



South Carolina
Department of Transportation

MEMORANDUM

TO: Public Notice

FROM: Professional Services Contracting Office

DATE: January 31, 2023

RE: **S-261-23** – On-Call Construction Engineering & Inspection (CE&I) Services

The following firms were selected for the referenced solicitation above:

1. KCI Technologies, Inc.
2. Wilson Ferguson Associates, LLC
3. Civil Engineering Consulting Services, Inc.
4. Mead & Hunt, Inc.
5. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP
6. Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC
7. OLH, Inc.
8. HDR Engineering, Inc.
9. F&ME Consulting, Inc.
10. Michael Baker International, Inc.
11. Davis & Floyd, Inc.
12. Neel-Schaffer, Inc.
13. TranSystems Corporation
14. Parrish and Partners, LLC
15. CDM Smith, Inc.

SCDOT has attached to this memorandum the selection committee's comments and scores.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (803) 737-0746 or via email at Hollingswg@scdot.org.

Wendy Hollingsworth

Wendy Hollingsworth
Contracting Officer/Contract Selection Manager





TO: Robbie Isgett, Director of Construction
Andy Leaphart, Chief Engineer for Operations
J. Darrin Player, Chief Procurement Officer

FROM: Wendy Hollingsworth

DATE: January 25, 2023

RE: S-261-23 - On-Call Construction Engineering & Inspection (CE&I) Services

Approval is requested for the referenced solicitation that was advertised on November 29, 2022, with a proposal due date of December 20, 2022. The **SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (SCDOT)** requests a letter of interest and a proposal containing qualifications from all interested consulting firms experienced in performing Construction Engineering and Inspection (CE&I) Services. These services may include but not be limited to the services to perform inspection and testing on various projects throughout the state in the areas of concrete, foundation, earthwork, drainage and base, erosion control, traffic control, asphalt roadway, and asphalt plant, signal installation, survey verification, etc.

These services will be provided under a **three (3)** year statewide On-Call contract on an "as needed" basis. The SCDOT will select up to **fifteen (15)** firms to provide these services, with a total maximum On-Call amount for up to **three (3)** year period not to exceed **\$100,000,000.00**. Consultants will be evaluated and ranked based on their score during the selection process. Work under this on-call will be assigned based on the consultant's qualifications for the project being assigned for an individual task order/work order. The project team should be capable of providing all services outlined above.



Twenty-five (25) firm's submitted proposals and all were deemed acceptable for meeting the minimum requirements for submittal. January 25, 2023 at 9:00 AM, through SCDOT WEBEX teleconferencing the selection committee convened to evaluate the proposals.

The final ranking of the fifteen (15) firms deemed most highly qualified for this selection were:

1. KCI Technologies, Inc.
2. Wilson Ferguson Associates, LLC
3. Civil Engineering Consulting Services, Inc.
4. Mead & Hunt, Inc.
5. Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP
6. Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC
7. OLH, Inc.
8. HDR Engineering, Inc.
9. F&ME Consulting, Inc.
10. Michael Baker International, Inc.
11. Davis & Floyd, Inc.
12. Neel-Schaffer, Inc.
13. TranSystems Corporation
14. Parrish and Partners, LLC
15. CDM Smith, Inc.

Upon CPO approval, the Professional Services Contracting Office will notify all responding consulting firms of the selection results.

APPROVAL:

ACTION	OFFICE	SIGNATURE	DATE
APPROVE	Director of Construction	 Digitally signed by Robert E. Isgett, III Date: 2023.01.27 08:45:53 -05'00'	1/27/23
APPROVE	Chief Engineer for Operations	 Andrew T. Leaphart, P.E. 2023.01.31 10:22:08 -05'00'	1/31/23
APPROVE	Chief Procurement Officer	J. Darrin Player Digitally signed by J. Darrin Player Date: 2023.01.31 12:49:04 -05'00'	1/31/23

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES SELECTION PROCESS

Evaluation Committee Deliberation

Project Name: S-261-23 - On-Call Construction Engineering & Inspection
(CE&I) Services



Submitted Information



Interview

Firm	Comments
See Attached	

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES SELECTION PROCESS

Evaluation Committee Recommendation

Project Name: S-261-23 - On-Call Construction Engineering & Inspection
(CE&I) Services

Instructions: The Evaluation Committee shall list firms in the order of approval for cost-proposal negotiations.

Firm/Individual	Order Negotiation Approval	Comments
KCI Technologies, Inc.	1st	11. Davis & Floyd, Inc.
Wilson Ferguson Associates, Inc.	2nd	12. Neel-Schaffer, Inc.
Civil Engineering Consulting Services, Inc.	3rd	13. TranSystems Corporation
Mead & Hunt, Inc.	4th	14. Parrish and Partners, LLC
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP	5th	15. CDM Smith, Inc.
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	6th	
OLH, Inc.	7th	
HDR Engineering, Inc.	8th	
F&ME Consulting, Inc.	9th	
Michael Baker International, Inc.	10th	

Authorization: I hereby authorize the Director for subject project to
begin cost-proposal negotiations in the order listed above.



Concur



Not Concur

**J. Darrin
Player** Digitally signed by
J. Darrin Player
Date: 2023.01.31
12:49:31 -05'00'

01/31/2023

Chief Procurement Officer

Date

SCORING SUMMARY MASTER SCORESHEET

S-261-23 On-Call Construction Engineering & Inspection (CE&I)

1/25/2023

SCDOT
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
CONTRACTING OFFICE



SCORING SUMMARY MASTER SCORESHEET



S-261-23 On-Call Construction Engineering & Inspection (CE&I)

RANKING	FIRM RANKINGS <small>Ranked in Order by Firm Name</small>	TOTAL SCORE	CRITERIA									
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			35%	25%	25%	5%	5%	5%	0	0	0	0
1	KCI Technologies, Inc.	78.93	28.00	19.69	20.62	3.81	2.81	4.00				
2	Willson.Ferguson Associate, LLC	74.76	26.25	16.25	19.38	3.44	4.44	5.00				
3	Civil Engineering Consulting Services Inc.	74.62	27.12	18.44	19.06	3.50	3.00	3.50				
4	Mead & Hunt, Inc.	74.62	26.25	18.44	20.31	3.62	3.00	3.00				
5	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP	72.69	24.94	18.44	18.44	3.56	2.81	4.50				
6	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	72.06	24.50	16.88	20.62	3.81	2.25	4.00				
7	OLH Inc.	69.25	22.75	14.69	19.06	3.31	4.44	5.00				
8	HDR Engineering, Inc.- Infrastructure Corporation of America	69.18	25.81	16.56	19.69	3.56	3.06	0.50				
9	F&ME Consultants	68.87	23.62	15.94	18.75	3.31	2.25	5.00				
10	Michael Baker International, Inc.	68.63	25.81	17.50	18.44	3.69	2.69	0.50				
11	Davis & Floyd, Inc.	67.24	20.56	15.31	19.69	3.56	3.12	5.00				
12	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	66.81	22.31	16.25	16.88	3.56	2.81	5.00				
13	TranSystems Corporation	63.81	24.50	16.25	15.00	3.25	2.81	2.00				
14	Parrish & Partners, LLC	63.25	21.44	14.06	16.25	3.25	3.25	5.00				
15	CDM Smith, Inc.	62.13	22.75	14.06	17.19	3.38	2.75	2.00				
16	RS&H, Inc.	61.37	19.69	13.12	17.50	3.12	2.94	5.00				
17	S&ME, Inc.	60.94	21.00	14.69	15.00	2.81	2.44	5.00				
18	CONSOR Engineers, LLC	60.25	22.31	14.06	15.94	3.44	3.00	1.50				
19	Summit Design and Engineering Services, PLLC	56.94	19.69	13.75	12.81	2.81	2.88	5.00				
20	A. Morton Thomas and Associates, Inc.	56.63	19.25	12.81	13.75	2.94	2.88	5.00				
21	WSP USA Inc.	55.25	18.81	11.25	17.50	2.69	3.00	2.00				
22	ESP Associates, Inc.	55.20	17.94	11.88	15.00	3.00	2.88	4.50				
23	SAM-Construction Services, LLC	52.37	16.62	11.25	13.75	3.00	2.75	5.00				
24	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	46.62	15.31	10.31	10.00	2.88	3.12	5.00				
25	NOVA Engineering & Environmental, LLC	24.88	7.00	7.50	4.38	0.50	0.50	5.00				

There was one tie in this selection third and fourth place. Tie breaker procedures were used in accordance with the RFP in order to produce the correct order of the firms. Above is the score sheet that reflects the correct ranking order.

