

MEMORANDUM

TO: Public Notice

FROM: Professional Services Contracting Office

DATE: October 9, 2023

RE: S-271-23 – I-26 Bridge Rehabilitations over US-1, Southern Railway, and SC-302

The following firm was selected for the referenced solicitation above:

Kisinger Campo & Associates

The next top four (4) firms in ranking order are:

TranSystems Corporation HDR Engineering, Inc. of the Carolinas Mead & Hunt, Inc. Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, 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: John Boylston, Director of Preconstruction Randy Young, Chief Engineer for Project Delivery J. Darrin Player, Chief Procurement Officer

FROM: Wendy Hollingsworth

DATE: October 6, 2023

RE: **S-271-23** - I-26 Bridge Rehabilitations over US-1, Southern Railway, and SC-302 in Lexington County

Approval is requested for the referenced solicitation that was advertised on August 29, 2023, with a proposal due date of September 14, 2023. The **SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (SCDOT)** requests a proposal containing a technical approach from all short-listed consulting firms. The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to select a Proposer to perform the Project services and to design the Project, as further described in this RFP. It is not the intention of SCDOT to receive complete detailed Project analysis and design prior to the selection of a Proposer and the later execution of the Contract. Rather, the response to this RFP shall provide sufficient information to be evaluated by SCDOT to determine if the Proposal is in accordance with the specified process and criteria.

Requested services include but are not limited to: project management, environmental studies and documentation, environmental permitting, bridge design, structural design, roadway structures design, roadway design, hydrology/hydraulic design, geotechnical services, hazardous materials survey, subsurface utility engineering, utility coordination, development of preliminary/final right of way plans, right of way services, value engineering, development of preliminary/final construction plans, pavement marking and signing plans, constructability review, construction phase services, engineer's estimate/project specific special provisions and other related duties deemed necessary. SCDOT intends to select and negotiate a contract with one consultant team for development of these projects. The project team should be capable of providing all services outlined above.

Disadvantaged Business Enterprise goal is established as **10%** percent and will be administered in accordance with SECTION I. INSTRUCTIONS TO CONSULTANTS.

Whether or not there is a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal on this contract, proposer is strongly encouraged to obtain the maximum amount of DBE participation feasible on the contract. The selected consultant will be required to report all DBE participation through the DBE Quarterly Report required in the supplemental specification.

Five (5) firm's submitted RFP proposals and all were deemed acceptable for meeting the minimum requirements for submittal. October 6, 2023 at 9:00 AM, through SCDOT WEBEX teleconferencing the selection committee convened to evaluate the proposals.

The final ranking of the five (5) firms deemed most highly qualified for this RFP selection were:

- 1. Kisinger Campco & Associates
- 2. TranSystems Corporation
- 3. HDR Engineering, Inc. of the Carolinas
- 4. Mead & Hunt, Inc.
- 5. Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.

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

ACTION	OFFICE	SIGNATURE	DATE
APPROVE	Director of Preconstruction	In D. Boylator 2023.10.06 13:58:51 -04'00'	10/6/23
APPROVE	Chief Engineer for Project Delivery	Randall L. Young Digitally signed by Randall L. Young Date: 2023.10.09 08:43:07 -04'00'	10/9/23
APPROVE	Chief Procurement Officer	J. Darrin Player Digitally signed by J. Darrin Player Date: 2023.10.09 10:09:21 -04'00'	10/9/23

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES SELECTION PROCESS

Evaluation Committee Deliberation

& SC-302	
Firm	Comments
See Attached	

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES SELECTION PROCESS

Evaluation Committee Recommendation

S-271-23 - I-26 Bridge Rehabilitations over US-1, Southern Railway, & SC-302

Project Name:

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

Firm/Individual	Order Negotiation	Comments
	Approval	
Kisinger Campco & Associates	1st	
TranSystems Corporation	2nd	
HDR Engineering, Inc. of the Carolinas	3rd	
Mead & Hunt, Inc.	4th	
Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.	5th	
	6th	
	7th	
	8th	
	9th	
	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 Digitally signed by J. Darrin Player Date: 2023.10.09 10:09:49 -04'00'	10/09/2023
	Chief Procurement Officer	Date

S-271-23 I-26 Bridge Rehabs

Firm	SOQ Score	RFP Score	Total Score	Rank
Kisinger Campco & Associates	74.27	79.38	153.65	1
TranSystems Corporation	67.88	81.13	149.01	2
HDR Engineering Inc. of the Carolinas	74.12	74.5	148.62	3
Mead & Hunt, Inc.	74.55	68.74	143.29	4
Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.	70.55	65	135.55	5



S-271-23 I-26 Bridge Rehabilitations over US-1, Southern RFP			CRITERIA									
RANKING	FIRM RANKINGS TOTAL		1	2		4			7			
	Ranked in Order by Firm Name	SCORE	50%	20%	20%	10%	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	TranSystems Corporation	81.13	41.88	16.00	16.00	7.25						
2	Kisinger Campo & Associates	79.38	41.88	16.25	14.50	6.75						
3	HDR Engineering, Inc Infrastructure Corporation of America	74.50	41.25	13.00	13.50	6.75						
4	Mead & Hunt, Inc.	68.74	35.62	13.50	12.00	7.62						
5	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.	65.00	32.50	15.00	10.75	6.75						

MasterScoresheetReportV2 10/6/2023 Page 2 of 27



S-271-23 I-26 Bridge Rehabilitations over US-1, Southern RFQ				CRITERIA								
DANKING	FIRM RANKINGS		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NANKING	Ranked in Order by Firm Name	SCORE	25%	15%	15%	10%	25%	10%	0	0	0	0
1	Mead & Hunt, Inc.	74.55	15.94	11.25	10.31	7.75	20.00	9.30				
2	Kisinger Campo & Associates	74.27	17.50	10.31	10.31	7.75	20.00	8.40				
3	HDR Engineering, Inc Infrastructure Corporation of America	74.12	18.44	11.44	11.62	8.00	20.62	4.00				
4	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.	70.55	17.50	9.94	10.69	7.50	18.12	6.80				
5	TranSystems Corporation	67.88	15.94	10.50	10.50	7.62	18.12	5.20				
6	Carolina Transportation Engineers & Associates, PC	63.27	14.06	10.12	9.38	5.50	15.31	8.90				
7	Davis & Floyd, Inc.	61.06	14.38	7.31	8.81	5.12	15.94	9.50				
8	CDM Smith, Inc.	58.70	13.44	8.62	9.19	5.25	15.00	7.20				
9	CONSOR Engineers, LLC	55.72	13.44	7.88	7.88	5.00	13.12	8.40				

S-271-23 I-26 Bridge Rehabilitations over US-1, Southern RFP

10/6/2023





S-271-23 I-26 Bridge Rehabilitations over US-1, Southern RFP			CRITERIA									
RANKING	FIRM RANKINGS Ranked in Order by Firm Name	TOTAL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		SCORE	50%	20%	20%	10%	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	TranSystems Corporation	81.13	41.88	16.00	16.00	7.25						
2	Kisinger Campo & Associates	79.38	41.88	16.25	14.50	6.75						
3	HDR Engineering, Inc Infrastructure Corporation of America	74.50	41.25	13.00	13.50	6.75						
4	Mead & Hunt, Inc.	68.74	35.62	13.50	12.00	7.62						
5	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.	65.00	32.50	15.00	10.75	6.75						
EVALUATOR:	EVALUATOR:						•					
EVALUATOR: EVALUA												

CRITERIA QUESTIONS AND WEIGHTS



	Description of the consultant's understanding and technical approach to the project as it relates to the bridge/structural design, hydrologic/hydraulic design, geotechnical design, and traffic design. Include any expected	
1	challenges and potential mitigation strategies.	50
2	Description of the consultant's understanding of the project as related to environmental documentation and permitting challenges. These should include but are not limited to public involvement and external agency coordination.	20
	Consultant's technical approach to applying the SCDOT Bridge Design Manual and other associated/relevant	
3	manuals to these rehabilitation project.	20
4	Consultant's approach to ensure quality in the development of the PS&E package.	10
	Total	100

MasterScoresheetReportV2 10/6/2023 Page 3 of 27

EVALUATOR : 1

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

Criteria 1	10.00	The description of the consultant's understanding and technical approach is outstanding as it relates to the bridge/structural design and traffic design, and the consultant's understanding of expected challenges, such as the project's construction being likely to occur at the same time as Carolina Crossroads, is accompanied by potential mitigation strategies, such as the proposed traffic control options, that meets all expectations in every aspect. A
Criteria 2	8.00	The description of the consultant's understanding is very good as it relates to environmental documentation and permitting challenges, such as the anticipation of a potential endangered species conflict and local community challenges, and the consultant's approach to coordinating public outreach exceeds expectations in most regards. B
Criteria 3	10.00	The consultant's technical approach for the structural design of this rehabilitation project is outstanding, as outlined in the BDM applications table, the narrative of understanding how to apply existing design policies for rehabilitations through the use of existing inspection, load rating, and design manuals and practices, and summarized in the anticipated repair and rehabilitation scope table that meets all expectations in every aspect.
Criteria 4	9.00	The consultant's approach to ensure quality in the development of the PS&E package is excellent and outlines specific processes, such as the Best Practices program, that meets virtually all expectations and details how QA/QC will be performed.
TOTAL	37.00	

EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.

Criteria 1	5.00	The description of the consultant's understanding and technical approach is average as it relates to the bridge/structural design and traffic design, and the consultant's understanding of expected challenges, such as the substandard clearance over US 1, is identified, but it is not accompanied by thorough potential mitigation strategies. Additionally, there is no acknowledgement of the potential challenge of construction occurring for this project at the same time as Carolina Crossroads.
Criteria 2	8.00	The description of the consultant's understanding is very good as it relates to environmental documentation and permitting challenges, such as the anticipation of a potential endangered species conflict and local community challenges, and the consultant's approach to coordinating public outreach exceeds expectations in most regards. C
Criteria 3	5.00	The consultant's technical approach for the structural design of this rehabilitation project is average, as the table lists typical Design Manuals, but there are insufficient details regarding the development of bridge specific rehabilitation scopes or thorough explanations of anticipated rehabilitation scopes and how these design guides would be applied. E
Criteria 4	9.00	The consultant's approach to ensure quality in the development of the PS&E package is excellent and outlines specific processes, such as the Quality Management System, that meets virtually all expectations and details how QA/QC will be performed.
TOTAL	27.00	

EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Kisinger Campo & Associates

Criteria 1	10.00	The description of the consultant's understanding and technical approach is outstanding as it relates to the bridge/structural design and traffic design, and the consultant's understanding of expected challenges, such as the project's construction being likely to occur at the same time as Carolina Crossroads, is accompanied by potential mitigation strategies, such as the proposed traffic control options, that meets all expectations in every aspect.
Criteria 2	10.00	The description of the consultant's understanding is outstanding as it relates to environmental documentation and permitting challenges that are outlined in the Key Issues, such as the anticipation of a potential endangered species conflict and local community challenges, and these are accompanied by potential mitigation strategies, such as the Public Involvement Plan, that meets all expectations in every aspect. D
Criteria 3	10.00	The consultant's technical approach for the structural design of this rehabilitation project is outstanding, as outlined by the detailed field scoping process, effective use of the Joint Technical Committee to establish effective and agreed upon rehabilitation scopes, and summarized in the recommended scope table that meets all expectations in every aspect.
Criteria 4	8.00	The consultant's approach to ensure quality in the development of the PS&E package is very good and emphasizes the importance of quality by proposing to submit the QA/QC plan to the SCDOT PM for approval, but additional details about the approach are needed.
TOTAL	38.00	

EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Mead & Hunt, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	The description of the consultant's understanding and technical approach is slightly above average as it relates to the bridge/structural design and traffic design, and the consultant's understanding of expected challenges, such as the substandard clearance over US 1 and the potential feasibility of construction cost escalations, is identified, but the potential mitigation strategies lack sufficient technical details.
Criteria 2	8.00	The description of the consultant's understanding is very good as it relates to environmental documentation and permitting challenges, such as the anticipation of a potential endangered species conflict and local community challenges, and the consultant's approach to coordinating public outreach exceeds expectations in most regards.
Criteria 3	5.00	The consultant's technical approach for the structural design of this rehabilitation project is average, as the table lists typical Design Manuals, but there are insufficient details regarding the development of bridge specific rehabilitation scopes or thorough explanations of anticipated rehabilitation scopes and how these design guides would be applied.
Criteria 4	9.00	The consultant's approach to ensure quality in the development of the PS&E package is excellent and outlines specific processes, such as the Quality Management Plan, that meets virtually all expectations and details how QA/QC will be performed.
TOTAL	28.00	

EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : TranSystems Corporation

Criteria 1	9.00	The description of the consultant's understanding and technical approach is excellent as it relates to the bridge/structural design and traffic design, and the consultant's understanding of expected challenges, such as the substandard clearance over US 1, is accompanied by potential mitigation strategies, such as the proposed feasibility study for increasing this clearance, as well as traffic control options, but there is no acknowledgement of the potential challenge of construction occurring for this project at the same time as Carolina Crossroads.
Criteria 2	10.00	The description of the consultant's understanding is outstanding as it relates to environmental documentation and permitting challenges that are outlined in the Key Issues, such as the anticipation of a potential endangered species conflict and local community challenges, and these are accompanied by potential mitigation strategies, such as the Public Involvement Plan, that meets all expectations in every aspect.
Criteria 3	10.00	The consultant's technical approach for the structural design of this rehabilitation project is outstanding, as outlined in the design manuals table, the narrative of understanding how to apply existing design policies for rehabilitations through the use of existing inspection, load rating, and design manuals and practices, and summarized in the anticipated repair and rehabilitation scope table that meets all expectations in every aspect.
Criteria 4	9.00	The consultant's approach to ensure quality in the development of the PS&E package is excellent and outlines specific processes, such as the Quality Control Manual, that meets virtually all expectations and details how QA/QC will be performed.
TOTAL	38.00	

EVALUATOR : 2

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

Criteria 1	9.00	HDR provided a summary of the conditions of the existing bridges. The bridges are approximately 60 years old and their lifespan can be extended about 25 years if appropriate repairs are implemented. HDR has recent bridge rehabilitation experience on I-26. HDR will review bridge documents on file prior to performing a site assessment. Coordination with traffic officials and Norfolk Southern will be needed. A Field Scoping Summary will then be prepared for each bridge detailing existing conditions and recommended repairs. The proposal includes anticipated repair and rehabilitation needs for each bridge. Some repairs include spall or crack injection, bearing rehab, joint replacement, and painting. HDR provided repair types pertinent to this project and detailed their approach for implementing the repair type. Past experience with certain repair types was also provided. Example photos were provided. HDR has a lot of experience with bridge load rating. Hydraulic design services are expected to be limited on this project. Significant drainage improvements are not expected. New bridge end drainage may be needed. The project will be performed under the NPDES general permit and HDR will complete the NOI application. Geotechnical analyses and design will be limited, but a desktop review will be performed to determine if any subsurface explorations will be needed. Existing foundations will be checked to make sure they are adequate for any additional structural loading from the rehab work. HDR will evaluate each bridge site for traffic control solutions. They recommend a staged constructed approach. The SC 302 interchange should maintain ramps at all times. Coordination with Norfolk Southern will be required to make substructure repairs to that bridge. Three potential traffic challenges and mitigation solutions were provided in the proposal.
Criteria 2	6.00	HDR anticipates that the project will qualify for PCE. Human Environment/Community, Permitting, Natural Resources, and Cultural Resources are anticipated environmental scope items. Coordination with USACE and USCG is not anticipated. Each of the environmental scope items were discussed briefly. HDR has past experience with Public Involvement on interstate projects. They will use a four-step approach to public outreach, including research, strategy, connectedness, and innovation. The proposal provides possible public information meeting locations. HDR will provide utility and railroad coordination services as needed to make the required bridge repairs. The proposal provides key elements to railroad coordination success.
Criteria 3	5.00	HDR will design new bridge components using the BDM and AASHTO LRFD Specifications, while replacement of existing components will be designed the BDM and AASHTO Standard Specification. Section 23.2 of the BDM was referenced in the proposal because this section covers general procedures for bridge repair and rehabilitation. Numerous chapters from the BDM were listed and descriptions were given as to the applicability of each chapter. Over 20 other design manuals and specifications were listed in the proposal encompassing bridge, roadway, traffic, hydrology, geotechnical, and additional type services.

Criteria 4	5.00	HDR's proposal included a flow chart showing the project development process from inception to construction. HDR uses a Quality Management Information System (QMIS) that outlines their company's planning, people management, client satisfaction, practice management, and how to manage subconsultants. QA/QC procedures have been developed for bridge design, inspection, and analysis services. They have a step-by-step process for production, checking reports, calculations, program inputs, and final deliverables. Their procedures are compliant with the FHWA technical memo "Guidance on Quality Control and Quality Assurance in Bridge Design."
TOTAL	25.00	

MasterScoresheetReportV2 10/6/2023 Page 10 of 27

EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.50	JMT understands the overall project scope and existing bridge conditions. They want to focus on structural repairs to restore the original design capacity at least 25 years longer. The proposal goes into detail as to what JMT anticipates will need repair. They provide structural repair items needed and bridge preservation items for each repair. Expected challenges and potential mitigation strategies were also provided in the proposal. Structural repairs needed include spall repair, jacking, bearing replacement, crack injection, steel beam repair, and approach slab settlement. Some of the preservation items include cleaning and painting, epoxy coating, deck overlay, bridge jacking, and washing concrete super- and substructure. One of the primary expected challenges is traffic control and MOT. JMT will coordinate with DOT in advance to mitigate MOT concerns during repairs. Much of the MOT concern stems from bridge jacking, if decided to perform. A lead based paint and asbestos study will be performed. Hydraulic design is not anticipated to be a significant part of this project. Scour studies will not be needed. If MOT dictates major traffic shifts and staging, then hydrology will get involved. Geotechnical design services will be limited. If needed, JMT can provide this service. MOT at US 1 and SC 302 will be challenging, but the bridge over NS Railroad will not be much of a challenge. JMT wants traffic along I-26 to remain consistent during construction, but traffic under the bridges can vary depending on the repairs being made. The proposal discussed traffic conditions and expectations for each individual bridge site.
Criteria 2	7.00	The NEPA and Permitting checklists for maintenance projects will be completed for each bridge. No jurisdictional water of the US are anticipated within the vicinity of the bridge rehab locations. Migratory birds and bats may be present within the project limits and an inspection will be performed to determine if they are present. Environmental Justice and Limited English Proficiency was mentioned in detail in the proposal. A public involvement plan will be prepared and include framework for public outreach. A list of steps on how the plan will be prepared was provided that included desktop survey, identify stakeholders, site visits, coordination, schedule, and meetings. A detailed explanation on JMT's strategies to engage Limited English Proficiency populations was provided that included a project website, advertisements, and a public information meeting. Several possible meeting locations were listed.
Criteria 3	4.50	JMT provided a table in the proposal listing pertinent design manuals and how each will be implemented. The BDM, bridge memos, AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, bridge drawings and details, hydraulic design manual, load rating guidance, GDM, construction specifications, and manual of bridge evaluation were listed. The following sections of the BDM were specifically referenced and implementation described: 11.3.2, 21.1.1.9, 23.1.2, 23.2.3, 23.2.4, 23.2.5, and 23.2.6. The table provided was generic and details were limited.

Criteria 4	4.00	JMT requires a Project Management Plan for each of their projects that documents expectations for successful project delivery. JMT utilizes QA/QC procedures, but the proposal did not provide details as to what the procedures entail. JMT will use Bluebeam Revu to document review comments and status of comments.
TOTAL	22.00	

MasterScoresheetReportV2 10/6/2023 Page 12 of 27

EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Kisinger Campo & Associates

Criteria 1	8.00	KCA has four key tenets to their management approach for this project; production focus, efficient decision making, optimized schedule, and quality management. The proposal listed 15 project tasks beginning with project management and ending with emergency services. All of the project tasks were pertinent to this project. Anticipated deliverables for each project task were provided. KCA will perform project document review, site visits field scoping, and design field reviews at the beginning of the project. KCA will provide rehabilitation items for each bridge that restores and maintains the original design load capacity for at least 25 years after construction. The proposal lists rehabilitation scope items that are applicable for each bridge. Items include, but are not limited to, joint replacement, deck repair, beam repair, saddle installation, jacking, and cleaning and painting. KCA provides rehabilitation alternatives for the bearing and beam end conditions that are poor condition. Saddle bents and jacking with bearing replacements were presented. The proposal briefly discussed utility involvement. A detailed discussion on traffic control was presented that included a table of traffic impacts during construction and mitigation strategies. Hydrologic/hydraulic design and geotechnical design were not discussed. Photos of existing bridge issues were provided, which was very good to see.
Criteria 2	7.00	The NEPA and Permitting checklists for maintenance projects will be completed for each bridge. No jurisdictional water of the US are anticipated within the vicinity of the bridge rehab locations. Migratory birds and bats may be present within the project limits and an inspection will be performed to determine if they are present. Environmental Justice and Limited English Proficiency was mentioned in detail in the proposal. A public involvement plan will be prepared and include framework for public outreach. A list of steps on how the plan will be prepared was provided that included desktop survey, identify stakeholders, site visits, coordination, schedule, and meetings. A detailed explanation on KCA's strategies to engage Limited English Proficiency populations was provided that included a project website, advertisements, and a public information meeting. Several possible meeting locations were listed.
Criteria 3	5.00	KCA will utilize Section 23.2.3 of the BDM to perform field scoping operations. Section 23.2.2 of the BDM focuses on bridge condition, construction access, existing utilities, and work zone traffic control planning. KCA's recommended rehabilitation scope will improve NBI condition ratings. Section 23.2.5 of the BDM was referenced in relation to bearings. DOT Technical Note 13 was referenced for Tee Beam K-Factors to determine flexural capacity. The Standard Specifications for Highway Construction was called out for guidance on cleaning and painting steel members. Shop drawing reviews will be done in accordance with Section 24.1.2 of the BDM. The Bridge Loading Rating Guidance and Bridge Inspection Guidance Document were referenced. Numerous other applicable manuals were listed in the proposal for use on this project.

