

#### MEMORANDUM

TO: J. Darrin Player, Chief Procurement Officer
FROM: Nicholas C. Pizzuti, Chief, Professional Services Contracting Office
RE: S-277-24 - S-277 Bridge Replacement over Twelve Mile Creek
DATE: November 7, 2023

The South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) Professional Services Contracting Office (PSCO) received nine (9) responses to the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the above referenced project.

The Evaluation Committee met on November 7, 2023 to review and score the proposals. As a result, the PSCO recommends that **Carolina Transportation Engineers & Associates, PC** advance to contract negotiations.

If you approve the advancement of the recommended firm to the contract negotiation process, please indicate by signing below.

The final ranking of the three (3) firms deemed most highly qualified for this selection were:

- 1. Carolina Transportation Engineers & Associates, PC
- 2. A. Morton Thomas and Associates, Inc.
- 3. Parrish & Partners, LLC

Upon Acting Deputy Secretary for Finance and Administration concurrence, the Professional Services Contracting Office will notify all responding consulting firms of the selection results.

Approval:

J. Darrin Player, Chief Procurement Officer

Date

Concurrence:

Madeleine Hendry, Acting Deputy Secretary for Finance & Admin.

Date

NP:np



# SCORING SUMMARY MASTER SCORESHEET

### S-277-24 S-277 Bridge Replacement over Twelve Mile Creek in Pi 11/7/2023



# SCORING SUMMARY MASTER SCORESHEET



S-277-24 S-277 Bridge Replacement over Twelve Mile Creek in Pi							CRIT	ERI
DANKING	FIRM RANKINGS	TOTAL	1	2	3	4	5	6
RANKING	Ranked in Order by Firm Name	SCORE	30%	20%	20%	10%	5%	15
1	Carolina Transportation Engineers & Associates, PC	80.05	25.80	13.60	16.00	6.80	3.90	13.
2	A. Morton Thomas and Associates, Inc.	68.05	20.40	13.20	11.60	5.80	3.40	13.
3	Parrish & Partners, LLC	66.55	18.60	12.80	11.60	6.80	3.70	13.
4	Cox and Dinkins, Inc.	65.45	17.40	12.00	12.40	6.80	2.90	13.
5	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	64.10	15.60	12.00	12.80	6.80	3.40	13.
6	Holt Consulting Company, LLC	64.00	18.00	11.60	10.80	6.40	3.10	14.
7	J. Bragg Consulting, Inc.	63.95	16.80	12.40	10.80	6.80	2.90	14.
8	ATCS, PLC	63.35	18.00	12.00	11.20	5.20	2.70	14.
9	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	59.05	16.80	10.80	10.80	5.40	2.80	12.
EVALUATOR:		EVALUATOR:						
EVALUATOR:		EVALUATOR:						
EVALUATOR:								

MasterScoresheetReportV2 11/7/2023 Page 2 of 67

## CRITERIA QUESTIONS AND WEIGHTS



	Description of the consultant's understanding of the project including the major environmental, engineering,	
	development challenges and consultant's technical approach in the following key areas: $\Box$	
	•Context sensitive design to balance design impacts□	
1	<ul> <li>Development of right of way and construction plans</li> </ul>	30
	1. Demonstrate that the team has the personnel and experience to provide all services for the development of the	
	projects.	
2	<ol><li>Demonstrate the ability to be responsive to SCDOT.</li></ol>	20
	Detail the specific experience of the proposed project manager and design leads in managing bridge replacement	
3	projects.	20
	Past performance and quality of past performance of the firm/team Key Individuals on similar type projects according	
4	to consultant performance evaluations and references.	10
	Familiarity of the firm/team with state transportation agency practices and procedures including familiarity with the	
5	SCDOT Bridge Design Manual and other associated manuals.	5
	"Workload" is defined as the dollar amount of active executed agreements (basic, contract modifications, work	
	orders, task orders, and small purchase) between a consultant and SCDOT, minus the amounts already invoiced. It	
6	will also include those amounts under negotiation, exclusive of those that are suspended.	15
	Total	100

#### **EVALUATOR : 1**

#### FIRM : A. Morton Thomas and Associates, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	Existing data of structure are clearly presented, proposal also mention of roadside barriers, challenges and possible options. Page 8 mention cursory review of publicly available crash data and page 9 mention "WE DON'T KNOW THE EXISTING CRASH HISTORY" Recommended Design Criteria is well presented, except for minimum grade for Rural Local is 0%, Desirable is 0.5% the proposal shows minimum of 0.5%. Manuals shows pass page 30. Hydraulic didn't talk about the skew angle.
Criteria 2	6.00	Personnel / team availability & experiences are NOT presented well. Doesn't show availability percentage of the key personnel's with in the page 30 and most key personnel have low availability. Firms has previous project that shows responsiveness to DOT. Mentioning bi weekly meeting then once a month.
Criteria 3	6.00	Road & Structure Lead don't have much similar detailed bridge projects experiences that are shown in the proposal and other key personnel as well. Structure Lead have 10 years of Experience and Road lead 14 years of Experience.
Criteria 4	7.00	Some firms has very low rating performance on one or two past projects, but overall the Firms have great rating. Nothing who indicate who work on a project.
Criteria 5	6.00	Proposal shows Minimum grade for Rural Local is 0% buy Desirable is 0.5%, the proposal shows minimum of 0.5%.
Criteria 6	9.10	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	40.10	