SCORING SUMMARY MASTER SCORESHEET



S-261-23 On-Call Construction Engineering & Inspection (CE&I)

RANKING	FIRM RANKINGS Ranked in Order by Firm Name	TOTAL SCORE	CRITERIA									
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
			35%	25%	25%	5%	5%	5%	0	0	0	0
1	KCI Technologies, Inc.	78.93	28.00	19.69	20.62	3.81	2.81	4.00				
2	Willson.Ferguson Associate, LLC	74.76	26.25	16.25	19.38	3.44	4.44	5.00				
3	Civil Engineering Consulting Services Inc.	74.62	27.12	18.44	19.06	3.50	3.00	3.50				
4	Mead & Hunt, Inc.	74.62	26.25	18.44	20.31	3.62	3.00	3.00				
5	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP	72.69	24.94	18.44	18.44	3.56	2.81	4.50				
6	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	72.06	24.50	16.88	20.62	3.81	2.25	4.00				
7	OLH Inc.	69.25	22.75	14.69	19.06	3.31	4.44	5.00				
8	HDR Engineering, Inc.- Infrastructure Corporation of America	69.18	25.81	16.56	19.69	3.56	3.06	0.50				
9	F&ME Consultants	68.87	23.62	15.94	18.75	3.31	2.25	5.00				
10	Michael Baker International, Inc.	68.63	25.81	17.50	18.44	3.69	2.69	0.50				
11	Davis & Floyd, Inc.	67.24	20.56	15.31	19.69	3.56	3.12	5.00				
12	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	66.81	22.31	16.25	16.88	3.56	2.81	5.00				
13	TranSystems Corporation	63.81	24.50	16.25	15.00	3.25	2.81	2.00				
14	Parrish & Partners, LLC	63.25	21.44	14.06	16.25	3.25	3.25	5.00				
15	CDM Smith, Inc.	62.13	22.75	14.06	17.19	3.38	2.75	2.00				
16	RS&H, Inc.	61.37	19.69	13.12	17.50	3.12	2.94	5.00				
17	S&ME, Inc.	60.94	21.00	14.69	15.00	2.81	2.44	5.00				
18	CONSOR Engineers, LLC	60.25	22.31	14.06	15.94	3.44	3.00	1.50				
19	Summit Design and Engineering Services, PLLC	56.94	19.69	13.75	12.81	2.81	2.88	5.00				
20	A. Morton Thomas and Associates, Inc.	56.63	19.25	12.81	13.75	2.94	2.88	5.00				
21	WSP USA Inc.	55.25	18.81	11.25	17.50	2.69	3.00	2.00				
22	ESP Associates, Inc.	55.20	17.94	11.88	15.00	3.00	2.88	4.50				
23	SAM-Construction Services, LLC	52.37	16.62	11.25	13.75	3.00	2.75	5.00				
24	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	46.62	15.31	10.31	10.00	2.88	3.12	5.00				
25	NOVA Engineering & Environmental, LLC	24.88	7.00	7.50	4.38	0.50	0.50	5.00				
EVALUATOR:		EVALUATOR:										
EVALUATOR:		EVALUATOR:										

CRITERIA QUESTIONS AND WEIGHTS



1	Experience, qualifications, and technical competence of staff proposed for the type of work required.	35
2	Availability of proposed staff and ability to be responsive to SCDOT requirements.	25
3	Past performance of the firm/team on similar type projects.	25
4	Familiarity of the firm/team with State Transportation Agency practices and procedures.	5
5	DBE utilization plan	5
6	"Workload" is defined and consists of the amount of active executed agreements (basic, contract modifications, work orders, task orders, and small purchase), minus the amounts invoiced already. It will also include those amounts under negotiation, exclusive of those that are suspended.	5
	Total	100

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : A. Morton Thomas and Associates, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	Staff has above average technical competency.
Criteria 2	5.00	Consultant inspector pool is average. Management availability is low.
Criteria 3	6.00	Firm has performed above average on previous assignments.
Criteria 4	8.00	Staff has demonstrated Knowledge of Agency practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	6.00	Consultant has a 13% Committal amongst 2 DBE sub-consultant firms.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	41.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

Criteria 1	5.00	Limited Staff with technical competency.
Criteria 2	4.00	Below average availability of staff.
Criteria 3	4.00	Limited performance/ experience of On call related work.
Criteria 4	8.00	Staff has demonstrated knowledge of Agency practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	7.00	Firm has goal of 35% with two sub-consultants.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	38.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : CDM Smith, Inc.

Criteria 1	8.00	Proposed staff in inspector and management roles show multiple years of experience and competency with Road and Bridge Construction Projects.
Criteria 2	6.00	Consultants inspector pool available is adequate.
Criteria 3	7.00	Team has scored well on previous On-call assignments.
Criteria 4	9.00	The Team proposed has demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT Practices and Procedures.
Criteria 5	6.00	Consultant has 10% committal among 2 sub-consultants.
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	40.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Civil Engineering Consulting Services Inc.

Criteria 1	8.00	Proposed staff in inspector and management roles show multiple years of experience and competency with Road and Bridge Construction Projects.
Criteria 2	8.00	Consultant has inspector pool available to respond to SCDOT needs. Past performance indicates quick response times.
Criteria 3	7.00	Team has scored well on past projects and received excellent reviews for their quality of work and responsiveness.
Criteria 4	9.00	The Team proposed has demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT Practices and Procedures.
Criteria 5	7.00	Firm has committed to 13% among 2 sub consultants. Firm has consistently utilized more than committed on previous projects.
Criteria 6	7.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	46.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : CONSOR Engineers, LLC

Criteria 1	6.00	Proposed Staff has above average technical competency.
Criteria 2	5.00	Firm does not have staff available in all areas.
Criteria 3	7.00	Firm has performed well and received positive reviews on limited projects.
Criteria 4	9.00	The Team proposed has demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	6.00	Firm has committed 15% goal to one DBE sub-consultant firm.
Criteria 6	3.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	36.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Davis & Floyd, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	Team Leaders and inspectors show competency in inspection roles.
Criteria 2	8.00	Consultant has inspector availability to respond to DOT needs. CPE scores of responsiveness for this firm are high.
Criteria 3	8.00	Previous CPE scores and remarks for On-Call work have been high.
Criteria 4	9.00	The Team proposed has demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT Practices and Procedures.
Criteria 5	7.00	Firm has committed 20% DBE utilization from a single firm. Only other Sub-consultant this consultant is teamed with is the DBE.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	49.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : ESP Associates, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	Proposed staff has above average technical competency
Criteria 2	5.00	Firm has average staff to respond to DOT needs.
Criteria 3	5.00	Firm does not show extensive history of similar type work.
Criteria 4	5.00	A large percentage are unfamiliar with DOT on-call work.
Criteria 5	6.00	Firm has a goal of 15% among 2 DBE sub-consultants.
Criteria 6	9.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	36.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : F&ME Consultants

Criteria 1	8.00	Proposed staff in inspector and management roles show multiple years of experience and competency with road and Bridge Construction projects.
Criteria 2	7.00	Inspection pool is capable of handling DOT requests.
Criteria 3	7.00	Firm has performed well and received very good or excellent CPE scores on previous on-call projects.
Criteria 4	9.00	The Team proposed has demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	4.00	Committed DBE utilization is only 4%.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	45.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : HDR Engineering, Inc.- Infrastructure Corporation of America

Criteria 1	8.00	Proposed staff in inspector and management roles show multiple years of experience and competency with road and Bridge Construction Projects.
Criteria 2	8.00	HDR has multiple Project Managers and large inspection pool to be able to respond to needs.
Criteria 3	8.00	Previous CPE scores and remarks for this type of work are high.
Criteria 4	9.00	The Team proposed had demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	6.00	Firm shows 15% utilization amongst 3 DBE Sub-consultants
Criteria 6	1.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	40.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC

Criteria 1	8.00	Proposed staff in inspector and management roles show multiple years of experience and competency with Road and Bridge Construction Projects
Criteria 2	9.00	Consultant has ability and inspector pool for response. References verify ICE's ability to respond quickly.
Criteria 3	8.00	ICE has scored highly on extensive previous projects.
Criteria 4	9.00	The Team proposed has demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	6.00	Nearly all of ICE's sub-consultants are DBE certified consultants.
Criteria 6	8.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	48.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : KCI Technologies, Inc.

Criteria 1	8.00	Proposed Staff in inspector and management roles show multiple years of experience and competency with Road and Bridge Construction projects.
Criteria 2	8.00	Inspection team of over 75 Inspectors available.
Criteria 3	8.00	Firm has scored 7+ on previous CPE scores of similar On-Call and Project specific contracts.
Criteria 4	9.00	The team proposed has demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	6.00	Firm shows 10% commitment from one DBE sub-consultant.
Criteria 6	8.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	47.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Mead & Hunt, Inc.