Criteria 4	5.00	KCA implements a 5 step QA/QC process on every project deliverable. They have a 3-point check to ensure consistency across plans, specifications, and estimates. KCA uses personnel from other office locations to perform QC checks. The proposal provides a generic discussion on how KCA will provide the design and plans that DOT is expecting.
TOTAL	25.00	

MasterScoresheetReportV2 10/6/2023 Page 14 of 27

EVALUATOR: 2

FIRM : Mead & Hunt, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.50	Mead & Hunt will perform field investigations, that include GPR, IR, and site reconnaissance by structural engineers. A scoping meeting with DOT staff will then take place. Mead & Hunt also recommend a workshop to discuss the best project approach. The proposal includes numerous recommendations for the bridge structures, all of which are relevant. They recommend jacking each bridge. Mead & Hunt provided several recommended improvements to each bridge individually. A section for each bridge was included in the proposal. Aesthetic upgrades were mentioned. Hydrologic analyses and design was briefly discussed in the proposal. The use of a closed drainage system will be contemplated. They mention a culvert carrying Six Mile Creek south of SC 302 that may need to be explored. Geotechnical services may not be required depending on the scope of the rehab. No evidence of poor subsurface materials were noted during their site visit. They provided 4 MOT options and briefly described the pros and cons of each option. A table including challenges and mitigation for each challenge was provided. Challenges included Construction Cost Escalations, Load Rating Changes, Support Review, Comment Closeout, Risk Management, and Delays Due to Railroad Involvement.
Criteria 2	6.00	Mead & Hunt understands that this project would require NEPA review. They would prepare a PCE to meet NEPA requirements. The proposal provides environmental constraints with an explanation of each constraint. Constraints listed were Cultural Resources, Threatened & Endangered Species, Hazardous Materials, Biological Assessment, Environmental Justice, and Public Involvement. Mead & Hunt does not anticipate needing a permit for this project. They will coordinate with FHWA for the environmental document. Coordination with USFWS will also be needed for bird and bat verification. If staged constructed, a Public Info Meeting is not recommended, but will be if any of the bridges are closed for construction.
Criteria 3	5.00	Mead & Hunt's first goal will be to utilize the latest design codes and requirements of AASHTO or DOT. They reference BDM 23.1.2, which indicates it is acceptable to use the original design requirements for work being completed. The proposal lists 4 sections from the BDM and describes how each section is applicable. Additional criteria was also included, such as bridge design memos, the GDM, AREMA, load rating documents, and work zone traffic control design.
Criteria 4	6.00	Mead & Hunt will develop a Quality Management Plan to address specific items for the project. They have their own QA/QC checklists and will also utilize the DOT Design QC checklists for structural, roadway, hydraulics, and geotechnical design. Bluebeam Studio sessions will be used to track plan changes and make comments. The proposal provides a summary of their QC checking procedures and QA verification.
TOTAL	24.50	

EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : TranSystems Corporation

Criteria 1	8.50	TranSystems will perform project document review, conduct site visits, develop a field scoping summary, and coordinate their findings with DOT prior to preliminary plan development. The same repair methods can be used on each bridge. The proposal provides common defects and proposed repairs. Repairs include crack sealing, joint replacement, recasting concrete beam ends, bearing replacement, and protective coatings. Bridge deck cracking is widespread and TranSystems will evaluate the deck deterioration before making a recommendation on appropriate repairs. Details were provided for beam end concrete repair work. The proposal also summarizes repairs unique to each bridge. Some unique repairs include steel beam straightening, bridge jacking, spalling of approach slab concrete, end slope erosion repair, cleaning and painting structural steel, and overhead sign components replacement. TranSystems recommends a feasibility study be performed for jacking the US 1 and SC 302 bridges because of extensive impacts to the surrounding public. The proposal includes a general proposed construction sequence. Challenges and mitigation strategies for each challenge were provided. TranSystems will be in accordance with RHDS. No FEMA coordination or bridge hydraulic analysis will be required. Deck drainage was not discussed. If needed, geotechnical borings will be performed in accordance with the GDM. Soil bearing pressure was briefly mentioned pertaining to bridge jacking. Most of the repair work at US 1 and SC 302 will be performed at night or on weekends with lane closures. Coordination with DOT and railroad authorities will be required to plan appropriately for the bridge repair work. Deck repair work on I-26 will be performed under lane closures in accordance with DOT restrictions. Challenges and mitigations related to MOT were presented in the proposal. Utility owners and contact information was provided for utilities that exist in the project limits.
Criteria 2	7.00	The NEPA and Permitting checklists for maintenance projects will be completed for each bridge. No jurisdictional water of the US are anticipated within the vicinity of the bridge rehab locations. Migratory birds and bats may be present within the project limits and an inspection will be performed to determine if they are present. Environmental Justice and Limited English Proficiency was mentioned in detail in the proposal. A public involvement plan will be prepared and include framework for public outreach. A list of steps on how the plan will be prepared was provided that included desktop survey, identify stakeholders, site visits, coordination, schedule, and meetings. A detailed explanation on TranSystems' strategies to engage Limited English Proficiency populations was provided that included a project website, advertisements, and a public information meeting. Several possible meeting locations were listed.

Criteria 3	6.00	TranSystems understand Chapter 23 of the BDM, specifically the Rehabilitation Strategy section. They have experience using mobile deck acoustic response to evaluate bridge deck deterioration. The proposal lists numerous manuals applicable for use on this project, criteria for each manual, and technical applicability. Manuals referenced included the BDM, design memos, the Roadway Design Manual, and N.S. Southern Public Improvement Projects Manual. A detailed technical approach application was provided for each manual reference.
Criteria 4	5.00	TranSystems develops a Quality Control Manual at the beginning of each project. QA/QC procedures are outlined in this manual and includes QC checklists, front checker, addressing comments, independent peer review, back checker, and finalize calculations and plans. All QC and final plan sets are sent to the PM and QA manager for review. Bluebeam will be used to track internal comments and corrections.
TOTAL	26.50	

EVALUATOR : 3

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

Criteria 1	6.00	Good use of tables to show anticipated repairs. Consider specific details on how you got to those assumptions for repairs. Challenges and mitigation strategies vague. Consider more detail and specific challenges for each structure and potential mitigation strategies. Good use of similar projects to show experience with anticipated repair types. Consider more discussion on traffic control measures. Ok discussion of potential detour routes. CCR coordination mentioned.
Criteria 2	5.00	Acceptable discussion of funding requirements. Consider determining what funding types are allocated to the project. Federal funds are already allocated to the project and federal NEPA requirements are expected. Expected future endangered species is discussed. Outline of anticipated environmental scope items good but would like more specific discussion of expected challenges and mitigation strategies. Good discussion of mitigating impacts to graves near project limits. Potential PIM locations identified. Consider discussing utility coordination and provide details about which utilities are in place.
Criteria 3	5.00	Acceptable discussion of BDM applications. Consider additional information specific to the project. Consider showing information from the specific areas that relate to each structure and potential decisions made due to that information.
Criteria 4	6.00	Good use of personnel to lead QC/QA reviews and having accountability documents to track reviewer and originator. Sub quality mentioned briefly. Consider discussing how you will specifically assure that sub's quality of work is acceptable.
TOTAL	22.00	

EVALUATOR: 3

FIRM : Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.

		Great use of tables to discuss specific challenges and mitigation strategies for each bridge. Good discussion of bridge preservation and structural repair items that are expected. Good explanation of methodology in
Criteria 1		determining how to rehabilitate and repair each structure. Bridge jacking for repairs and the potential to
	7.00	accomplish permanent height adjustment included in project discussion. Good discussion of potential for
		additional drainage items. Good discussion of current lane closure restrictions for each road section and
		anticipated TC strategies that may be used. No discussion of expected detour routes or techniques to mitigate
		detour delays. Consider discussing challenges associated with CCR.
		Excellent discussion of EJ and LEP areas with expected strategies to engage citizens. Good discussion of
	7.00	expected future endangered species within the project limits and discussing your team's ability to complete the
Criteria 2		surveys. Potential PIM locations are identified. Good discussion of coordination efforts with the RR and potential
		RR requirements' effects on the project. Vague utility coordination discussion with utilities in the area not identified
		or specific strategies to mitigate utility or RR delays not identified.
		Good discussion of design manuals and implementation strategies. Consider including additional information
Criteria 3	5.00	about how each manual is to be used. No discussion or information shown about MOT, utilities, nor railroad
		standards expected to be used.
		Great discussion of what the dedicated QC/QA engineer's role is in the project and his involvement with the plans
Criteria 4	6.00	development. Sub quality mentioned briefly. Good discussion of ISO certification. Consider discussing OTIC and
		what it is.
TOTAL	25.00	

EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : Kisinger Campo & Associates

Criteria 1	8.50	Great detail and excellent discussion of structural design considerations. Good identifying that CCR effort may be happening concurrently with the construction of this project. Anticipated timeline good to see. Very good technical approach explanation. Good use of photos and use of specific bridge issues. Utility matrix a plus. Consider including contact info to further show knowledge of utility coordination efforts. Would also like to see an expected conflict matrix that discusses each specific utilities' facilities in the area (overhead or underground, cable tied to power poles, etc.) Good discussion of traffic impacts and mitigation strategies. Would like to see contact info and direction from external agencies to mitigate impacts for CMRTA, CAE, and first responders. Good discussion of deck sealant to decrease traffic impacts. Good discussion of potential temporary traffic control methods and expected detour routes. Good discussion of emergency on-call staff. Good discussion of the JTC and its successes. Consider discussing more about the potential hydro and geotech effort that may be needed.
Criteria 2	7.50	Good use of key issue callout. Excellent discussion of EJ and LEP areas with expected strategies to engage citizens. Good discussion of expected future endangered species within the project limits and discussing your team's ability to complete the surveys. Potential PIM locations are identified.
Criteria 3	8.00	Good discussion of what the sufficiency rating is and how it's used through the BMO. Good use of table that discusses potential scope items and where those assumptions came from (prelim field surveys). Good use of TC3 callouts to point to specific instances of technical approach that show intricate knowledge of DOT standards. Great discussion of DOT standards and specific application to the project's scope. Consider discussing the MOT policies that will be used for the project.
Criteria 4	6.00	Acceptable discussion of QC/QA practices. Good strategy to have external personnel perform QC checks and compare the plans, specs, and estimates. Would like to see more discussion on the 5-step QC/QA process and discussion on how internal QC/QA practices will assure subs' work is of a high quality.
TOTAL	30.00	

EVALUATOR: 3

FIRM : Mead & Hunt, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	Great discussion of methods expected to be needed for each structure. Aesthetics taken into account and discussed. Federal funding and requirements mentioned. Good discussion of options for traffic control but no selection made. Consider choosing an option and discussing why it would be favorable for the project. Good callout of the TMP. Good discussion of challenges and risk mitigation strategies. Consider going into more detail about how risk will be continually mitigated throughout the project's life. Good discussion of emergency contact's availability and strategy to expedite emergency repairs. Good discussion of STIP items and each structure's obligation dates.
Criteria 2	6.00	Type of NEPA document expected is identified. Good discussion of endangered species expected to be impacted. EJ areas identified. Consider adding detail about how EJ areas will be reached for comment and identify potential meeting locations. Good discussion of potential stream credits needed. CCR coordination mentioned but not discussed.
Criteria 3	6.00	Good discussion of specific BDM sections and their implementation with the project. Other design criteria discussed briefly. Consider calling out specific requirements and their application to each structure as done in previous sections.
Criteria 4	6.50	Great discussion of QC team's roles in maintaining a high quality of work and how those members interact with each other in the QC/QA phase. Consider discussing the QC manager's specific duties.
TOTAL	25.50	

EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : TranSystems Corporation

Criteria 1		Excellent use of tables to show defects and expected repairs shared by all 3 structures and structure specific
		Items. Great use bridge design standards and relating the standards to each structure. Vertical clearance noted
		Creat example of construction acquiences and notantial isoking impacts. Cool discussion of load ratings and
	9.00	lerror with crossing RR in asset report. Lane closure restrictions mentioned and potential MOT configurations
		discussed. Utility owners and contact info given and concisely shown. All challenges for each technical criteria
		and mitigation tasks well detailed and shown clearly and concisely. Discuss coordination efforts that may be
		needed for CCR.
	7.00	Excellent discussion of EJ and LEP areas with expected strategies to engage citizens. Good discussion of
Criteria 2		expected future endangered species within the project limits and discussing your team's ability to complete the
		surveys. Potential PIM locations are identified.
Criteria 3	8.00	Great use of tables to clearly and concisely show reference material, the specific criteria, and application.
Criteria 4	7.00	Great discussion of QC/QA procedures and identifying QC/QA manager that will independently assure a high
	7.00	quality of work.
TOTAL	31.00	