#### **EVALUATOR : 1**

#### FIRM : AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	Proposal have lot's of typos. Page 7,8,11 some letters in words are missing, some illustration are blur and it is not readable. Structure Lead in org chart from ICE firm but in Qualification from CTEA firm. Nicely presented the multiple alternatives in the proposal with possible approaches, impact and the rural local road criteria. constructability wasn't discuss.
Criteria 2	6.00	Most key personnel have plenty of availability except for PM and assist. Pm in the current availability chart. Proposal direct you to go to SF330 for related bridge project pass page 30. Firms has previous project that shows responsiveness to DOT.
Criteria 3	6.00	Proposal shows for PM with just one related bridge project. Deputy Pm has significant bridge Pm experiences. no mention on day to day communication between them. Structure Lead in org chart from ICE firm but in Qualification from CTEA firm. Proposal shows Page 5 the Environmental Lead has 22 years of experience but on page 23 she has 23 years of experience. other lead you have to go to SF330 for detailed related bridge project
Criteria 4	8.00	Most Firms have good performances on the past project, except for one terminated project. But average performances are good.
Criteria 5	7.00	Good manual tables shown in the proposal, but not project specific.
Criteria 6	8.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	41.30	

#### **EVALUATOR** : 1

#### FIRM : ATCS, PLC

Criteria 1	7.00	Site visit review are well presented in the proposal along with the challenges of the project. Proposal mention to utilized compressed guardrail on the creek side and utilize slopes steeper then 2:1. Shown multiple Alternative design and it's advantages and disadvantages. Roadway design and development of the plan are very well presented, and nicely shown on the typical section. No mention of endangered species, traffic analysis and utility.
Criteria 2	7.00	All Key personnel have very high availability specially PM 80%. Proposal shows that they will coordinate with the DOT Pm and present ways of communications.
Criteria 3	7.00	Pm has a great years of managing bridge experiences as well us the other key leads.
Criteria 4	7.00	Firms have good quality performances in their past projects.
Criteria 5	6.00	Very generic presentation of the manual, some of the manuals are not presented in their proposal like ARMS ( Access Roadside Management Standard), Roadside design guide,& Standard Drawings.
Criteria 6	9.50	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	43.50	

#### **EVALUATOR : 1**

#### FIRM : Carolina Transportation Engineers & Associates, PC

Criteria 1	9.00	Bridge existing condition and challenges are very well presented in the proposal. Propose alternates alignments are clearly presented with each advantages and disadvantages Task schedules and completed dates are presented well. Great presentation and explanation of proposed Moment Slab barrier along the northern approach to the bridge. Mention of Texas mash compliance as barrier as well.
Criteria 2	7.00	All Key personnel have very high availability specially PM 80%. Proposal shows that the firm is very responsive to their previous projects.
Criteria 3	8.00	Key personnel's specific project experience and task are presented very well All Personnel have plenty of related bridge experiences.
Criteria 4	8.00	Some firms has very low rating performance on one or two past projects, but overall the Firms have great rating. Proposal also shows key staff involved in pass projects.
Criteria 5	8.00	Firm is very familiar with DOT manuals, proposal shows what chapter and manual to use. No roadside guide mention in the the manual table.
Criteria 6	9.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	49.30	

#### **EVALUATOR : 1**

#### FIRM : Cox and Dinkins, Inc.

	7.00	Bridge existing condition and challenges are very well presented in the proposal.
		Propose alternates alignments are clearly presented with each pros and cons.
Critoria 1		Great presentation of the issue and solutions of unauthorized short parking on creek side of both bridge
Chiena i	7.00	approaches.
		context sensitive design are nicely presented.
		No road design proposed criteria mention or what functional classification of the road.
Criteria 2	7.00	Most key Personnel have plenty of availability and proposal shows the ability to be responsive to DOT.
Critoria 3	8.00	Key personnel's specific project experience and task are presented very well All Personnel have plenty of related
Chiena S		bridge experiences.
Criteria 4	8.00	Some firms has very low rating performance on one or two past projects, but overall the Firms have great rating
Ontena 4	0.00	Come nime has very low rating performance on one of two past projects, but overall the rinne have great rating.
Criteria 5	6.00	Road manuals are not clearly shown, they mention some of the chapters but of what manuals? No mention of
	0.00	roadside design guide as well.
Criteria 6	9.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	45.30	