Criteria 1	8.00	Proposed Staff in inspector and management roles show multiple years of experience and competency with Road and Bridge Construction projects.
Criteria 2	8.00	Consultant staff has 30+ inspectors available.
Criteria 3	8.00	Firm has scored high CPE scores on similar work orders.
Criteria 4	9.00	The team proposed has demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	6.00	Firm has committed 12.5%. Some areas committed are not typically utilized on the On-call CEI contract
Criteria 6	6.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	45.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Michael Baker International, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	Proposed Staff has above average competency for on-call type work.
Criteria 2	6.50	Consultant has adequate staff to be responsive.
Criteria 3	7.00	Firm has performed well on previous on-call assignments.
Criteria 4	9.00	The team proposed has demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	5.00	DBE committed percentage is 5% spread over 4 consultant firms.
Criteria 6	1.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	35.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	Proposed Staff has competent inspectors.
Criteria 2	7.00	Inspection pool is adequate to handle DOT On call needs.
Criteria 3	7.00	Firm has received positive reviews/ QMT scores on limited prior projects.
Criteria 4	9.00	The team proposed has demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	5.00	Firm has a goal of 12% however some services are not typically utilized for on call work.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	45.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : NOVA Engineering & Environmental, LLC

Criteria 1	2.00	Limited porposed staff shows very little experience with DOT work.
Criteria 2	4.00	Below average availability of certified staff.
Criteria 3	1.00	Did not provide any past performance information
Criteria 4	1.00	No demonstration of familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	1.00	No DBE Plan
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	19.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : OLH Inc.

Criteria 1	8.00	Proposed staff of management and inspectors display competence in required road/ bridge construction.
Criteria 2	7.00	Inspection pool of firm is capable of handling needs of DOT.
Criteria 3	7.00	Firm has received high CPE scores and QMT scores on previously assigned projects.
Criteria 4	9.00	The team proposed has demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	9.00	Firm is DBE and has committed 65% use of their inspectors
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	50.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Parrish & Partners, LLC

Criteria 1	6.00	Staff has above average competency for On- Call work.
Criteria 2	6.50	Firm has adequate staff to respond to DOT needs.
Criteria 3	7.00	Firm has received positive reviews on limited prior projects.
Criteria 4	9.00	The team proposed has demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	7.00	Firm has committed 20% amongst 3 DBE Sub- consultant firms.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	45.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : RS&H, Inc.

Criteria 1	5.00	Staff has average technical competency.
Criteria 2	5.00	Firm has average staff available to respond to DOT needs.
Criteria 3	8.00	Firm has excellent CPE reviews on previous On- Call Projects
Criteria 4	8.00	A few of the staff have demonstrated familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	6.00	Firm has 12% commitment with 2 DBE firms
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	42.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP

Criteria 1	7.00	Staff proposed in inspection roles demonstrate competency in inspection process.
Criteria 2	7.00	Inspection pool is capable of handling DOT on call inspection needs.
Criteria 3	8.00	Firm has received excellent CPE Scores on previous projects.
Criteria 4	9.00	The team proposed has demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	5.00	Firm has committed 8% to 3 DBE sub consultants.
Criteria 6	9.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	45.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : S&ME, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.50	Firm has some experience on management and several competent inspectors.
Criteria 2	7.00	Inspector pool is capable of handling needs of DOT.
Criteria 3	5.00	Firm does not show extensive history of past performance on similar type projects.
Criteria 4	6.00	Firms management/ inspection staff has shown slightly above average familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	5.00	Firm has committed 5% utilization to one firm.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	39.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : SAM-Construction Services, LLC

Criteria 1	5.00	Limited staff with technical competency.
Criteria 2	4.00	Firm has limited staff to respond to DOT needs.
Criteria 3	6.00	Firm has performed above average on previous similar assignments.
Criteria 4	8.00	Limited staff have shown familiarity with DOT policies and procedures.
Criteria 5	6.00	Firm has a 12% goal over three DBE sub-consultants.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	39.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Summit Design and Engineering Services, PLLC

Criteria 1	6.00	Staff has above average competency for On Call work.
Criteria 2	5.00	Firm has average staff to be available for on-call work.
Criteria 3	5.00	Firm does not show extensive history of performance on previous type projects.
Criteria 4	6.00	Firms management/ inspection staff has shown slightly above average familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	6.00	Firm has proposed a 10% goal amongst two firms.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	38.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : TranSystems Corporation

Criteria 1	7.00	Staff proposed in inspection roles demonstrate competency in inspection process.
Criteria 2	7.00	Inspection pool is capable of handling on call inspection needs.
Criteria 3	6.00	Firm has performed above average on previous similar assignments.
Criteria 4	8.00	Inspection staff has familiarity with DOT policies and procedures.
Criteria 5	6.00	Firm has goal of 8% over two DBE sub-consultants.
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	38.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Willson.Ferguson Associate, LLC

Criteria 1	7.00	Staff proposed in inspection roles demonstrate competency in inspection processes.
Criteria 2	7.00	Inspector pool available to quickly meet DOT needs.
Criteria 3	8.00	Excellent CPE scores on previous On-Call assignments.
Criteria 4	9.00	The team proposed has demonstrated intimate familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	9.00	Consultant is DBE and will utilize own staff 65%.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	50.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : WSP USA Inc.

Criteria 1	6.50	Firm has some experience on management and several competent inspectors.
Criteria 2	4.00	Firm has not had available staff upon multiple requests.
Criteria 3	7.00	Firm has received positive reviews on limited project experience.
Criteria 4	7.00	Staff has demonstrated some familiarity with DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	6.00	Firm has committed 15% DBE utilization between 2 DBE sub-consultants.
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	34.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : A. Morton Thomas and Associates, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	AMT displays good experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	6.00	AMT has fair availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They claim to have over 200 staff dedicated between themselves and their subs; however only 48, 53, and 54 are shown for this project for project years 2023, 2024, and 2025, respectively. Of those shown available for those years, less than 20 are shown from AMT to be available each year, with the rest of the staff shown as subs.
Criteria 3	6.00	AMT has listed several DOT projects they have worked on but most of them are as a sub-consultant to another firm.
Criteria 4	7.00	AMT displays good familiarity of DOT practices and procedures with several key personnel having experience with DOT projects.
Criteria 5	7.00	AMT presents a good DBE Utilization plan with showing two sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	43.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

Criteria 1	5.00	AECOM displays average experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	5.00	AECOM has average availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 48,000+ staff in their firm; however only 18 from their firm are shown as available for this contract. They also provide several quotes from CPES scores detailing their responsiveness; however, those are all for preconstruction projects.
Criteria 3	5.00	AECOM has limited DOT past performance listed in their proposal.
Criteria 4	7.00	AECOM displays good familiarity of DOT practices and procedures, listing several DOT guidance manuals and specifications needed to follow.
Criteria 5	7.00	AECOM presents a good DBE Utilization plan with showing two sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	39.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : CDM Smith, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	CDM Smith displays good experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise. They need more lower level inspectors from their own firm (mid-level and junior).
Criteria 2	6.00	CDM Smith has fair availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 60 inspection personnel dedicated to this contract; however only 9 are listed from their firm. Several of the other firms are listed on other proposals or have proposals themselves.
Criteria 3	8.00	CDM Smith displays great past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great CPE scores on them.
Criteria 4	8.00	CDM Smith displays great familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	7.00	CDM Smith presents a good DBE Utilization plan with showing two sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	40.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Civil Engineering Consulting Services Inc.