EVALUATOR : 4

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

Criteria 1	8.00	Typical considerations are included. Notes they are scheduled to inspect these bridges soon under an existing contract. Notes hydro should be limited based on scope but will evaluate for spread and bridge end erosion as well as for closed drainage and scuppers. Notes evaluation of existing foundations and testing to consider corrosion and deterioration. Notes MOT will be context sensitive. Notes overlay will require extended closure of all or part of bridge. Notes likely closure of US 1 weaves and interior lane closures on SC 302. Notes analysis of potential detours. Notes challenges and mitigations.
Criteria 2	7.00	Typical considerations are included. Notes graves at one location.
Criteria 3	7.00	Notes applicable BDM sections and lists other manuals. Application of other manuals doesn't have further description.
Criteria 4	7.00	Has internal QMIS and structures QA/QC Procedures.
TOTAL	29.00	

EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.50	Typical considerations are included. Notes deck overlay may be needed. Notes hydro should be minimal for temp spread and scuppers and bridge end flume consideration. Notes geotech should be minimal as substantial retrofits aren't expected. Notes traffic analysis for MOT to determine feasibility of lane closures and/or temp detours. Notes likely closure of US 1 weaves, interior lane closures on SC 302, and directional under route closures. Notes potential to divert I-26 onto the SC 302 ramps. Notes challenges and mitigations.
Criteria 2	8.00	Typical considerations are included. Notes minority and low income EJ and LEP populations and targeted PI strategy related to those.
Criteria 3	7.00	Notes applicable BDM (and other manual) sections and bulletins and their relevance. No mention of MOT policies.
Criteria 4	8.00	Has internal QMS, PMP, and independent reviewer. Includes cross discipline reviews. Will use Bluebeam. Unclear what OTIC is.
TOTAL	30.50	

EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Kisinger Campo & Associates

Criteria 1	7.00	Typical considerations are included. Notes possible deck alternative. Hydro and Geotech are barely mentioned. Notes usage of a Joint Technical Committee. Notes AADT of all project routes. Notes expectation of traffic queues during lane closures in peak hours. Notes possible directional under route closure/detour. Notes deck overlay/replacement would require staged construction, have severe daytime traffic impacts, and at US 1 would require closure of loop ramps. Notes challenges and mitigations particularly coordination with first responders and CMRTA.
Criteria 2	8.00	Typical considerations are included. Notes minority and low income EJ and LEP populations and targeted PI strategy related to those.
Criteria 3	6.00	Notes applicable BDM sections and lists other manuals. Application of other manuals doesn't have further description. No mention of MOT policies.
Criteria 4	8.00	Has five-step QA/QC process and project-specific QA/QC plan. Includes cross discipline reviews as well as independent peer reviews within each design discipline. Will use Bluebeam.
TOTAL	29.00	

EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Mead & Hunt, Inc.

Criteria 1	8.00	Typical considerations are included. Notes deck overlay may be needed. Notes closed drainage and additional scuppers may be needed due to apparent water damage. Notes verification of final and temp spread. Notes DOT inlet spread calc method may be updated in near future. Notes geotech may not be necessary unless loading is substantially changed. Notes TMP in accordance with Rule. Notes possible I-26 directional closure/detour similar to recent I-77 project. Notes multi-stage I-26 option which may require replacement of PCMB. Notes close/detour of under routes with ramps carrying I-26. Notes under route lane closures. Notes challenges and mitigations.
Criteria 2	7.00	Typical considerations are included. Notes lead/asbestos surveys if needed. Notes stream/wetland credits if needed.
Criteria 3	8.00	Notes applicable BDM (and other manual) sections and their relevance. Mentions ED32 and WZ Design Guide.
Criteria 4	9.00	Will develop QMP. Has internal QA/QC checklists in addition to DOT's. Has QA Manager and an ongoing QA audit process. Details the QC procedure and roles. Will use Bluebeam.
TOTAL	32.00	

EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : TranSystems Corporation

Criteria 1	7.00	Typical considerations are included. Notes possible deck alternative depending on level of deterioration. Notes previous widening plans didn't permit jacking from pier caps and that additional study for jacking may be needed. Notes temp jacking towers may be needed which may require temp hydro and geotech considerations. Notes likely closure of US 1 weaves, interior lane closures on SC 302, and directional under route closures. Also notes MUTCD guidance and expected MOT on I-26. Notes challenges and mitigations.
Criteria 2	8.00	Typical considerations are included. Notes minority and low income EJ and LEP populations and targeted PI strategy related to those.
Criteria 3	8.00	Notes applicable BDM (and other manual) sections and their relevance in great detail. No mention of MOT policies.
Criteria 4	8.00	Will develop QCM. Has independent QA/QC reviewer. Will use Bluebeam.
TOTAL	31.00	

S-271-23 I-26 Bridge Rehabilitations over US-1, Southern RFQ

8/7/2023





S-271-23 I-26 Bridge Rehabilitations over US-1, Southern RFQ			CRITERIA									
PANKING	FIRM RANKINGS		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
RANKING	Ranked in Order by Firm Name	SCORE	25%	15%	15%	10%	25%	10%	0	0	0	0
1	Mead & Hunt, Inc.	74.55	15.94	11.25	10.31	7.75	20.00	9.30				
2	Kisinger Campo & Associates	74.27	17.50	10.31	10.31	7.75	20.00	8.40				
3	HDR Engineering, Inc Infrastructure Corporation of America	74.12	18.44	11.44	11.62	8.00	20.62	4.00				
4	Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.	70.55	17.50	9.94	10.69	7.50	18.12	6.80				
5	TranSystems Corporation	67.88	15.94	10.50	10.50	7.62	18.12	5.20				
6	Carolina Transportation Engineers & Associates, PC	63.27	14.06	10.12	9.38	5.50	15.31	8.90				
7	Davis & Floyd, Inc.	61.06	14.38	7.31	8.81	5.12	15.94	9.50				
8	CDM Smith, Inc.	58.70	13.44	8.62	9.19	5.25	15.00	7.20				
9	CONSOR Engineers, LLC	55.72	13.44	7.88	7.88	5.00	13.12	8.40				
EVALUATOR:		EVALUATOR:										
EVALUATOR:	EVALUATOR:											
CRITERIA QUESTIONS AND WEIGHTS



	•Provide an organizational chart showing the flow of the "chain of command" with lines identifying Key Individuals (by full legal name and firm) and any other disciplines (firm name only) the Proposer deems critical. The chart must show the functional structure of the organization down to the design discipline and construction superintendent level. Identify the critical support roles and relationships of project management, project administration, executive management, construction management, quality management, safety, environmental compliance, and subcontractor administration. The organizational chart shall be limited to one page and will not count towards the specified page limit.	
	•Provide a brief, written description of significant functional relationships and how the proposed organization will	
	function as an integrated team.	
	 Identify in tabular form if any of the firms and/or Key Individuals have worked together on the same team (not just on 	
	the same job) in the past. Describe the types of projects they worked on, the year(s) they worked together, the level	
	of participation, and a reference contact name, email address, and phone number for that project. Any references	
1	documented in this section must also be tabulated in the format listed in reference section of RFQ.	25

Project Management Team (15%)	
I ne Proposer's project management team shall include, at a minimum, a Project Manager. If the Proposer elects to include an Assistant Project Manager, the Assistant Project Manager will report directly to the Project Manager and	
will be responsible for facilitating delivery of the Project under direction of the Manager. If the Proposer elects not to	
include an Assistant Project Manager, the Project Manager shall be responsible for all duties and requirements of	
both the Project Manager and the Assistant Project Manager. If the Proposer elects not to include an Assistant	
Project Manager, any points assigned to that position will be re-allocated to the Project Manager.	
Project Manager	
The Project Manager shall be the primary person in charge of and responsible for delivery of the Project in	
accordance with the contract requirements. The Project Manager should have full authority to make final decisions on	1
behalf of the Proposer and have responsibility for communicating these decisions directly to SCDOT. After award of	
the Project, the Project Manager shall be the primary contact for communications with SCDOT. The SOQ must	
Identify the Project Manager and the employing firm and, if the Project Manager does not have full authority, clearly	
and the role and responsibility of the Project Manager relative to the member firms	
•The Project Manager must have years of experience that demonstrates growth in responsibility and expertise in the	
management of highway transportation projects:	
•The Project Manager shall provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management	
of projects with similar:	
oScope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables;	
oMagnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project;	
oComplexity – time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and risk.	
 The Project Manager shall be available at the request of the SCDOT. 	15

	Design Engineering Team (15%)	
	The Proposer's design engineering team shall have experience and expertise in all phases of roadway design and	
	bridge structure design for the Project. Key Individuals of the design team shall have the following minimum	
	qualifications:	
	Lead Design Engineer(s)	
	•The Lead Design Engineer(s) shall be in charge of and responsible for all aspects of the design of the Project,	
	subject to oversight of the Project Manager.	
	•The Lead Design Engineer(s) shall provide qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the	
	design of projects with similar:	
	oScope – project requirements, tasks, goals and deliverables;	
	oMagnitude – workload, contract size, and resources needed to successfully complete the project;	
	oComplexity - time constraints, sequencing, site accessibility, environmental concerns, engineering, uncertainty and	
	risk.	
3	•For the duration of the design phase, the Lead Design Engineer(s) will be available as needed by SCDOT.	15
	Experience of Proposer's Team (10%):	
	Provide no more than five projects for which a design services contract was executed within the last seven calendar	
	years that identify the previous work experience by the Prime Firm or any Major Design Sub-consultants. The	
	projects listed should be those the Proposer considers most relevant in demonstrating the qualifications of the team	40
4	to manage and design this Project.	10
	Quality of Post Parformance (25%)	
	Quality of Past Performance (25%) Quality of past performance of the firm/team Key Individuals on similar type projects according to, but not limited to	
	consultant performance evaluations and references	
	consultant performance evaluations and references.	
	The information required by subsections 1 and 2 will be used in the qualitative assessment of the SOO. In evaluating	
	past performance. SCDOT will evaluate the level of experience and quality of work of the Proposer's organization to	
	effectively deliver the Project.	
	The Proposers are advised that the SCDOT may use all information provided by the Proposer and information	
	obtained from other sources in the assessment of past performance. Past performance information on contracts not	
	listed by the Proposer, or that of named subcontractors, may also be evaluated. SCDOT may contact references	
	other than those identified by the Proposer and information received may be used in the evaluation of the Proposer's	
	past performance. While SCDOT may elect to consider information obtained from other sources, the burden of	
5	providing current, accurate, and complete past performance information rests with the Proposer.	25
6	Weighted Workload Criteria	10
	Total	100

MasterScoresheetReportV2 8/7/2023 Page 6 of 47

EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Carolina Transportation Engineers & Associates, PC

		The organizational chart meets expectations, but the description of significant functional relationships and how the
Criteria 1	5.00	proposed organization will function as an integrated team was average and lacked sufficient detail about how the
		development of each of the three bridges will be integrated together. A
		The project management team is above average and exceeds expectations in some regards, but additional
Criteria 2	7.00	details are needed for the qualitative or quantitative proof to fully demonstrate experience in the management of
		similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects. C
Critoria 2	5.00	The design team meets expectations, but the design experience of similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects
Chilena 5		was average and lacked sufficient detail. G
		The experience of the team meets most expectations, but the experience on interstate bridge rehabilitation
Criteria 4	4 5.00	projects was average and did not show dates in the proposal to show the listed projects were within the seven
		year window specified.
Critorio F	7.00	The quality of past performance of the firm and Project Manager was above average, but it did not show quality of
Critella 5		past performance on interstate bridge rehabilitations.
Criteria 6	8.90	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	37.90	

EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : CDM Smith, Inc.

