP Conformance Issues:</b> Legend on Typical Sections, HMA 200 lbs/sy, need SMA 200 lbs/sy.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
b. Plan view shall include as a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geometric layout with reference data</li> <li>• Superelevation data</li> <li>• Taper lengths</li> <li>• Deceleration/acceleration lengths</li> <li>• Construction limits</li> <li>• Control of Access Limits (mainline and interchange)</li> <li>• Existing and proposed Right of Way</li> <li>• Lane alignment</li> <li>• Clear zone limits</li> <li>• Horizontal clearance at obstructions (any critical locations)</li> <li>• Roadside barriers (location and type)</li> <li>• Bridge and box culverts</li> <li>• Limits of retaining walls</li> <li>• Indicate any design exceptions approved in the RFP</li> <li>• Material Staging and Laydown Areas</li> </ul>	Multiple	<b>RFP Conformance Issues:</b> Crash cushions shown at bridge ends where concrete median barrier terminates in a cable barrier median. Pre-MASH impact attenuators required per Exhibit 4a Section 2.11 (5th paragraph). <b>Omitted Item:</b> Missing taper length dimensions in several locations.  <b>RFP Conformance Issues:</b> Shared Use Path tie-in does not meet RFP. Closed off dock/recreation area.  <b>RFP Conformance Issues:</b> Cul-de-sac for Bass Dr., required by RFP, not shown on plans.  <b>RFP Conformance Issues:</b> Concrete barrier separating utility window from I-95 Southbound traffic is not long enough to comply with Exhibit 4a 2.11 (second to last paragraph).  <b>Omitted Item:</b> No rest area work (i.e. striping and re-paving asphalt shoulders) demonstrated on plans.  <b>Omitted Item:</b> No rip rap armoring shown along western edge of causeway in plan view.  <b>Deficiency:</b> C/A and associated fencing should be on opposite side as shown along both southern and northern tie-ins for both bridges for SUP.  <b>Deficiency:</b> Bridge end catch basin (west at southern main bridge tie-in) should be located within shoulder rather than as shown.	Omitted Items	Missing taper length dimensions in several locations.



<b>SCDOT Design-Build</b>	<b>SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet</b>			
	<b>P041130 I-95 over Lake Marion Bridge Replacement</b>			
	<b>9/30/2025 - 10/2/2025</b>			
c. Profile view shall indicate: • Grades & elevations • Vertical curvature (PI station & elevation, length & K value, stopping site distance design speed met) • Bridge clearance envelopes	<b>Omitted Items</b>	Missing bridge clearance dimensions with respect to lake full pool for relief bridge and main bridge.	<b>Omitted Items</b>	Missing bridge clearance dimensions with respect to lake full pool for relief bridge and main bridge.
d. Cross sections only where necessary to indicate a significant difference from the conceptual plans in the Project Information Package. These should be limited to only those showing a significant change and may be segmented for only the areas where changes occur.	<b>Omitted Items</b>	Median cable barrier is not shown.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
e. Special emphasis details (where needed to clearly demonstrate understanding and approach - isolated locations such as ramp ties, wall types, etc.).		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
	<b>Adjectival Score</b>		<b>Adjectival Score</b>	
<b>Overall Adjectival Score:</b>	<b>C</b>		<b>B</b>	
<b>Procurement Officer Initials</b>	<b>CW</b>		<b>CW</b>	
<b>Technical Proposal Appendices</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>4. Appendix A.2:</b> 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" = 200' on 36" width x 8' length sheets for the entire projects limits including interchanges, as applicable. 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.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
b. Plan for access to the median work zone (ingress and egress).	<b>Multiple</b>	<b>RFP Conformance Issues:</b> Plan detail for the high-speed shoulder and median ingress and egress accesses do not meet minimum spacing requirements as shown in Attachment B and included plans (e.g. Phase 1B and Phase 2, unclear ingress/egress will operate during bridge construction).  <b>Omitted Items:</b> No lane closure restrictions are referenced or provided within MOT plans.  <b>Omitted Items:</b> Median access from US 301 interchange lacks detail and constructability information.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
c. Plan for maintaining positive temporary drainage during stages.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
d. Plan for notifying the traveling public of upcoming stages.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
	<b>Adjectival Score</b>		<b>Adjectival Score</b>	
<b>Overall Adjectival Score:</b>	<b>C</b>		<b>A</b>	
<b>Procurement Officer Initials</b>	<b>CW</b>		<b>CW</b>	
<b>Technical Proposal Appendices</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>5. Appendix A.3:</b> Provide Conceptual Bridge Plans which shall consist of the following:				



SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet			
	P041130 I-95 over Lake Marion Bridge Replacement			
	9/30/2025 - 10/2/2025			
a. Plan and profile of bridge, including but not limited to: horizontal and vertical clearances, hydrology data, intent for bridge deck and bridge end drainage, anticipated foundation type, approximate toe of slope with abutment grading and riprap, expansion joint locations and types of joint materials, and bearing conditions at each bent.	RFP Conformance Issues	DM0114 prohibits use of sleeper slab in conjunction with staged-construction. Proposed relief bridge length exceeds 300' limit for a jointless bridge. Relief bridge design should incorporate expansion joint(s).		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
b. Superstructure cross sections and substructure elevations showing pertinent structural elements and dimensions.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
c. Construction staging plan for bridge work including dimensions of temporary roadway widths both on the bridges and, where applicable, on the roadway beneath the bridges (not required when traffic is detoured at the bridge site).		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
d. Bridge construction access plan showing areas used to access the bridge work and showing proposed equipment and material handling locations and staging (not required when traffic is detoured at the bridge site).	Omitted Items	Construction access for the south end of the Main bridge is not shown (trestle stops on north side of the navigational window).		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
e. Retaining wall envelopes at the bridge ends showing top of wall, ground lines, and bottom of wall (required only if retaining walls are proposed).		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
	Adjectival Score		Adjectival Score	
Overall Adjectival Score:	B		A	
Procurement Officer Initials	CW		CW	
Technical Proposal Appendices	Reason	Comments	Reason	Comments
6. Appendix A.4: CPM Schedule (scored in Project Delivery and Approach), include the following items at a minimum:				
a. Design phases/breakdown		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
b. Start and finish milestones for all segments, sections, or phases		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
c. Details of traffic control plans	Omitted Items	Activities for construction ingress/egress are not included in schedule.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
d. Traffic shifts		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
e. Utility windows		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
f. Right-of-Way acquisitions/right-of-entry		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
g. Special contract Requirements	Omitted Items	Some special contract requirements not included in schedule.  Rest area shoulder re-paving and striping not included in schedule.  Grading and rip rap placement for the causeway embankment reinforcement not included in schedule.  Shared Use Path references for shifting from existing to proposed not included in schedule.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
h. Known or expected risks		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
i. Other activities or relationships that are critical to the Proposer's Project Design or construction	Deficiencies	Several activities are shown during restricted holiday periods. Proposer does not appear to adhere to SCDOT Specifications for Holiday Restrictions.		MEETS the requirements of the RFP.
Proposed Innovation & Added Value (Quality Credits)	Possible Points	Comments	Possible Points	Comments



SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet				
P041130 I-95 over Lake Marion Bridge Replacement				
9/30/2025 - 10/2/2025				
SCDOT Design-Build				
2. Describe the Proposer's Innovation and Added Value to the Project that clearly provides additional benefit to SCDOT or the public. In order to receive Quality Credit Points, the Proposer may respond to the items below within the Quality Credit Matrix. The quality credit points assigned will be based on commitments beyond the minimum requirements of the RFP which are summarized in the Quality Credit Matrix. The required Quality Credit Matrix 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> . An innovative feature of a Proposal means proposing practices that are not standard or customary to the industry, nonetheless safely, efficiently, and effectively accomplish the same goal. Innovation may include the Proposer's means and methods, roadway alignments, approach to Project, etc. If the Proposer wishes SCDOT to consider items, including Formal ATCs previously authorized for inclusion in the Proposal, to be innovative or to provide additional quality, these items shall be included in the Quality Credit Matrix. However, SCDOT reserves the right to assign points for all items deemed innovative and favorable to SCDOT or the public that have not been identified in this section. In addition, the Proposer should consider, but not be limited to, the following items, which SCDOT considers high risk to the Project.	100.00		100.00	
a. Expedited Schedule	1.09	(1.09) Quality Items #1/#4/#5: Expedited Schedule, Proposer committed to adjusting Substantial Completion 60 days (1600 to 1540 days) with increased self-imposed LDs of \$22,500.		
b. Schedule Certainty o Assuming SCDOT risks related to schedule	1.44	(0.90) Quality Item #3: Elimination of construction joints should improve schedule certainty. (0.18) Quality Item #13: Installation of temporary trestle at night should improve schedule certainty. (0.36) Quality Items #6/8: Advanced design and coordination of Early Works Package should improve schedule certainty.	2.16	(0.36) Quality Items #1/#2/#3: Advanced investigations, design, and separate NOIs to advance material storage and construction setup should collectively improve schedule certainty. (0.36) Quality Item #4: Modified Lane Closure Times should improve schedule certainty by allowing longer construction windows. (0.36) Quality Item #7: Drilled shaft load tests should improve schedule certainty by allowing optimization of shaft length or diameter. (0.72) Quality Items #8/#9: Reduction of drilled shafts through increased column spacing in addition to utilization of precast column sections for portions of each bridge should improve schedule certainty. (0.36) Quality Item #10/#29: Increased bent cap length without construction joint should improve schedule certainty.
c. Minimizing impacts to traffic including, but not limited to, the following: o Traffic shifts o Temporary lane closures o Construction Stages	0.15	(0.15) Quality Item #11: HAAS system appears to have tangible benefits to traveling public by providing real-time traffic data associated with construction as they travel through this corridor.	0.36	(0.36) Quality Items #15/#16: Utilization of 12' lanes and median access from US 301 interchange should minimize impacts to traffic.
d. Identify materials, designs, and construction methods that would minimize maintenance costs in the future to the SCDOT or benefit the Project	0.50	(0.50) Quality Item #2: Steepened slopes eliminate need for retaining structures which should reduce impacts to Lake Marion, potential ROW, and improve long-term maintenance.	0.00	





SCDOT Design-Build	SCDOT Design-Build Technical Proposal Evaluation Score Sheet			
	P041130 I-95 over Lake Marion Bridge Replacement			
	9/30/2025 - 10/2/2025			
Any other items	0.00		3.63	(3.63) Quality Items #5/#13/#17/#19/#21/#25: Providing rooftop section is beneficial to SCDOT as it improves constructability, should improve schedule certainty, improves safety, minimizes impacts to traffic, provides additional capacity and pavement for future widening, improves temporary drainage during construction, and reduces future maintenance costs of permanent median drainage infrastructure.
Subtotal:	3.18		6.15	
Procurement Officer Initials	CW		CW	
I certify that the scores shown on this sheet(s) accurately reflect the actions of the Committee on October 21, 2025 and that the evaluation was done in accordance with the RFP.				
<div>Tyler A. ClarkChairperson</div> <div>Ben McKinneyVoting Member</div> <div>John BurnsVoting Member</div> <div>Bobby UsryVoting Member</div> <div>Carmen WrightProcurement Officer</div> <div>Brian GambrellLegal</div>				