Criteria 1	9.00	CECS displays excellent experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	8.00	CECS has great availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 70% of the proposed CE&I team as being from CECS and the other 30% coming from sub consultants.
Criteria 3	8.00	CECS displays great past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great CPE scores on them.
Criteria 4	8.00	CECS displays great familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	7.00	CECS presents a good DBE Utilization plan with showing two sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	7.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	47.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : CONSOR Engineers, LLC

Criteria 1	8.00	CONSOR displays great experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	6.00	CONSOR has fair availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show only having 26% of the proposed CE&I team as being from CONSOR and the other 74% coming from sub consultants, which are also listed on other teams.
Criteria 3	7.00	CONSOR displays good past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts listed in their proposal.
Criteria 4	8.00	CONSOR displays great familiarity with DOT practices and procedures by listing very detailed information in their proposal.
Criteria 5	6.00	CONSOR presents a fair DBE Utilization plan with showing one sub-consultant to meet their goals.
Criteria 6	3.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	38.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Davis & Floyd, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	Davis & Floyd displays good experience and qualifications from inspectors of their higher levels; however, they rely heavily on their subs for their lower level inspectors.
Criteria 2	6.00	Davis & Floyd has fair availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They needed to show who from their team vs. who from sub-consultants would be available for this contract.
Criteria 3	8.00	Davis & Floyd displays great past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great CPE evaluations and comments from DOT staff.
Criteria 4	8.00	Davis & Floyd displays great familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	6.00	Davis & Floyd presents a fair DBE Utilization plan with showing one sub-consultant to meet their goals.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	45.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : ESP Associates, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	ESP displays fair experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise. However, there is some concern with the Low Country Manager as he also serves as the Geotechnical Manager for the firm.
Criteria 2	6.00	ESP has fair availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 83 inspectors on their team but only 16 of those are from ESP and the others from firms who are also subs on other proposals.
Criteria 3	7.00	ESP displays good past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts they have/are currently working on.
Criteria 4	8.00	ESP displays great familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	7.00	CECS presents a good DBE Utilization plan with showing two sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	9.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	43.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : F&ME Consultants

Criteria 1	8.00	F&ME displays great experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	8.00	F&ME has great availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 65% of the proposed CE&I team as being from F&ME and the other 35% coming from sub consultants.
Criteria 3	8.00	F&ME displays great past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great CPE evaluations in their proposal.
Criteria 4	7.00	F&ME displays good familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	7.00	F&ME presents a good DBE Utilization plan with showing two sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	48.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : HDR Engineering, Inc.- Infrastructure Corporation of America

Criteria 1	8.00	HDR displays great experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	7.00	HDR has good availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 50 members from the CE&I team dedicated to this contract out of the total 71 members on the team. Would like to see more availability of lower level inspectors.
Criteria 3	8.00	HDR displays great past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great feedback from DOT personnel.
Criteria 4	7.00	HDR displays good familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	8.00	HDR presents a great DBE Utilization plan with showing three sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	1.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	39.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC

Criteria 1	9.00	ICE displays excellent experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	7.00	ICE has good availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 14 of the proposed CE&I senior/lead inspectors as being from ICE and the other 8 coming from sub consultants. Would like to see more information on availability of lower level inspectors.
Criteria 3	9.00	ICE displays excellent past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great feedback from DOT personnel.
Criteria 4	8.00	ICE displays great familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	5.00	ICE doesn't provide any firms that they will utilize to meet any DBE goals in their proposal. They only mention partnering with a few firms in a mentoring role.
Criteria 6	8.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	46.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : KCI Technologies, Inc.

Criteria 1	8.00	KCI displays great experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	9.00	KCI has excellent availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 40 KCI members from the CE&I team with various levels of experience dedicated to this contract.
Criteria 3	9.00	KCI displays excellent past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great feedback from DOT personnel.
Criteria 4	8.00	KCI displays great familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	6.00	KCI presents a fair DBE Utilization plan with showing one sub-consultant to meet their goals.
Criteria 6	8.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	48.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Mead & Hunt, Inc.

Criteria 1	8.00	M&H displays great experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	8.00	M&H has great availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 70% of the proposed CE&I team as being from M&H and the other 30% coming from sub consultants.
Criteria 3	9.00	M&H displays excellent past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great feedback from DOT personnel.
Criteria 4	7.00	M&H displays good familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	8.00	M&H presents a great DBE Utilization plan with showing three sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	6.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	46.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Michael Baker International, Inc.

Criteria 1	8.00	MB displays great experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	8.00	MB has great availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 19 of the proposed CE&I team as being from MB and the other 30 coming from sub consultants.
Criteria 3	8.00	MB displays great past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great feedback from DOT personnel.
Criteria 4	8.00	MB displays great familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	8.00	MB presents a great DBE Utilization plan with showing four sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	1.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	41.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Criteria 1	8.00	NS displays great experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	8.00	NS has great availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 12 of the proposed CE&I team as being from NS and the other 24 coming from sub consultants. Most inspectors of all levels with NS have 100% availability.
Criteria 3	8.00	NS displays great past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great feedback from DOT personnel.
Criteria 4	8.00	NS displays great familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	8.00	NS presents a great DBE Utilization plan with showing three sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	50.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : NOVA Engineering & Environmental, LLC

Criteria 1	3.00	NOVA displays limited experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise. No inspectors are listed in the proposal.
Criteria 2	3.00	NOVA has limited availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They only show availability of the three lead/managers of the project team and not the inspectors themselves.
Criteria 3	1.00	NOVA does not provide any past performance in their proposal.
Criteria 4	1.00	NOVA doesn't display any familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	1.00	NOVA doesn't present a DBE Goal Utilization Plan.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	19.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : OLH Inc.

Criteria 1	8.00	OLH displays great experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	7.00	OLH has good availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 16 of the proposed CE&I inspectors as being from OLH and the other 25 coming from sub consultants.
Criteria 3	8.00	OLH displays great past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great feedback from DOT personnel.
Criteria 4	7.00	OLH displays good familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	10.00	OLH has an outstanding DBE Utilization Plan with them being the prime as a DBE.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	50.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Parrish & Partners, LLC

Criteria 1	8.00	P&P displays great experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	7.00	P&P has good availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 11 of the proposed CE&I team as being from P&P and the other 36 coming from sub consultants.
Criteria 3	9.00	P&P displays excellent past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great feedback from DOT personnel.
Criteria 4	7.00	P&P displays good familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	8.00	P&P presents a great DBE Utilization plan with showing three sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	49.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : RS&H, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	RSH displays good experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	7.00	RSH has good availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 18 of the proposed CE&I team as being from RSH and the other 40 coming from sub consultants. Would like to see some availability of lower level inspectors.
Criteria 3	7.00	RSH displays good past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with good feedback from DOT personnel.
Criteria 4	7.00	RSH displays good familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	7.00	RSH presents a good DBE Utilization plan with showing two sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	45.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP

Criteria 1	8.00	RKK displays great experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	9.00	RKK has excellent availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 30 of the proposed CE&I project management/inspection team as being from RKK and the other 16 coming from sub consultants.
Criteria 3	7.00	RKK displays good past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great feedback from DOT personnel.
Criteria 4	8.00	RKK displays great familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	8.00	RKK presents a great DBE Utilization plan with showing four sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	9.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	49.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : S&ME, Inc.

Criteria 1	9.00	S&ME displays excellent experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	8.00	S&ME has great availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 35 of the proposed CE&I inspection team as being from S&ME and the other 63 coming from sub consultants. Would like to see some availability on lower level inspectors.
Criteria 3	8.00	S&ME displays great past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great CPE scores.
Criteria 4	7.00	S&ME displays good familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	6.00	S&ME presents a fair DBE Utilization plan with showing one sub-consultant to meet their goals.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	48.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : SAM-Construction Services, LLC

Criteria 1	7.00	SAM displays good experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	6.00	SAM has fair availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 7 of the proposed CE&I inspection team as being from SAM and the other 15 coming from sub consultants.
Criteria 3	7.00	SAM displays good past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts in their proposal
Criteria 4	7.00	SAM displays good familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	7.00	SAM presents a good DBE Utilization plan with showing three sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable. Would like to see a breakdown on how these DBE firms will be utilized.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	44.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Summit Design and Engineering Services, PLLC

Criteria 1	7.00	Summit displays good experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	7.00	Summit has good availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 21 Summit members from the CE&I inspection team with various levels of experience dedicated to this contract.
Criteria 3	7.00	Summit displays good past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts in their proposal
Criteria 4	7.00	Summit displays good familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	7.00	Summit presents a good DBE Utilization plan with showing two sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	45.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : TranSystems Corporation

Criteria 1	7.00	TranSystems displays good experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise. Would like more information on lower level inspectors.
Criteria 2	8.00	TranSystem has great availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 22 of the proposed CE&I inspection team as being from TranSystem and the other 19 coming from sub consultants.
Criteria 3	6.00	TranSystem displays fair past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great feedback from DOT personnel.
Criteria 4	7.00	TranSystem displays good familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	7.00	TranSystem presents a good DBE Utilization plan with showing two sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	39.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Willson.Ferguson Associate, LLC

Criteria 1	8.00	WFA displays great experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise.
Criteria 2	8.00	WFA has great availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 18 of the proposed CE&I inspection team as being from WFA and the other 35 coming from sub consultants.
Criteria 3	8.00	WFA displays great past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great feedback from DOT personnel.
Criteria 4	8.00	WFA displays great familiarity with DOT practices and procedures in their proposal.
Criteria 5	10.00	WFA has an outstanding DBE Utilization Plan with them being the prime as a DBE.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	52.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : WSP USA Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	WSP displays average experience and qualifications from inspectors of various levels of expertise. Would like to see more information on lower level inspectors and would like to see a certification matrix.
Criteria 2	7.00	WSP has great availability of proposed staff to be responsive to this contract. They show having 25 of the proposed CE&I inspection team as being from WSP and the other 25 coming from sub consultants.
Criteria 3	7.00	WSP displays good past performance with listing several DOT CE&I contracts with great feedback from DOT personnel.
Criteria 4	5.00	WSP doesn't go into enough detail for this criteria question.
Criteria 5	7.00	WSP presents a good DBE Utilization plan with showing two sub-consultants to meet their goals. This will allow for more than one avenue to meet their DBE goal if one sub-consultant were to become unavailable.
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	36.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : A. Morton Thomas and Associates, Inc.