Criteria 1	5.00	The organizational chart meets expectations, but the description of significant functional relationships and how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team was average and lacked sufficient detail about how the development of each of the three bridges will be integrated together.
Criteria 2	7.00	The project management team is above average and exceeds expectations in some regards, but additional details are needed for the qualitative or quantitative proof to fully demonstrate experience in the management of similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects.
Criteria 3	8.00	The design team is very good and exceeds expectations in most regards, including sufficient details that demonstrate experience in the design of similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects. H.
Criteria 4	5.00	The experience of the team meets most expectations, but the experience on interstate bridge rehabilitation projects was average and did not show sufficient project details.
Criteria 5	5.00	The quality and past performance was average, as it did not identify the roles of key individuals or specific details on those past projects.
Criteria 6	7.20	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	37.20	

EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : CONSOR Engineers, LLC

Criteria 1	5.00	The organizational chart, description of significant functional relationships, and description of how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team was average, and the porposal lacked sufficient details about team assignments and did not identify specific MOT responsibilities.
Criteria 2	6.00	The project management team is slightly above average, but additional details are needed for the qualitative or quantitative proof to fully demonstrate experience in the management of similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects.
Criteria 3	5.00	The design team meets expectations, but the design experience of similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects was average and lacked sufficient detail.
Criteria 4	5.00	The experience of the team meets most expectations, but the experience on interstate bridge rehabilitation projects was average and project specific deterial were limited. L
Criteria 5	5.00	The quality and past performance was average, as it did not identify the roles of key individuals or specific details on those past projects,
Criteria 6	8.40	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	34.40	

EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Davis & Floyd, Inc.

Criteria 1	5.00	The organizational chart meets expectations, but the description of significant functional relationships was average and lacked sufficient detail about how each discipline will be integrated throughout the project.
Criteria 2	6.00	The project management team is slightly above average, but additional project specific details are needed for the qualitative or quantitative proof to fully demonstrate experience in the management of similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects.
Criteria 3	6.00	The design team is slightly above average, but additional project specific details are needed to fully demonstrate design experience of similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects.
Criteria 4	5.00	The experience of the team meets most expectations, but the experience on interstate bridge rehabilitation projects was average and project specific deterial were limited.
Criteria 5	6.00	The quality of past performance of the firm and Project Manager was slightly above average, but it did not show the roles of key individuals and quality of past performance on interstate bridge rehabilitations.
Criteria 6	9.50	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	37.50	

EVALUATOR : 1

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

Criteria 1	8.00	The organizational chart, description of significant functional relationships, and description of how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team was very good and provided ample details about the team's
		functional structure and the key individuals.
Critoria 2	9.00	The project management team is excellent and meets virtually all expectations and provides the qualitative or
Chiena z		quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of similar projects. D
Critorio 2	9.00	The design team is excellent and meets virtually all expectations and provides excellent detail that demonstrates
Chiena S		experience in the design of similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects. I.
Critorio 4	9.00	The experience of the team is excellent and meets virtually all expectations and provides excellent detail that
Chiena 4		demonstrates experience with similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects. M
Critorio 5	9.00	The quality of past performance of the team is excellent and meets virtually all expectations and provides
Chiena 5		excellent detail that demonstrates experience with similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects. P
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	48.00	

EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.

Criteria 1	8.00	The organizational chart, description of significant functional relationships, and description of how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team was very good and provided ample details about the team's functional structure and the key individuals. B
Criteria 2	8.00	The project management team is very good and exceeds expectations in most regards, including the qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects. E
Criteria 3	8.00	The design team is very good and exceeds expectations in most regards, including sufficient details that demonstrate experience in the design of similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects. J
Criteria 4	8.00	The experience of the team is very good and exceeds expectations in most regards, including sufficient details that demonstrate experience with similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects. N
Criteria 5	7.00	The quality of past performance of the firm, key individuals, and sub consultants was above average, but it did not show quality of past performance on interstate bridge rehabilitations.
Criteria 6	6.80	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	45.80	

EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Kisinger Campo & Associates

Criteria 1	9.00	The organizational chart, description of significant functional relationships, and description of how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team was excellent and provided great details about the team's functional structure, how each discipline will integrate through the workflow, and the work sharing of the key individuals.
Criteria 2	9.00	The project management team is excellent and meets virtually all expectations and provides the qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of similar projects. F
Criteria 3	9.00	The design team is excellent and meets virtually all expectations and provides excellent detail that demonstrates experience in the design of similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects. K
Criteria 4	9.00	The experience of the team is excellent and meets virtually all expectations and provides excellent detail that demonstrates experience with similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects. O
Criteria 5	9.00	The quality of past performance of the team is excellent and meets virtually all expectations and provides excellent detail that demonstrates experience with similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects. Q
Criteria 6	8.40	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	53.40	

EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : Mead & Hunt, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	The organizational chart and the description of significant functional relationships was slightly above average, but there was not enough details for the description of how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team.
Criteria 2	8.00	The project management team is very good and exceeds expectations in most regards, including the qualitative or quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects.
Criteria 3	8.00	The design team is very good and exceeds expectations in most regards, including sufficient details that demonstrate experience in the design of similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects.
Criteria 4	8.00	The experience of the team is very good and exceeds expectations in most regards, including sufficient details that demonstrate experience with similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects.
Criteria 5	9.00	The quality of past performance of the team is excellent and meets virtually all expectations and provides excellent detail that demonstrates experience with similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects. R
Criteria 6	9.30	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	48.30	

EVALUATOR : 1

FIRM : TranSystems Corporation

Criteria 1	8.00	The organizational chart, description of significant functional relationships, and description of how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team was very good and provided ample details about the team's
		functional structure and the key individuals.
Critoria 2	9.00	The project management team is excellent and meets virtually all expectations and provides the qualitative or
Griteria Z		quantitative proof that demonstrates experience in the management of similar projects.
Onitenie O	9.00	The design team is excellent and meets virtually all expectations and provides excellent detail that demonstrates
Chiena S		experience in the design of similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects.
Critorio 4	9.00	The experience of the team is excellent and meets virtually all expectations and provides excellent detail that
Chiena 4		demonstrates experience with similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects.
Critorio E	9.00	The quality of past performance of the team is excellent and meets virtually all expectations and provides
Chiena 5		excellent detail that demonstrates experience with similar interstate bridge rehabilitation projects.
Criteria 6	5.20	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	49.20	

EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Carolina Transportation Engineers & Associates, PC

Criteria 1	4.00	CTEA provided an organizational chart showing key individuals and chain of command. Pertinent design disciplines and construction support personnel were provided. A brief description about key personnel was provided demonstrating past experience of similar type projects. CTEA did not provide how the proposed organization will function as an integrated team. CTEA routinely partners with subconsultants CECS, GF, R&D, ESP, and Aulick. It was not clear in the proposal which projects that the proposed team members have worked on together in the past. Several DOT projects were listed; however, a table with all the RFQ requirements for Criteria 1 was not provided.
Criteria 2	6.00	The PM has 30 years of bridge inspection, rehabilitation, and design experience. The Assistant PM has 28 years of experience as being a construction inspector, maintenance engineer, planner, and project manager. The PM was the PM for 3 cycles of the Charlotte Municipal Bridge Inspection and Rehabilitation Program. He has experience detailing and providing specifications for steel girder repairs, painting, concrete repairs, post tensioning, deck rehab, and joint replacement. The proposal did not demonstrate the Assistant PM's experience in management of past projects with similar scope, magnitude, and complexity. However, he coordinated with multiple agencies on an emergency project to reroute interstate traffic around a vehicular crash that caused bridge damage.
Criteria 3	6.00	The proposal does not designate a Lead Design Engineer. The Structures Manager has experience in the planning, inspection, design, and construction of bridge rehab projects. His experience is limited based on the proposal language. The Bridge Repairs Lead has more than 30 years of experience in bridge inspections, design, repair, and rehab. He managed field operations and design for preservation, repair, and rehab of over 900 bridges. The Bridge Inspection & Load Rating Engineer is an NBIS certified bridge inspector. He has experience with nighttime bridge inspections, emergency inspections, and free-climbing large steel truss bridges. Other team members have experience with construction engineering design, roadway design, MOT, and railroad/utility coordination.
Criteria 4	6.00	CTEA named 5 different projects in which team members performed design services. Three of the projects were project specific and included inspection, seismic retrofit, rehab of prestressed concrete girders and steel beams, deck rehab, and deck replacement. Two of the projects listed were "on-call" type projects that included bridge inspections, emergency services, and load rating.
Criteria 5	6.50	The proposal included 6 projects that CTEA took part in where they received an average overall CPE score of 7.5. Staff involvement, client quotes, and references with contact information was provided for each project. Gannett Fleming has several pending lawsuits against them according to the proposal.
Criteria 6	8.90	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
ΤΟΤΑΙ	37 40	

EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : CDM Smith, Inc.

Criteria 1	4.00	CDM Smith provided an organizational chart showing key individuals and chain of command. Pertinent design disciplines personnel were provided. A brief description regarding team structure and integration was provided. The Project Manager and Project Principal will work directly with design leads to maintain continuity between their team and DOT. The design leads will manage their respective staff in accordance with the scope of work. CDM Smith provided a table showing the firm, individual, project, years, and reference. The table shows how certain staff members have worked over the years with their client. It does not show how their proposed team has worked together in the past.
Criteria 2	4.00	The Project Manager has 26 years of experience. The Project Principal has 33 years of experience. The PM is a structural engineer and his specialties include structural design and project management. The proposal lists numerous relevant rehab projects, but does not provide any details as to what PM's experience entails. The Project Principal has experience in project management. He has minimal experience with bridge rehabilitation projects.
Criteria 3	4.00	The proposal does not designate a Lead Design Engineer. The QC Engineer for the project has 50 years of experience. He has performed bridge design and rehab over the last 30 years. Recently, he worked on a project that included widening, upgrades, or rehabilitation to over 50 bridges. The Structural Design Lead has 25 years of experience. The Structural Investigations Lead has 17 years of experience. The Traffic Design/MOT Lead has 26 years of experience. Each of these individuals had relevant project experience listed, but no details were provided. The proposal was extremely vague on each individuals relevant experience.
Criteria 4	4.00	CDM Smith included 5 projects that their team has worked on in recent years. The project name, owner, year, and relevant characteristics were provided. Relevant project features included high traffic volume, steel repairs, deck patching, joint repair, hydrodemolition, overlay, and bearing replacement. Project descriptions were extremely vague.
Criteria 5	6.50	The proposal included 5 projects that CDM Smith took part in where they received an average overall CPE score of 7.9 out of 10.0. Project names, staff involvement, reference, reference contact information, and reference quotes were provided. CDM Smith and Parrish & Partners have pending litigation according to the proposal.
Criteria 6	7.20	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	29.70	

EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : CONSOR Engineers, LLC

Criteria 1	5.00	Consor provided an organizational chart showing key individuals and chain of command. Some design disciplines were provided. The organizational chart did not include all pertinent disciplines and work tasks. A brief description about the Project Manager's experience was provided. The description was general. The proposal briefly touched on how Consor will delegate work amongst the different disciplines and coordinate project progress with their client. Consor provided a table showing the project, client, year, reference, and team member involvement. Twelve projects were provided that included at least 2 team members that worked together that are also proposed to work on this project.
Criteria 2	4.00	The PM has 41 years of experience in project management, constructability reviews, bridge widening, and bridge conceptual design. The Assistant PM has 38 years of bridge rehabilitation, design, emergency repairs, load rating, and rail improvements. While the PM has many years of project management experience, he lacks experience working on bridge rehab projects. The Assistant PM has worked on more than 20 DOT bridge replacements and has been involved with bridge repair projects. No specifics were provided as to the Assistant PM's experience on bridge rehab projects.
Criteria 3	4.50	The proposal does not designate a Lead Design Engineer. The Lead Structures Engineer has experience with bridge inspection and repair design. Some of his work experience includes spall repair, crutch bents, beam end repairs, concrete and steel beam strengthening, and joint replacement. The Senior Structures Engineer has experience with using Carbon Fiber Reinforced Polyer wrap on cored slab beams as well as concrete repairs. The Lead Roadway Engineer has 21 years of experience in road design and MOT. He has been the lead MOT engineer on past projects.
Criteria 4	5.00	Consor highlighted 4 individual projects that their team has worked on in recent years. Each project description provided a general summary of what was required of Consor. One project was an emergency project consisting of designing crutch bents for bridge piers that had been undermined. The other projects included repair to cored slab units, pier columns, and structural steel girders. They also noted a project where their team was responsible for emergency bridge repair and assessment on over 350 bridges.
Criteria 5	6.00	The proposal included 8 projects that Consor took part in where they received an average overall CPE score of 8.8. Client quotes and references with contact information was provided. Consor struggled to meet schedule milestones on the US 17 Waccamaw River Project and also had an abundant amount of comments on their plans.
Criteria 6	8.40	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	32.90	

EVALUATOR: 2

FIRM : Davis & Floyd, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	Davis & Floyd provided an organizational chart showing key individuals and chain of command. Pertinent design disciplines and construction support personnel were provided. A brief description regarding team structure and integration was provided. Davis & Floyd's team will have constant communication and share the goal of providing services to complete the project. Their proposal listed 3 key strategies for the team to function properly; cross-functional collaboration, effective and consistent communication, clear goals and objectives. Davis & Floyd included a table in the proposal that named the firm, number of years teamed with that firm, relevant projects, references, and level of participation. Five firms and five projects were provided. Firms listed in the table were SCI, NSA, OAK, Terracon, and DEW. Years of working with a firm ranged from 1 to 17 years.
Criteria 2	4.00	The PM has over 30 years of engineering experience. He has experience with project management, interstate projects, agency coordination, R/W access, bridges, and MOT. He lacks experience with bridge rehabilitation and repair projects.
Criteria 3	6.00	The Design Manager has over 16 years of DOT bridge design experience. His experience includes bridge replacements, new bridge construction, and design-build projects. He has project management, concrete design, prestress concrete design, steel design, load rating, and cost analysis experience. The Bridge Rehabilitation Lead has 21 years of experience. He has managed 17 bridge rehab projects and was the lead bridge engineer on 9 additional bridge rehab projects, for a total of 82 bridges. The Traffic and MOT Lead has 30 years of experience. He has managed and performed QA reviews on projects that included close to 100 bridge rehabs and replacements. The QA/QC Lead for Bridge Plans includes a generic overview of this experience in the proposal. The Bridge Load Rating Engineer has load rated over 550 bridges.
Criteria 4	4.00	Davis & Floyd included 4 individual projects that their team has worked on in recent years. Detailed project descriptions, the team members involved, and client contacts were provided for each project. Projects included bridge rehabs, bridge replacements, and emergency bridge repairs. Most of the projects listed are for Dewberry's work experience and not for Davis & Floyd's. Multiple bridges were included on 3 of the 4 projects discussed. They also discussed being a part of DOT load rating for 567 concrete slab bridges. Not many details were provided as to which type of repairs were performed on the projects.
Criteria 5	6.50	The proposal included 5 projects that Davis & Floyd took part in where they received an average overall CPE score of 7.3. Client quotes and references were provided for each project. Contact information for references was not provided.
Criteria 6	9.50	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	36.00	

MasterScoresheetReportV2 8/7/2023 Page 19 of 47

EVALUATOR : 2

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

Criteria 1	6.00	HDR provided an organizational chart showing key individuals and chain of command. Pertinent design disciplines and construction support personnel were provided. HDR has specific personnel dedicated to each of the 3 bridges on the project. A brief description on how the Project Manager will coordinate design disciplines with their client from project inception to construction was provided. The team structure and lines of communication provided on the same page as the organizational chart was generic. HDR included a table in the proposal that named the firm, time period teamed with that firm, relevant projects, references, and staff involvement. Numerous firms and seven projects were provided.
Criteria 2	7.00	The PM has 17 years of bridge design and management experience. The proposal highlights the PM's professional growth by breaking down his staff title and the years he worked at each level. From June 2006 to December 2012 he was a Structural Supervisor and he is currently a Senior Structures Project Manager that began in September 2022. The PM has experience designing and managing bridge replacement and bridge rehabilitation projects of all sizes. He has structural design experience with concrete and steel structures for bridges on rural, urban, and interstate routes. He currently leads 14 staff members at 4 offices that deliver designs for bridge replacements, rehabs, and load ratings. He is currently the PM for 3 DOT projects and is the Contract Manager for the DOT Bridge On-Call Contract.
Criteria 3	7.00	The Lead Design Engineer has 12 years of industry experience. He is a certified bridge inspector as well as certified fracture critical inspector. The proposal shows the Lead Design Engineer's professional growth showing that he began as a Structural EIT, went on to be an Assistant PM, and is now the Bridge Inspection PM. He has experience on dozens of bridge designs, rehabs, inspections, and load ratings. The Technical Advisor has 28 years of experience including bridge rehabilitations, accelerated bridge construction, and bridge engineering. The Traffic Control Design & Plans Lead has 24 years of experience ranging from 6 to 15 years. Their experience includes construction phasing and bridge repairs such as saddles, crutch bents, superstructure strengthening, and deck repairs. They also have experience load rating with over 2,500 bridges load rated.

Criteria 4	7.00	HDR highlighted 2 individual projects that their team has worked on in recent years. Each project description provided a general summary of what was required of HDR. One project was an interstate rehabilitation project consisting of jacking 8 bridges, concrete patching, deck repairs, hydro-demolition, and CRFP beam repair. The other project was an emergency repair project consisting of repairing two ruptured external tendons part of a precast concrete segmental bridge. HDR also listed 3 "purchase order" type contracts that consisted of multiple bridges in each contract. They designed repairs including deck repair, LMC overlay, beam repair, joint replacement, saddles, and crutch bents. They also have experience preparing plans, specifications, and cost estimates. Each project included a client contact.
Criteria 5	7.50	The proposal included 10 projects that HDR's team took part in where they received an average overall CPE score of 8.8. Staff involvement and references with contact information were not provided for each project. However, client quotes were provided for several projects. HDR, CECS, S&ME, & WSP have pending litigation according to the proposal.
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	38.50	

EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.

Criteria 1	5.00	JMT provided an organizational chart showing key individuals and chain of command. Pertinent design disciplines and construction support personnel were provided. A brief description about the experience that the Project Manager, Deputy Project Manager, and Design Lead were provided. The proposal briefly touched on how Consor will delegate work amongst the different disciplines and coordinate project progress with their client. JMT provided a table showing the project, client, year, reference, and team member involvement. Twenty-one projects were provided that included 2 team members that worked together that are also proposed to work on this project.
Criteria 2	5.00	The PM has 25 years of experience in project management, bridge preservation and rehabilitation, inspection, load rating, structural analysis, and bridge replacement design. The Deputy PM has 31 years of structural design experience. The PM has experience with interstate multi-level interchange bridges, railroad and highway crossings, and stream crossings. His experience also includes retrofit analysis and design, bearing and joint replacements, spall repair, beam repair, and pile jackets. He provided lead bridge inspection, design, and plan QC review for the Fripp Inlet Bridge Inspection program. The Deputy PM spent the past 16 years as a bridge project manager and has worked on multiple bridge rehabilitation projects. He has experience determining candidates for rehab work, performing cost analysis, and coordinating between engineering firms and clients.
Criteria 3	6.00	The Design Lead has 17 years of structural engineering and project management experience. His experience includes preliminary and final structure design, inspection, and analysis of various structure types. He has worked on new and replacement structures as well as various preservation projects. The Traffic Engineering Lead has 34 years of experience, primarily in Traffic Engineering. He has experience performing safety/traffic engineering studies on various sized projects. The Railroad Coordination & Railroad Bridge Design Engineer has 15 years of experience in the design and rehabilitation of fixed and movable highway and railroad bridges. The proposal listed relevant projects that each of the key staff members have worked on recently. Several other individuals were named as major support staff for quality control, bridge engineering, and traffic control plans. The proposal briefly touched on their experience. The "Experience of Key Individuals" section of the proposal was generic and did not provide detail as to what most of the staff members have experience with.

Criteria 4	5.00	JMT included 4 individual projects that their team has worked on in recent years. Detailed project descriptions, the team members involved, and client contacts were provided for each project. Projects included deck joint replacement, approach slab reconstruction, MOT, inspection, steel girder strengthening, deck repairs, and concrete repairs. They also discussed being a part of the On Call Structural Inspection and Engineering Support Contract for the Fripp Island Public Service District. This contract has allowed JMT to gain experience with underwater inspection and retrofit design for bents, spall repairs, and pile jackets.
Criteria 5	6.50	The proposal included 12 projects that JMT or their subconsultants took part in where they received an average overall CPE score of 8.2. Client quotes and references were provided for each project. Contact information for references was not provided. JMT has pending litigation according to the proposal.
Criteria 6	6.80	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	34.30	

EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : Kisinger Campo & Associates

Criteria 1	6.00	KCA provided an organizational chart showing key individuals and chain of command. Pertinent design disciplines and construction support personnel were provided. A brief description regarding team structure and integration was provided. KCA will closely coordinate with the Bridge Maintenance Office as the contract progresses. They will also coordinate and partner with other offices that have a stake in the project. KCA benefits from having engineers that received training as bridge inspectors and maintenance personnel prior to becoming licensed. KCA provided a table indicating which key individuals have worked together in the past and for how many years. Years of working together ranged from 2 to 14 years. They did not include experience with subconsultants.
Criteria 2	5.00	The PM has 18 years of experience in structures design, repair, and bridge inspection. The Assistant PM has 12 years of experience in structural inspection, rehabilitation, and design. The PM has managed several multidisciplinary projects recently and has experience with bridge preservation, including cathodic protection on transportation projects. The Assistant PM has performed engineering studies and designed repairs for old bridge structures. Repair plans have included structures with concrete restoration, fiber-reinforced polymer, cathodic protection, and emergency procedures. The proposal did not provide many details as to what exactly the PM and Assistant PM have experience with.
Criteria 3	4.50	The Lead Design Engineer has 12 years of relevant experience. He has performed NBIS inspections and load rating analysis for several DOTs. He has experience with delivering designs for bridge repair projects, although specifics were not provided in the proposal. The Load Ratings Engineer has 8 years of experience in design of bridges, retaining walls, hospitals, stadiums, and buildings. His background involves design and analysis of structures subjected to seismic and wind loads. The QA/QC Engineer has 18 years of structural design and analysis experience and will provide QA/QC for the project. He has designed bridges consisting of flat slabs, prestressed beams, and steel structures. He has developed repair plans including cathodic protection, scour remediation, concrete restoration, overlays, and beam replacement.
Criteria 4	6.00	KCA highlighted 4 projects that they are currently working on or have worked on recently. Each project consists of multiple bridges. Scope items on some of these projects include bearing replacements, crutch bents, deck overlays, concrete repairs, joint replacements, pile repairs, beam repairs, slope repairs, bridge jacking, and superstructure strengthening. Some of the work has included emergency repairs. KCA has experience working on interstate bridges. Each project included key project team members and references.