Criteria 1	5.00	Very clear in stating the qualifications and level of proposed staff. A fairly good mix of staff but would like to see more junior inspector levels represented. Would like to see certifications possessed that would qualify personnel for waivers, rather than just stating they are eligible. Some certifications presented for waiver do not qualify.
Criteria 2	5.50	Very clearly provided a plan to hire and train construction inspectors. Showed a good availability for those individuals listed.
Criteria 3	5.00	A wide variety of past projects listed for all team members. Very good CPE scores listed, but only for subs. No owner feedback provided for AMT.
Criteria 4	5.50	Presented some understanding of DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	5.00	13% DBE Utilization will be achieved through overall work percentage.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	36.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

Criteria 1	4.50	While project management is a strength of this proposal, there is much less experience for the inspection side. Would rather have seen the classifications of each inspector. Hard to judge how well rounded the team is based on years of experience without classifying to what degree. Did not see any work zone traffic certified individuals. Prime has very few staff with certifications.
Criteria 2	4.50	Availability shown for 2023 is less than would be desired for a majority of the shown staff.
Criteria 3	4.00	Showed a variety of past projects, but no feedback from owners.
Criteria 4	5.00	Focused only on PM's and APM's familiarity with State DOT practices and procedures. Would like to have seen this addressed with more of the proposed staff.
Criteria 5	4.50	35% DBE utilization based on overall work. Have concerns that this is achievable with subs being utilized on other teams.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	32.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : CDM Smith, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.50	Very good mix of levels of staff proposed across the team. Would like to have some junior level inspection from the prime though.
Criteria 2	6.00	A good availability of the staff that was listed. Would have liked to have seen availability of more staff across the team.
Criteria 3	6.50	Good CPE scores. Showed a good deal of past projects from Prime.
Criteria 4	5.00	Some detail on familiarity of Task Managers. Would like to have seen more detail for staff across the board.
Criteria 5	5.00	DBE utilization plan of 10% of overall work percentage.
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	33.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : Civil Engineering Consulting Services Inc.

Criteria 1	6.50	Very good listing of the team and their qualifications. Would like to see a few more junior inspectors available.
Criteria 2	5.00	A good availability shown. But no detail other than a blanket statement that all inspectors would be available.
Criteria 3	7.00	Good CPE scores and a wide variety of past projects for all team members shown.
Criteria 4	6.00	Provided a good understanding of DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	5.50	Provides a clear DBE utilization plan for the 13% allocated. In addition, demonstrated the actual DBE utilization compared to past plans.
Criteria 6	7.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	37.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : CONSOR Engineers, LLC

Criteria 1	6.50	Good breadth of classifications and certifications represented. Would like to have a a few more junior level shown.
Criteria 2	6.50	Good availability shown and a clear plan to provide additional inspection resources, if needed.
Criteria 3	6.50	A wide variety of past projects shown. Owner feedback provided for a couple projects.
Criteria 4	5.50	Showed some knowledge and understanding of DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	5.50	Provided a clear DBE utilization plan to achieve the stated goal of 20%. Had a commitment from WFA that they would be able to supply people to reach this goal.
Criteria 6	3.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	33.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : Davis & Floyd, Inc.

Criteria 1	5.50	A good mix of inspection levels are represented here. But the prime's own employees show them to be a bit top heavy as far as inspector levels. Also, a bit lacking on available project management personnel.
Criteria 2	5.50	Good availability of the staff that was listed. However, availability of most of WF staff was not shown.
Criteria 3	7.00	Good CPE scores shown. A good amount of projects demonstrating past performance listed.
Criteria 4	6.50	Demonstrated a good knowledge of State DOT practices and procedures with relation to inspection duties.
Criteria 5	5.00	20% DBE utilization was stated as the goal.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	39.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : ESP Associates, Inc.

Criteria 1	5.00	Would like to see each level of inspection divided up instead of grouping chiefs with seniors and mid-levels with juniors. Shows a good mix of PMs and APMs. Would like to have seen a couple of Foundations Certified Team Members representing the prime.
Criteria 2	4.50	Availability for the key individuals shown is fair. There was no differentiation between availability of each team member's staff. Was hard to decipher if the chart was relating to all team members or prime resources only.
Criteria 3	7.00	Good CPE scores shown for all team members. A variety of projects shown also for all team members.
Criteria 4	6.00	Provided good detail showing understanding of State DOT processes, both from project management and inspection standpoint.
Criteria 5	5.00	15% DBE utilization was stated as the goal.
Criteria 6	9.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	36.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : F&ME Consultants

Criteria 1	5.50	A large group of inspection with most certifications. However, would like to see more than 3 juniors available. Project management side is a strength.
Criteria 2	5.50	Good availability shown for the project management side. Would like to have seen more specifics as to availability of inspection side.
Criteria 3	7.00	Good CPE scores. A variety of projects shown for F&ME.
Criteria 4	5.50	Showed a brief explanation of an understanding of State DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	4.00	4% was stated DBE goal. However, I am concerned of achieving this goal with allocating only 2 individuals and with one being a survey verification slot.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	37.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : HDR Engineering, Inc.- Infrastructure Corporation of America

Criteria 1	5.50	A very large inspection pool is presented but no detail is given to the level of each inspector. Showing certifications possessed by each staff member was a plus.
Criteria 2	4.50	No availability of project managers and inspectors are presented other than for Chris Wood. Would like to see the actual distribution of staff and how that will impact responsiveness.
Criteria 3	7.00	Good CPE scores were listed. A variety of past projects were presented for the Prime.
Criteria 4	6.50	Showed a good understanding of State DOT practices and procedures. Demonstrated a commitment to quality with implementation of internal quality manual.
Criteria 5	5.00	15% was the stated DBE goal.
Criteria 6	1.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	29.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC

Criteria 1	6.00	A great deal of experience within the PM level shown. However, inspection is only shown under "senior/lead inspectors". Would like to see the entire pool of inspection with their corresponding levels. Showing certifications possessed was a plus. Liked that prime has a large pool of certified inspectors in house.
Criteria 2	5.00	Availability is only shown for key individuals. Nothing shown for inspection side or any other project manangement.
Criteria 3	7.00	Good CPE scores presented. A good deal of variety of past projects shown,
Criteria 4	6.50	Provided good detail showing a clear understanding of State DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	3.00	No DBE goal percentage stated. No mention of DBE firms other than in project organization chart and Mentor Protege Opportunity. No real explanation of how the goal will be achieved.
Criteria 6	8.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	35.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : KCI Technologies, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	A wide variety of levels of classifications available. Well presented across not only prime but subs also. Very clearly shows the depth and breadth of talent available.
Criteria 2	5.50	Clearly showed the inspection numbers available over the life of the proposed on-call period. Good availability of the PM and APM side.
Criteria 3	6.50	Good CPE scores presented for prime and subs. A moderate amount of projects presented.
Criteria 4	5.50	A brief description showing understanding of State DOT practices and procedures was given. Could have expounded on this as opposed to bullet points.
Criteria 5	5.50	A good presenting of past DBE goals achieved. A clear plan to continue achieving DBE utilization of 10% was given.
Criteria 6	8.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	38.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : Mead & Hunt, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	A good mix of inspection levels presented for Mead & Hunt and subs. Presented a plan to add to junior level to supplement numbers. PM and APM clearly shown.
Criteria 2	5.50	Well presented availability of inspection resources available. Moderate availability of APM and PM shown.
Criteria 3	7.00	Good CPE scores shown. A good variety of past projects for both prime and subs presented.
Criteria 4	6.50	Showed good detail outlining the expectations of inspectors on a State DOT project. Shows a clear understanding of State DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	5.00	Showed a DBE utilization goal of 12.5% and provided a plan on how to achieve.
Criteria 6	6.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	37.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : Michael Baker International, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	A good variety of inspection levels presented across prime and subs. PM and APM levels well represented. Level of certifications across all inspection classifications is good.
Criteria 2	5.50	Good availability of inspection and project management resources.
Criteria 3	7.00	Good CPE scores presented. A good variety of past projects for MBI, in addition to WFA and SME.
Criteria 4	6.50	Showed good detail of various State DOT practices and procedures. Showed a familiarity and clear understanding of how inspection is to be performed.
Criteria 5	5.00	Showed a DBE utilization goal of 5% and provided a plan on how to achieve.
Criteria 6	1.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	32.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	A little lacking on the junior level of inspection presented. Also, some mid-levels lack the expected certifications for what I would expect. But altogether a large pool of staff available from the prime.
Criteria 2	6.50	A good availability of project management and inspection resources for prime.
Criteria 3	5.00	A variety of past projects were presented. However, no CPE scores presented. One QMT score for only the bridge subsection was presented.
Criteria 4	6.50	Provided good detail outlining the expectations of inspection. Showed a clear understanding of the inspector's role within State DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	5.00	Stated a 12% DBE utilization goal and a plan on how they will achieve it.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	39.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : NOVA Engineering & Environmental, LLC

Criteria 1	2.00	Nothing shown as to classification of inspection. A lack of total number of inspectors and project managers is a concern. Did not see any inspectors ACI or Foundations certified. Only one Asphalt Roadway Certified inspector presented.
Criteria 2	4.00	Availability only shown for key personnel. Nothing shown for any level of inspection.
Criteria 3	3.00	Showed a variety of past projects, but no owner feedback given. Projects shown were geotechnical in nature.
Criteria 4	1.00	Nothing detailed that would lead one to believe that the prime is familiar with State DOT practices and procedures. It is implied due to current projects, but not explicitly detailed.
Criteria 5	1.00	No DBE utilization goal given or plan on how to achieve any DBE utilization.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	21.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : OLH Inc.

Criteria 1	5.50	A good mix of inspection levels for the prime is shown. Most subs are lacking the expected junior level inspectors. Also concerning is the prime's two mid-level and two senior inspectors with no certifications beyond OSHA and Work Zone Traffic. Would expect at those levels at least one certification beyond those.
Criteria 2	4.50	Availability for 2023 is less than desired at 61%.
Criteria 3	7.00	A wide variety of past projects representing both prime and subs. CPE and QMT scores presented were good.
Criteria 4	5.50	Provided a brief detail of an understanding of State DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	6.50	DBE utilization of 65% is stated goal. Very achievable as prime is a DBE.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	39.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : Parrish & Partners, LLC

Criteria 1	7.00	A good mix of inspection levels are shown. Both prime and subs have a good deal of certified team members available.
Criteria 2	5.50	Availability shown for key staff is good. However, other than a blanket statement that the entire directory of staff is 100% available, nothing speaks to availability of inspection staff.
Criteria 3	5.00	Some owner feedback given for past performance. Would like to have seen feedback for most of the projects presented. A wide variety of past projects were shown.
Criteria 4	5.00	Very little specifics given to showing familiarity with State DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	5.00	Stated a 20% DBE utilization goal and a plan on how it will be achieved.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	37.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : RS&H, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.50	A good mix of inspection levels shown. A wide variety of PMs and APMs available. Was concerned that all inspection resources shown for DRMP did not have certifications shown beyond ACI.
Criteria 2	5.00	Availability of key staff shown is good. However, would like something other than a blanket statement that RS&H and subs are 100% available. Something more specific to inspectors or at a minimum each sub.
Criteria 3	6.00	Good CPE scores shown and 1 QMT score. Only project shown was current On-Call.
Criteria 4	5.00	Very little specifics given that show familiarity with State SOT practices and procedures. Would like to have seen more detail showing understanding.
Criteria 5	5.00	Stated a 12% DBE utilization goal and a plan on how it will be achieved.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	37.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP

Criteria 1	6.50	A fair mix of inspection resources available. Would like more available junior inspectors shown. Certifications presented show and good breadth and depth of team talent.
Criteria 2	6.50	Very clear in showing available resources. Also, presented a plan to get more inspectors approved for this solicitation if the need arose.
Criteria 3	7.00	Good CPE scores were presented. A wide variety of projects were presented, including how they relate to this project.
Criteria 4	6.50	Provided a great deal of detail showing a clear understanding of State DOT practices and procedures. Also, included internal best practices in how inspection would be achieved.
Criteria 5	5.50	Presented a DBE utilization goal of 12% and plan on how it will be achieved. Also included historical DBE participation as a percentage of revenue.
Criteria 6	9.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	41.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : S&ME, Inc.

Criteria 1	4.50	A large pool of inspection resources is shown, but there is nothing to differentiate them based on classification. Would like to see them broken down into the various classifications.
Criteria 2	4.50	Availability for PMs and APMs for prime shown only. Nothing refers to the availability of any inspection staff.
Criteria 3	6.00	Some CPE scores provided. Those that were provided, were average. An adequate amount of various projects were shown demonstrating past performance of the prime.
Criteria 4	5.50	Provided a brief understanding of State DOT practices and procedures. Would like more explanation showing a full and clear understanding.
Criteria 5	5.00	Presented a 5% DBE utilization goal and a plan on how it will be achieved.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	35.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : SAM-Construction Services, LLC

Criteria 1	4.00	No classifications were shown for inspection levels. Would like to see those individuals presented with their respective classification shown.
Criteria 2	5.00	Availability given specifically form SAM-CS staff. However, would like something more for subs other than a blanket statement that the prime and their subs can 100% meet any request.
Criteria 3	4.00	Showed few past projects of similar nature. No owner feedback provided.
Criteria 4	4.00	Provided little detail to show a clear understanding of State DOT practices and procedures. Only information provided was years of experience.
Criteria 5	5.00	Presented a 12% DBE utilization goal and a plan on how it will be achieved.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	32.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : Summit Design and Engineering Services, PLLC

Criteria 1	6.50	A good mix across all inspection levels. Very clearly shows the certifications that inspectors possess. Would like to have seen more certifications possessed by some of the chief and senior levels.
Criteria 2	6.00	Very clear in stating the availability of inspection resources. Also presented an additional pool of inspectors that could be utilized, if needed.
Criteria 3	4.50	Several past projects were presented demonstrating Summit's ability to perform on this type of project. Would like to have been provided some owner feedback.
Criteria 4	5.50	Provided a short explanation of State DOT practices and procedures. Would like to have seen more detail here.
Criteria 5	5.00	A 10% DBE utilization goal was presented. A plan on how this will be achieved was also shown.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	37.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : TranSystems Corporation

Criteria 1	7.00	A good mix of inspection levels available. Shows a breadth and depth of certifications across prime and sub team members.
Criteria 2	6.00	Very detailed in presenting available resources. Also, showed a history of being able to provide additional resources on short notice.
Criteria 3	6.50	Good CPE scores presented and several examples of owner feedback given for a variety of projects.
Criteria 4	6.00	A very detailed explanation showing a clear understanding of State DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	5.50	Presented a DBE utilization goal of 8% and a plan on how that will be achieved. Showed a history of achieving a high DBE utilization on a past project.
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	35.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : Willson.Ferguson Associate, LLC

Criteria 1	7.00	A large pool of inspection resources with a good mix of inspection levels are shown.
Criteria 2	4.00	No availability for inspection. Only shown availability for key individuals.
Criteria 3	6.50	CPE scores shown were good. A large number of past projects were given for both prime and subs. Would liked to have seen a little more detail on the projects shown.
Criteria 4	5.50	Provided a brief detail showing an understanding of State DOT practices and procedures.
Criteria 5	6.50	DBE utilization goal is 70%. Very achievable as prime is a DBE. In addition has indicated that IPW will also get 5% of the workload.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	39.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : WSP USA Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	A large pool of resources is shown but nothing is presented showing certifications possessed. While a good deal of detail is provided for some key individuals, would like to see more for the talent pool presented.
Criteria 2	4.00	Only availability given is for key individuals. Want to see the entire pool availability presented.
Criteria 3	6.50	A wide variety of past projects were shown. Several on-call projects were presented of similar scope. Some owner feedback provided.
Criteria 4	4.50	Very little detail given showing a clear understanding of State DOT practices and procedures. Only information given were blanket statements saying WSP is familiar with DOT practices and procedures but not explanation as to how.
Criteria 5	5.00	A DBE utilization goal of 15% was presented in addition to a plan on how to achieve.
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	30.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : A. Morton Thomas and Associates, Inc.