Criteria 5	7.00	The proposal included 4 projects that KCA took part in where they received an average overall CPE score of 4.6 out of 5.0. The client, project name, number of bridges within the project, and a comment were provided. Staff involvement, client quotes, and references with contact information were not provided. KCA and CES have pending litigation according to the proposal.
Criteria 6	8.40	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	36.90	

MasterScoresheetReportV2 8/7/2023 Page 25 of 47

EVALUATOR: 2

FIRM : Mead & Hunt, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	Mead & Hunt provided an organizational chart showing key individuals and chain of command. Pertinent design disciplines personnel were provided. Mead & Hunt has specific personnel dedicated to each of the 3 bridges on the project. A detailed description regarding team structure and integration was provided. Tony Steffee will closely coordinate with his 3 Assistant Project Managers as the contract progresses. They will also coordinate and partner with other offices that have a stake in the project. Mead & Hunt will benefit by having 1 dedicated Assistant Project Manager for each bridge. This will allow for the designs to be individually championed, but performed concurrently. Mead & Hunt provided a table indicating the firm, year partnership began, firm's project role, and relationship with the firm. Years of working together ranged from 1 to 17 years. Individual projects that team members have joined Mead & Hunt on were also provided. References were provided for each project listed.
Criteria 2	6.00	The Project Manager has 20 years of relevant experience. The three Assistant Project Manager and Bridge Leads have 11, 16, and 26 years of experience. The PM has experience as being the project manager or bridge design lead on bridge rehabilitation, design-build, and bridge replacement projects. He played a major role in 3 recent projects. He was the project manager for a bridge rehab project that had an accelerated schedule where he coordinated with multiple stakeholders. He served as the Bridge Design Lead over his company's bridge design group for a major design-build project. He was the Project Manager and Lead Bridge Engineer for a project that included 3 bridge replacements on a US route. The proposal highlighted 2 projects for each Assistant PM. Project experience included MOT, rehabilitation design, load rating, management, and steel beam repair.
Criteria 3	4.00	The proposal does not designate a Lead Design Engineer. One individual has 34 years of experience and will perform QA/QC for the project. He has experience with QC check for load rating, scupper, bearing design, and bridge plans. Another individual has 13 years of experience and will provide traffic control oversight. He has experience with MOT and hydraulic design on bridge replacements. Both individuals lack experience with bridge rehabilitation projects.
Criteria 4	6.00	Mead & Hunt included 4 individual projects that their team has worked on in recent years. Detailed project descriptions, services provided, and the team members involved were provided for each project. Projects included hydrodemolition, overlay, jacking, bearing replacement, joint replacement, concrete patching, structural steel repairs, and cathodic protection. Relevant experience on rehabilitation projects is minimal.
Criteria 5	7.00	The proposal included 4 projects that Mead & Hunt took part in where they received an average overall CPE score of 8.1 out of 10.0. The project name, personnel involved, a reference, and a comment were provided. Contact information for the references were not provided.
Criteria 6	9.30	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)



TOTAL 38.30

MasterScoresheetReportV2 8/7/2023 Page 27 of 47

EVALUATOR : 2

FIRM : TranSystems Corporation

Criteria 1	5.00	TranSystems provided an organizational chart showing key individuals and chain of command. Pertinent design disciplines and construction support personnel were provided. A brief description regarding team structure and integration was provided. The Project Manager and Assistant Project Manager will work directly with design leads to maintain continuity between their team and DOT. TranSystems will ensure that all submittals will be reviewed by a third party and all QA/QC checklists have been completed prior to submission. TranSystems provided a table showing the project, year, reference, and team member involvement. Eight projects were provided that included at least 2 team members that worked together that are also proposed to work on this project.
Criteria 2	6.00	The Project Manager has 26 years of experience that includes management of bridge projects. The Assistant PM specializes in bridge design, load ratings, and bridge inspections. Years of experience were not provided for the Assistant PM. The PM has experience as a structural engineer for complex fixed and movable bridge rehabilitations, bridge replacements, and isolated bridge repairs. He has experience performing emergency damage assessments, field visits, goal setting, scoping, pricing, invoicing, and conducting meetings. He is considered a subject matter expert on the Ravenel Bridge. The Assistant PM is the load rating engineer for over 250 bridges and engineer of record for 4 bridge projects associated with railroad crossing. He is familiar with DOT practices and procedures. He has performed inspection and rehabilitation design on structural steel and reinforce concrete bridges.
Criteria 3	5.00	The proposal does not designate a Lead Design Engineer. The Lead Bridge Designer has 15 years of experience in design and rehabilitation of fixed and movable highway and railroad bridges. He has designed a varied of repairs including steel beam retrofit and strengthening, concrete repair and strengthening, bearing replacement, and steel truss repairs. The Bridge Designer has 25 years of experience managing multi-disciplinary teams on bridge projects. He has experience with interstate multi-level interchange bridges, railroad and highway crossings, and stream crossings. His experience also includes retrofit analysis and design, bearing and joint replacements, spall repair, beam repair, and pile jackets. The Traffic Control Lead has 26 years of roadway design and MOT experience. The QA/QC Engineer for the project has extensive experience in the inspection, evaluation, rehabilitation, and design of bridges.
Criteria 4	6.00	TranSystems included 5 projects that their team has worked on in recent years. Brief project descriptions and the team members involved were provided for each project. Projects included bridge inspection, deck replacement, overlay, pier cap replacement, MOT, truss replacement, load rating.

Criteria 5	6.50	The proposal included 12 projects that TranSystems took part in where they received an average overall CPE score of 7.5 out of 10.0. Project names, reference, and reference quotes were provided. Contact information for the references was not included. JMT has pending litigation according to the proposal.
Criteria 6	5.20	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	33.70	

MasterScoresheetReportV2 8/7/2023 Page 29 of 47

EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : Carolina Transportation Engineers & Associates, PC

Criteria 1	6.50	Great use of an on call APM with prior experience with emergency response that required detour and expedited schedules. Good use of Safety and Field Manager to compartmentalize and delegate PM tasks. Good callout of POCs. Good use of chart to show key personnel working experience. Team is currently working together on multiple projects but not discussion of past projects or team's experience in working together in the past. CECS and ESP have new working relations with CTEA and no experience working with each other but have heavy workload among subs. Provide concise discussion of team integration and how that team will function.
Criteria 2	7.00	PM has applicable recent experience with management and structural inspection and design of multi-lane primary and interstate structures on projects of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity. Excellent use of APM with prior experience with emergency response that required detour and expedited schedules that will serve as a dedicated emergency on call POC. APM and Field Manager's interstate MOT experience relevant and applicable with projects that are similar in similar scope, magnitude, and complexity.
Criteria 3	6.00	Design team staff has significant experience applicable to current RFQ scope. MOT engineer has great portfolio of applicable project experience with projects that are similar in scope, magnitude, and complexity. Information was difficult to find and would like to see called out in proposal area.
Criteria 4	5.00	Project Team has good experience with managing, inspecting, and designing structures of a similar scope and magnitude but not all experience is shown in the applicable projects section. MOT engineer has applicable experience with coordinating interstate and multilane primary MOT. Field Manager has no experience shown in the key projects section but does have experience with coordinating projects of similar scope and size. Experience was hard to find and not called out under proposal section.
Criteria 5	5.00	Above average past scores for CPE. Past performance shown in proposal not indicative of similar projects.
Criteria 6	8.90	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	38.40	

EVALUATOR: 3

FIRM : CDM Smith, Inc.

Criteria 1	5.00	Monthly updates for DOT staff and bi-weekly internal updates are a plus. Personnel responsible for decisions not
		clearly defined. Working experience of project team hard to follow in table. Previous working relationships not
		clearly defined but project team has and is currently working together on projects. No learning curve for project
		called out and is an asset for the project's scope.
		PM has a large amount of structural design and PM experience with projects of similar scope, magnitude, and
Critoria 2	6.00	complexity. The PM has extensive experience with interstate bridge rehabs and complex MOT. PM's availability is
Cillena z	0.00	a concern. No APM is shown and as the main POC, the PM will need additional availability during the project's
		initialization.
	6.00	Project Team has large amount of relevant experience. There are concerns with MOT and Structural Design
		Leads' availabilities during project kickoff and year after. MOT is expected to be a key challenge for the project
Criteria 3		and structural design will be the focus of the project scope. Additional availability is needed for both roles.
		especially since there will not be any other key personnel to assist task duties
		Good use of relevant projects to show firm's applicable experience but personnel's roles in projects not clearly
Criteria 4	5.00	and cancically about the show in this applicable experience but personnels toles in projects not clearly
Criteria 5	4.50	Slightly above average CPE scores with a few scores of ~5 or below. Good references from similar projects and
		good use of table to show relevant experience.
Criteria 6	7.20	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	33,70	

EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : CONSOR Engineers, LLC

Criteria 1	5.00	Small team shown and not all design task from RFQ shown. Discussion of team integration and weekly internal meetings acceptable and helpful to expedite project delivery but produces potential challenges with availability. Good discussion of projects that provide relevant experience. No discussion of who has decision authority or what the process is expected to be to authorize changes. No MOT lead shown. Consider acknowledging who will do MOT/traffic. Integration matrix was clear and concise. No QC/QA staff shown.
Criteria 2	3.50	PM has acceptable experience shown but some concerns with PM's and APM's project experience shown. No discussion on project scopes and what roles the PM has previously held.
Criteria 3	4.50	Design Team has a decent amount of relevant experience. Good discussion of Structures Lead's experience specifically with bridge rehabs. No details on lead's roles in projects shown. There are concerns with no MOT lead specifically called out nor discussed. MOT will be a large part of the project scope.
Criteria 4	3.00	Good use of relevant projects to show firm's applicable experience but personnel's roles in projects not clearly and concisely shown. No discussion of teams involved nor roles held in projects shown.
Criteria 5	4.00	Great past CPE scores but not a large sample size. No discussion of which team members held what roles on those projects. Potential concerns with current performance on active projects.
Criteria 6	8.40	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	28.40	

EVALUATOR: 3

FIRM : Davis & Floyd, Inc.