Criteria 1	4.00	AMT has demonstrated that the team has a varying range of levels of inspectors, but limited amount of inspectors with necessary certifications. A lot of them have waivers.
Criteria 2	4.00	AMT's team possesses a limited pool of certified inspectors to support proper staffing levels on DOT construction projects. Will have to rely on subconsultants to be very responsive in providing an available and certified inspector.
Criteria 3	5.00	Review of past performance and evaluations demonstrate that AMT provided acceptable services for similar on-call CEI contracts.
Criteria 4	3.00	Limited experience, qualifications, inspector certifications; proposal demonstrates the team is not very familiar with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	5.00	13% utilization is expected and considered average.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	31.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

Criteria 1	3.00	AECOM does not have many inspectors, especially ones that are possess the necessary certifications to staff a DOT construction project. Subconsultants will be relied on heavily to properly staff projects.
Criteria 2	3.00	While AECOM has demonstrated staff availability ideal for a project manager level, available inspectors again would be primarily provided by subconsultants.
Criteria 3	3.00	Past performance involved more design and utility coordination type roles, with minor involvement with construction inspection on less complex DOT projects.
Criteria 4	3.00	Aside from the proposed PM that will be managing the on-call contract, has not demonstrated a lot of experience on DOT construction projects. AECOM staff are more heavily experts in specific design/preconstruction areas.
Criteria 5	6.50	AECOM is targeting 35% DBE utilization is considered very good, but don't find it obtainable.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	28.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : CDM Smith, Inc.

Criteria 1	4.50	PMs and inspectors possess adequate levels of experience and qualifications, but CDM Smith employees are all higher levels. Varying levels come from subconsultants with certifications. None of the entry level inspectors have pavement preservation certifications, so a PM or high level inspector would be assigned to less complex work if requested.
Criteria 2	4.50	CDM does not have many employed inspectors, and all employees are higher level PMs, Chiefs and Seniors, with 1 mid-level. When mid-level or junior levels would be requested, they would have to rely on subconsultants and I question their ability to be responsive with available inspectors to staff projects adequately.
Criteria 3	6.00	Firm and team members received slightly above average evaluations on similar on-call CEI projects
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	4.00	10% utilization is just slightly below average.
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	28.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Civil Engineering Consulting Services Inc.

Criteria 1	7.50	CECS' project team contains a desirable range of inspector levels, which possess the necessary inspector certifications. PMs have experience, knowledge, and are qualified to effectively manage this on-call, and assist with escalated issues/requests/etc; well rounded inspector pool in regards to levels of field inspectors
Criteria 2	8.50	CECS has a very good staffing level of inspectors, so availability and responsiveness will be higher than average; proposal indicates that all inspectors are available 100% day one
Criteria 3	8.50	Firm and team members regularly receive excellent and outstanding evaluation scores, and have demonstrated their ability to provide on-call CEI services.
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	4.50	13% utilization is expected and considered average; DBE subs listed are on so many other proposals so not sure how obtainable, with one being solely assigned for survey requests.
Criteria 6	7.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	41.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : CONSOR Engineers, LLC

Criteria 1	5.00	Conсор has provided a decently balanced team of inspectors and managers, possessing necessary qualifications and certifications to properly staff a DOT project.
Criteria 2	5.00	Not many of Conсор inspectors possess SCDOT Foundations nor Concrete inspector certifications, and would have to call upon subconsultants for these types of inspections; this will effect their responsiveness to provide an available inspector. All Conсор employees are 100% available. Liked that the proposal showed availability for every team member.
Criteria 3	5.00	Although there were not CPE scores available, personal and firm references were available to speak on past services by Conсор and/or its team members; specifically a good comment on CE&I performed previously.
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	6.50	20% utilization is slightly above average; but also has a commitment from DBE subconsultant that they will be available.
Criteria 6	3.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	29.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Davis & Floyd, Inc.

Criteria 1	4.00	CEI team has well qualified managers, and a slightly below average pool of inspectors with experience in areas common to a DOT project; inspector pool does vary in position levels
Criteria 2	5.00	As expected, the inspectors listed possess a majority of the required inspector certifications to properly staff a DOT project, so firm can be responsive in providing an available inspector. A bulk of the staff are available on day one.
Criteria 3	8.50	CPE 8.21; also considered references given on the firm and individuals listed in the proposal, specifically those discussing past performance on CE&I type contracts/projects.
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	7.00	20% utilization is above average
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	39.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : ESP Associates, Inc.

Criteria 1	3.50	There is a broad pool of inspectors with different levels and inspector certifications, but ESP employs very little inspectors with necessary certifications. Relies heavily on subconsultants for certified inspectors
Criteria 2	3.50	ESP will rely heavily on inspectors employed by its subconsultants and will not allow them to be responsive with available inspectors. Did not detail much of the inspection staff that are available, and rather highlighted management staff.
Criteria 3	5.00	Firm and individuals received good evaluations and comments from past inspection services
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	5.00	15% utilization is slightly above average; DBE subs are on so many proposals it will be difficult to achieve.
Criteria 6	9.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	31.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : F&ME Consultants

Criteria 1	5.50	Well rounded staff including PMs and Assistant PMs, but do not have a lot of lower tier. Rely on subconsultants for lower level inspectors with certifications.
Criteria 2	5.00	As expected, the inspectors listed possess a majority of the required inspector certifications to properly staff a DOT project. Bulk of staff are currently on the on-call, so are available immediately.
Criteria 3	8.00	Very good evaluations and comments on previous on-call inspection and project management services
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	3.00	4% utilization is below expectations
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	36.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : HDR Engineering, Inc.- Infrastructure Corporation of America

Criteria 1	8.00	HDR has a very good balance of experienced project managers, and certified inspectors of varying levels. The inspector pool of subconsultants also possess the necessary certifications to properly staff this on-call for multiple DOT projects at any given time.
Criteria 2	7.00	HDR has demonstrated that they have the ability to quickly assign an available inspector to a DOT project. Did not detail availability of inspectors outside of a couple of PMs and key staff.
Criteria 3	8.50	HDR has received exceptional evaluation scores, as well as comments for the firm and individuals for past performance on DOT projects and similar on-call contracts
Criteria 4	6.00	Qualifications of managers and engineers is slightly above average, but all in all experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	5.50	15% utilization is slightly above average, although not that obtainable
Criteria 6	1.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	36.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC

Criteria 1	5.00	Firm has provided an average size pool of inspectors, but all listed possess all necessary inspector certifications to properly staff multiple DOT projects. Only highlighted high level inspectors, with numerous PMs and Assistant PMs. Would have liked to see more mid and junior level inspectors.
Criteria 2	6.00	Although a limited amount of inspectors have been listed, ICE has also shown that they have a large pool of employees company and state wide that can be made available in response to requests for simultaneous DOT projects.
Criteria 3	9.00	Evaluations on past performance, and references on the firm and individuals are exceptional; especially for previous on-call project similar to this contract.
Criteria 4	7.00	Qualifications of managers and engineers is above average, but all in all experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications. ICE has also provided an above average pool of support services.
Criteria 5	4.00	Percentages are not provided, but DBE utilization shown is slightly below average.
Criteria 6	8.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	39.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : KCI Technologies, Inc.

Criteria 1	9.00	KCI has provided a well rounded and an exceptionally large pool of inspectors with all the primary certifications required to properly staff multiple DOT projects of all complexities. Their proposal identifies that they have a broad range of inspector levels available, the larger being the "Mid" and "Junior" level which is the most common level requested for an on-call contract.
Criteria 2	9.00	Would have liked to see a breakdown, but have committed an appropriate amount of PMs and Inspectors to being 100% available on day one. With the large inspector pool, as well as a very qualified and diverse group of project managers and support services, KCI has shown that they can be very responsive to just about any request, and will have the ability of provide an available inspector at just about any given time; well done.
Criteria 3	9.50	KCI received a very high CPE, and references on the firm's and individuals' past performances are very high as well. Raters hold KCI and their CEI services in high regards on many previous on-call contracts similar to this one.
Criteria 4	8.00	Qualifications and past experience on just about all types of DOT projects demonstrate that KCI's team is extremely familiar with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	5.00	10% utilization is just slightly below average, but is truly obtainable.
Criteria 6	8.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	48.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Mead & Hunt, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	Mead & Hunt has provided an above average pool of inspectors, with the appropriate balance of roadway vs. structures. Inspectors listed have the necessary inspector certifications, including the additional support from subconsultants. Well rounded team with focus on mid and senior level inspectors.
Criteria 2	8.00	Did not provide a breakdown, but showed 40 inspectors ready to start immediately. Mead & Hunt has shown that they have a good amount of inspectors available immediately, and the inspector pool will allow them to be very responsive in assigning a certified inspector to various types of DOT projects.
Criteria 3	8.50	Very good evaluation scores from past performance, and very good references for both the firm and individuals providing similar on-call CEI services on previous contracts.
Criteria 4	6.50	Qualifications of managers and engineers is above average, but all in all experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	5.00	13% utilization is expected and considered average.
Criteria 6	6.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	41.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Michael Baker International, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.50	Michael Baker has provided a well rounded team of PMs and inspectors, and also focused on highlighting their available mid-level and junior inspector pool. Available inspectors also possess the necessary inspector certifications. Liked that they highlighted qualifications and experience on each inspector.
Criteria 2	8.00	Bulk of the team is 90% available, but would have liked a breakdown of individuals. Michael Baker has demonstrated that they can be responsive in assigning an available inspector, and have also shown that they can provide additional support services when needed.
Criteria 3	7.50	Very good performance evaluations, and above average references on previously provided CEI services.
Criteria 4	6.00	Qualifications of managers and engineers is slightly above average, but all in all experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	3.50	5% utilization is below expectations, but great detail on the overall utilization plan.
Criteria 6	1.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	33.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Criteria 1	4.50	Neel Schaffer has a well rounded team, with appropriate amount of inspectors, especially ones that are certified in the areas to perform inspection duties on DOT projects.
Criteria 2	4.50	Majority of the team is 100% available. Based off of the available inspectors with proper certifications, they will be limited in responding to request for certified and qualified inspectors.
Criteria 3	7.00	Above average evaluations from past performance, and good references for certain individuals for CEI services provided previously.
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	4.50	12% utilization is expected and considered average.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	35.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : NOVA Engineering & Environmental, LLC

Criteria 1	1.00	Limited personnel with very limited certifications. Firm did not demonstrated that they have a well qualified enough staff to effectively staff an on-call CEI contract
Criteria 2	1.00	Firm did not demonstrated that they would be responsive and have enough inspectors available to properly staff multiple DOT projects
Criteria 3	2.00	Aside from very minimal firm and individual references, the firm's proposal did not demonstrate acceptable CE&I services provided on past projects
Criteria 4	1.00	Proposal did not address this section
Criteria 5	1.00	Firm did not address Technical Criteria 5
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	16.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : OLH Inc.

Criteria 1	4.50	Relay on subs for PMs and Assistant PMs; Firm has provided an average size pool of inspectors, somewhat balanced classification levels of inspectors and PMs; limited amount of inspectors possess necessary certifications to properly staff multiple DOT projects.
Criteria 2	5.00	Chart showing inspector availability was given, but would have liked to see a breakdown for individuals. Can be responsive in providing certified inspectors, including subconsultants.
Criteria 3	8.50	OLH received an excellent evaluation, and excellent firm references for similar CEI services provided in the past.
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	10.00	65% is well beyond expected; OLH is a certified DBE
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	43.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Parrish & Partners, LLC

Criteria 1	3.50	P&P has a small pool of inspectors, and although the team is primarily made up of mid-level inspectors, the seniors and chiefs are really the only ones that possess the necessary certifications to staff a DOT project.
Criteria 2	3.50	Gave a breakdown for critical, high level staff. Would have liked to see lower level availability as well. Firm relies heavily on subconsultants, which will effect P&P's ability to be responsive with providing an available inspector that is certified.
Criteria 3	5.00	Proposal provided good detail highlighting past performance; firm had a good reference for manager of previous CEI services
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	6.00	20% utilization is above average, but not very obtainable with DBE subs on the team
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	33.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : RS&H, Inc.

Criteria 1	4.00	Firm has a very limited inspector pool, and has a lot of PMs and Assistant PMs listed; would have liked to see a higher focus on the mid-level inspector pool; there is a limited amount of inspectors that possess the multiple certifications required to staff a DOT project without assigning multiple individuals. Rely heavily on subconsultants
Criteria 2	4.00	Did not highlight on inspector availability except for higher levels and PMs; RS&H's limited pool of inspectors with all certifications will restrict their responsiveness in providing an available inspector (that is certified) upon DOT's request
Criteria 3	7.00	Firm has received very good evaluations for past performance, and firm and individual references for CEI services provided on similar projects. Proposal did not provide much detail or highlights on past performance.
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	5.50	12% utilization is expected and considered average.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	35.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP

Criteria 1	7.00	RK&K has assembled an above average pool of inspectors; inspector classifications are well balanced with the focus being on the mid-level and senior levels; they have also assigned a reasonable amount of available PMs when requested, and shown additional support services that are available; RK&Ks inspectors possess the necessary certifications to properly staff a DOT project
Criteria 2	7.00	Proposal provided a breakdown of the team's availability; RK&K has demonstrated that they are staffed well enough to be very responsive in providing available, certified inspectors, and also have a pool of additional certified inspectors from subconsultants to assist.
Criteria 3	7.50	Firm has received very good evaluations from previous CEI services, and above average references for both the firm and individuals that have performed on similar types of projects
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	4.00	8% utilization is below average with no plan provided, but have exceeded this value drastically in the past.
Criteria 6	9.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	39.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : S&ME, Inc.

Criteria 1	4.00	S&ME has provided an average pool of inspectors; would have liked to see level classifications for inspectors; many of the S&ME inspectors do not possess multiple certifications to effectively staff a DOT project in all areas common to highway/bridge construction
Criteria 2	4.00	S&ME has demonstrated they possess the staff to be responsive to DOT requests; they will rely on subconsultants for inspectors certified in multiple areas so multiple inspectors on needed on a single project. Proposal detailed available support staff, but no details on inspectors.
Criteria 3	5.00	Firm received average evaluations from past performance, but has received good references for the firm and individuals for CEI services provided in the past
Criteria 4	4.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications, but section of proposal provided limited details/info
Criteria 5	3.50	5% utilization is below expectations
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	30.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : SAM-Construction Services, LLC

Criteria 1	3.00	Does not have a well rounded team; Firm's inspector pool is limited and relies heavily on inspectors provided by it's subconsultants
Criteria 2	3.00	Proposal says team is 100% available; Also, being that SAM will rely on assigning certified inspectors with the availability of it's subs, they are not going to be very responsive to DOT requests
Criteria 3	5.00	Average references on firm and individuals for CEI services provided in the past
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	4.00	Percentages are not provided, but DBE utilization shown is slightly below average.
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	30.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Summit Design and Engineering Services, PLLC

Criteria 1	3.00	Summit's inspector pool has a limited amount of individuals that possess multiple certifications to properly staff even a less complex DOT project
Criteria 2	4.00	Bulk of the team is 100% available; Their ability to be responsive in providing an available inspector is going to be difficult because of the limited individuals that possess the necessary certifications for the core areas of common on highway projects
Criteria 3	4.00	Past performance on similar types of CEI projects/contracts described similar DOT projects and CEI services, but the proposal did not provide a lot of detail or highlights on similar types of projects.
Criteria 4	4.00	Experience and qualifications of senior staff demonstrate a support team familiar with DOT standards and specifications, but limited inspector certifications does not demonstrate a lot of qualification at the field level being the primary focus
Criteria 5	5.00	10% utilization is average; plan includes newer subs so the goal is obtainable
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	30.00	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : TranSystems Corporation

Criteria 1	7.00	TranSystem did a great job in identifying an appropriate amount of PMs and Assistant PMs, as well as an inspector pool that is well balanced with the various levels with a focus on the mid-level; the inspectors possess the necessary certifications to properly staff a DOT project with one assigned inspector at any given time
Criteria 2	5.00	Bulk of the team is 75% available on day one; their ability to assign a well certification immediately is going to be limited
Criteria 3	5.50	Firm has received great evaluations from past performance on similar types of DOT projects, and references for the firm and individuals were very good especially for CEI services similar to this on call project. Firm received below average comments for management and administration of the on call contract(s).
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	4.00	8% utilization is below average.
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	30.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Willson.Ferguson Associate, LLC

Criteria 1	8.00	WFA has provided a well rounded team, with the appropriate number of PMs, Assistant PMs, engineers, etc., as well as a broad pool of various inspector levels. WFA and subconsultant inspectors possess the certifications necessary to staff any type of highway or bridge DOT project.
Criteria 2	7.00	High level team is available, but no details on lower level inspectors; proposal identified a limited number of individuals available, but from the org chart WFA has the ability to be very responsive in providing an available, certified inspector when requested.
Criteria 3	8.50	Very good evaluation scores/comments from past performance, as well the firm being held in high regards by many for CEI services it provided in the past
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	10.00	10 - 70% is well beyond expected; WFA is a certified DBE
Criteria 6	10.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	48.50	

EVALUATOR SCORING & COMMENTS



EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : WSP USA Inc.

Criteria 1	3.00	WSP has a limited pool of inspectors, and heavier on the higher levels; i.e. senior bridge and senior roadway. Also, their proposal needed a list of the inspector's current certifications. Need more certified inspectors
Criteria 2	3.00	many of the key inspectors listed have limited availability; plus it is hard to determine how many inspectors are available at any given time without knowing the status of their certifications. No inspector availability shown. Have had difficulty providing inspectors in the past.
Criteria 3	7.50	Firm received good evaluations from past performance, as well as good references for the firm and individuals for CEI services provided previously
Criteria 4	5.00	Experience, qualifications, inspector certifications, and past projects demonstrate the teams' familiarity with DOT standards and specifications.
Criteria 5	6.00	15% utilization is slightly above average
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 11/29/2022 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	28.50	