Criteria 1	4.00	No APM shown and PM will be sole POC. Field scoping team identified. Great use of ERT and emergency repairs leads. MOT lead identified. Good relationship with subs doing ~20% of the work. DF is shown to have minimal effort for prime and will manage multiple subs with MOT and bridge rehabilitation tasks not handled in house and is subbed to a firm with a new working relationship with the prime. This creates concerns with the prime's ability to control the project schedule even though a DM will be the manager for design related tasks. Good discussion of who has authority to make project decisions and discussion of team strategy to deliver the project. Traffic and MOT leads being split causes concerns.
Criteria 2	3.50	PM has good experience. Has not completed project as APM nor project on interstate, which causes concern. PM has no prior experience shown for bridge replacement projects.
Criteria 3	5.00	Design team experience not clearly and concisely shown. Consider highlighting specific project and specific MOT/Traffic Engineer has experience with designing for interstate projects.
Criteria 4	3.50	Little experience shown for DF team leads in similar capacities. Highlights are mainly for Dewberry staff and are of similar projects. Consider discussing DF experience more in depth and highlighting key staff's experience.
Criteria 5	5.50	Above average past scores for CPE. Consider including key staff's roles in the projects.
Criteria 6	9.50	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	31.00	

EVALUATOR: 3

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

Criteria 1	7.00	Good use of multiple design teams to expedite project delivery. Table provides good information on staff involved with similar projects. Consider including who did what for each staff member's involvement. Good discussion of subs' and prime's past working relations and shows what tasks subs worked on. Authority for decisions discussed but consider including that info on org chart or under discussion for Criteria 1 instead of under PM's profile.
Criteria 2	7.00	No APM shown but PM has good availability. PM has good experience with similar projects and experience progress shown. PM has applicable experience with being the PM and EOR for interstate bridge rehabs and RR bridge experience.
Criteria 3	7.00	Good discussion of Lead Design Engineer's experience with emergency repair or interstate bridge. Team has good experience and MOT lead shown. MOT will be a challenge and having a MOT lead with interstate bridge experience is a plus. Good concise discussion on team members' experiences. Lead Design Engineer's progressive experience shown clearly and concisely.
Criteria 4	7.00	Team's experience is relevant. Consider calling out each team members' contributions to past projects and how their performance affected project outcomes.
Criteria 5	7.50	Great CPE scores and past performance. Quality program discussion good to show how prime plans to replicate past results.
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	39.50	

EVALUATOR: 3

FIRM : Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.50	Use of DPM shown. Good use of direct reports and communication lines to show difference authority and responsibility interactions. Good, concise representation of Project Team's collaboration. Past working relationships shown and JMT has an established relationship with TRN, although not all projects shown are relevant to the RFQ's scope. Other subs have good working relations with JMT but not with each other. This creates concern for project cohesiveness. Consider discussing techniques used to keep design tasks on schedule and informed.
Criteria 2	6.00	PM has relevant experience with an interstate bridge projects and working with sensitive bridge rehabilitation projects with unique characteristics. DPM has no experience with interstate projects but does have applicable experience as a PM for bridge projects. This experience can translate over to the current RFQ's needs.
Criteria 3	7.00	Design team has a lot of relevant experience with projects of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity. Traffic engineer has good experience with a similar interstate bridge project.
Criteria 4	7.00	Great use of projects to discuss the design teams and roles held by each member of the proposal team. Projects were given that show design staff's relevant experience.
Criteria 5	7.50	Above average past CPE scores. Subs also have good CPEs and are called out in proposal.
Criteria 6	6.80	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	40.80	

EVALUATOR: 3

FIRM : Kisinger Campo & Associates

Criteria 1	6.50	Great discussion of internal training protocols that will streamline project development. Good use of a table to show key individuals working relationships and length of time but not specific about what teams worked together
		and for how long. Good use of internal staff to complete brunt of project development. No discussion of support
		Stall's fole ill project. Designt mene rement to and includes DM and ADM. DM has sum existence with interatety and simple second bridge
		Project management team includes PM and APM. PM has experience with interstate and single access bridge
Criteria 2	6.00	rehabilitation and repair projects. APM has applicable interstate structure rehab experience. Generic discussion of
		PM and APMs experience and no discussion of how it relates to the RFQ's scope.
	6.50	Lead engineer has good experience with projects of similar size, complexity, and magnitude. All design key
Criteria 3		personnel have experience with interstate bridge design and rehab. Consider discussing design team's specific
		experience and how it relates to the scope ot the RFQ.
	7.00	Prime has experience with similar bridge rehab projects and has met expedited schedules for key structures.
Criteria 4		Projects shown have most of staff with experience on those projects. Most projects are revolving selections and
		show that firm has been reselected to perform projects multiple times.
Critorio 5	7.00	Great representation of staff that had direct experience with all projects and scores shown. Great scores with
Criteria 5	7.00	similar projects. Discuss specific project attributes that are similar the the RFQ's scope.
Criteria 6	8.40	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	41.40	

EVALUATOR : 3

FIRM : Mead & Hunt, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	Good use of multiple APM strategy for independently developing each project. Good use of internal staff to complete brunt of bridge design and traffic control. Consider discussing how cohesion between APMs is going to be maintained so that project's don't become segregated. No construction phase services noted in org chart.
Criteria 2	8.00	Great use of experience in showing the PM group's roles, challenges, and successes in past projects that are
Critoria 2	8.00	Great use of experience in showing the design group's roles, challenges, and successes in past projects that are
Criteria 3		similar to the RFQ. Great layout and concise discussion.
Criteria 4	8.00	Great use of projects that are of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity to display team's experience.
Criteria 5	7.50	Great representation of staff that had direct experience with all projects and scores shown. Great scores with
		similar projects.
Criteria 6	9.30	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	46.80	

EVALUATOR: 3

FIRM : TranSystems Corporation

Criteria 1	5.00	Team integration chart doesn't have a lot of overlap with subs. Concerns with splitting bridge design and traffic control design across 3 different firms.
Criteria 2	6.00	Good discussion of qualitative experience. Consider showing quantitative aspects of PM's and APM's experience that are applicable to the RFQ.
Criteria 3	6.00	Lead MOT has interchange experience on two major projects that are similar to RFQ scope. Design team's experience is good and is with similar projects.
Criteria 4	6.50	Good showing experience, roles, and relevancy for team members.
Criteria 5	6.00	Good CPE scores and past experience shown clearly and concisely. Good use of past roles and relevancy.
Criteria 6	5.20	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	34.70	
EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Carolina Transportation Engineers & Associates, PC

Criteria 1	7.00	Chart identifies almost all desired/necessary roles.
		Past working relationship isn't shown with all subs .
		Additional integration efforts are preferable.
		Working relationships table is incomplete.
Criteria 2	7.00	Team lacks experience managing interstate/interchange projects particularly with this much coordination.
		Availability is above average.
		Team lacks single design lead which would have benefited the PM team.
Criteria 3	8.00	Team lacks interchange experience.
		Availability is above average.
Criteria 4	6.00	Experience is shown across most desirable project types, but most of the project team are not shown working
		together on these. Experience isn't shown well.
Criteria 5	6.00	Ratings/references indicate generally good quality. No scores provided for interstate projects.
Criteria 6	8.90	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	42.90	

EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : CDM Smith, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.50	Chart identifies almost all desired/necessary roles.
		Working relationships table is incomplete. Particularly unclear if the two primary consultants previously worked
		together.
		Integration is excellent.
Critoria 2	6.00	Team lacks managing experience and generally lacks experience with interchange projects particularly with this
Chilena Z		much coordination. Availability is only slightly above average.
	6.50	Team lacks single design lead which would have benefited the team due to inexperience/unavailability of key
Critoria 3		staff.
Cillena 5		Team lacks interchange experience.
		Availability is only slightly above average.
Criteria 4	7.00	Experience is shown across most desirable project types, but it isn't shown well.
Criteria 5	8.00	Ratings/references indicate very good quality.
Criteria 6	7.20	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	42.20	

EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : CONSOR Engineers, LLC

		Chart doesn't identify numerous desired/necessary roles and it's unclear how staff will be allocated to accomplish
Criteria 1	6.50	each task.
		Integration between PM and design leads is excellent.
Criteria 2	7.50	Team has some experience in these roles and on projects of similar magnitude.
		Availability is only slightly above average.
Criteria 3	7.00	Team lacks single design lead which would have benefited the overall team due to less availability from the key
		staff.
		Team lacks interchange experience.
		Availability is only slightly above average.
Criteria 4	7.00	Experience is shown across most desirable project types, but it isn't shown well.
Criteria 5	6.00	Ratings/references indicate very good quality however recent experiences haven't met this level of quality.
Criteria 6	8.40	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	42.40	

EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Davis & Floyd, Inc.

		Chart identifies almost all desired/necessary roles.
Criteria 1	8.00	The two primary consultants and their keys have limited experience together.
		Integration is great.
Criteria 2	6.00	Team lacks experience managing interstate/interchange projects particularly with this much coordination. Doesn't
		appear to have bridge rehab experience. Availability is above average.
Criteria 3	6.50	Design Manager has limited experience in role, on interstates, and on bridge rehabs.
		Availability of team is above average.
Criteria 4	8.00	Experience is shown across all desirable project types but isn't shown well for the lead consultant.
Criteria 5	7.50	Ratings/references indicate mostly good quality.
Criteria 6	9.50	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	45.50	

EVALUATOR : 4

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

Criteria 1	8.50	Chart identifies almost all desired/necessary roles.
		Coordination amongst consultant-identified critical roles like discipline leads is lacking/absent.
Criteria 2	7.50	Team lacks experience managing interstate/interchange projects.
		Limited experience in similar role.
		Availability is very good.
Criteria 3	8.00	Design lead has limited experience in similar role on similar scale project.
		Availability is slightly above average.
Criteria 4	9.00	Experience is shown across most desirable project types.
Criteria 5	9.00	Ratings/references indicate excellent quality.
Criteria 6	4.00	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	46.00	

EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson, Inc.

		Chart identifies almost all desired/necessary roles.
Criteria 1	8.50	Past working relationship isn't shown with all subs .
		Additional integration efforts are preferable.
		Team has limited experience managing projects with this much coordination.
Criteria 2	7.50	Team has limited experience working together.
		Availability is very good.
		Design Manager has limited experience in role.
Criteria 3	7.50	Key staff have limited experience as leads on interstate bridges.
		Availability of team is very good.
Criteria 4	10.00	Experience is shown across all desirable project types.
Criteria 5	8.00	Ratings/references indicate very good quality.
Criteria 6	6.80	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	48.30	

EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Kisinger Campo & Associates

Criteria 1	6.50	Chart identifies almost all desired/necessary roles.
		Team is thin on MOT/Roadway staff.
		Several key staff are serving dual roles.
		Working relationships table is incomplete and unclear.
		Integration is poorly addressed.
Oritaria O	7.50	Team lacks experience managing interchange projects.
Chiena Z		Availability is above average.
Critoria 2	7.50	Leads have limited experience in same role and on interchange projects.
Criteria 3		Availability of team is above average.
Criteria 4	9.00	Experience is shown across most desirable project types.
Criteria 5	9.00	Ratings/references indicate excellent quality.
Criteria 6	8.40	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	47.90	

EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : Mead & Hunt, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.50	Chart identifies almost all desired/necessary roles.
		Key staff are serving dual roles.
		Integration is addressed well especially considering how the team is structured.
		Past working relationship isn't shown in table with all subs.
Criteria 2	8.00	Team lacks experience managing interchange projects.
		Availability is very good.
		Leads/APMs have limited experience in similar roles.
Criteria 3	7.50	Team lacks single design lead/APM.
		Availability of team is very good.
Criteria 4	9.00	Experience is shown across most desirable project types.
Criteria 5	8.50	Ratings/references indicate great quality.
Criteria 6	9.30	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	49.80	

EVALUATOR : 4

FIRM : TranSystems Corporation

Criteria 1	7.50	Chart identifies almost all desired/necessary roles.
		Working relationships table is complete with all firms having some overlap.
		Integration/coordination isn't shown down to design staff. Meeting regularity isn't mentioned.
		MOT is split across 3 firms without design lead oversight.
		Some key staff relatively new to their firms.
		The two primary consultants have limited experience together.
	7.00	Team lacks experience managing interstate/interchange projects particularly with this much coordination.
Chiena Z		Availability is above average.
Criteria 3	8.00	Would benefit having single design lead due to PM inexperience, however the MOT lead has recent major
		interchange experience.
		Availability is very good.
Criteria 4	9.00	Experience is shown across most desirable project types.
Criteria 5	7.50	Ratings/references indicate mostly good quality.
Criteria 6	5.20	*** As of 5.30.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	44.20	