#### **EVALUATOR : 1**

#### FIRM : Holt Consulting Company, LLC

Criteria 1	7.00	Context sensitive solutions and ideas are clearly presented.
		Nicely presented on the anticipated projected milestones, design review coordination and the types of
		superstructure and the advantages & disadvantages.
		Roadway plan and profile are nicely presented, no mention of the constructability.
		Proposal shows that the firm has the ability to be responsive and available in in meetings and event. The Firm's
Criteria 2	7.00	PM's office is also close to DOT Headquarters with only 5 minutes away. All key personnel's have high availability,
		but the firm overall workload is only 31%.
	8.00	Key personnel's specific project experience and task are presented well in the proposal. All Personnel have plenty
Criteria 3		of related bridge experiences.
		pass example project in proposal are not related to this specific projects.
Critorio 4	8.00	Most Firms have good performances on the past project, except for one terminated project. But average
Chiena 4		performances are good.
Criteria 5	7.00	Generic shows familiarity which manual to used and presented good in the proposal.
Criteria 6	9.40	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	46.40	

#### **EVALUATOR : 1**

#### FIRM : J. Bragg Consulting, Inc.

Criteria 1	8.00	<ul> <li>Project understanding is well presented along with the existing condition, specification and restriction of the bridge. Monthly Communication, ON-SITE Meeting, data sharing, milestone schedules and design review coordination are well presented.</li> <li>Clearly and well presented on which chapters to use for rural local road design criteria.</li> <li>Mention of required coordination for peds/bicycle facilities.</li> <li>Clear presentation of drawing of the proposed bridge and road alignment.</li> </ul>
Criteria 2	7.00	Bridge & hydro Lead have 70% availability and other key personnel have good availability except for environmental Lead. Key personnels and other Task Leads Man Hours are clearly presented. Firms has previous project that shows responsiveness to DOT.
Criteria 3	7.00	PM & Structure has significant similar bridge projects experiences. Roadway Lead detailed experience only presented one similar bridge project, and the other two presented projects the roadway lead role is Lead hydrology. Other lead has plenty of similar bridge project experiences.
Criteria 4	8.00	Some firms has very low rating performance on one or two past projects, but overall the Firms have great rating. good representation of different firms.
Criteria 5	8.00	The Firm is very familiar with the DOT manuals and practices. Proposal also mention PM's awareness of the the RDM new release and associated updates. Also mention of using the Quality checklist for QA/QC review.
Criteria 6	9.50	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	47.50	

#### **EVALUATOR : 1**

#### FIRM : Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	Proposing a 11' wide lane and 6 foot shoulder and raising the grade will create more impact ad footprint.
		No other alternatives alignments that has proposed in the proposal.
	0.00	Identification & management of risk and mitigations factors are well presented.
		Conceptual schedule are nicely resented from Contract t final construction plan.
		All key Personnel have high availability and plenty of related bridge experience, but the structure key personnel
Criteria 2	7.00	only presented couple related bridge project.
		Firm have plenty of personnel and proposal shows the ability to be responsive to DOT.
		Most of the key personnel have plenty of bridge related project but the structure key personnel only shows a
Critoria 2	6.00	previous interchange project as a structure lead.
Chiena 3		Org chart does not show some personnel as part in the structure design Road design, but are listed in the
		personnel qualifications & experiences section in the proposal.
Criteria 4	8.00	Firms have good quality performances in their past projects.
Criteria 5	8.00	Firm is very familiar with DOT manuals, proposal presented which Chapter and manuals to be use.
Criteria 6	9.00	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	44.00	

#### **EVALUATOR : 1**

#### FIRM : Parrish & Partners, LLC

Criteria 1	6.00	Context sensitive design to balance impact are nicely presented along with the alternative design and advantages and disadvantages.
		no mention of the road functional classification, existing road & structure width and no design criteria.
Criteria 2	7.00	Key personnel's have very high availability. PM and Structure responsibility in the same personnel and does not have assistant PM, tho his dual roles from previous jobs shows his responsiveness to DOT.
Criteria 3	6.00	Most of the key personnel have plenty of bridge related project but the roadway key personnel only shows a previous intersection and widening project.
Criteria 4	8.00	Firms have good quality performances in their past projects. proposal shows past project to S-277 relevancy.
Criteria 5	8.00	Firm is very familiar with DOT manuals, proposal shows what manual to use. No roadside guide mention in the the manual table.
Criteria 6	8.70	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	43.70	

#### EVALUATOR: 2

#### FIRM : A. Morton Thomas and Associates, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	<ul> <li>+proactive approach of identifying areas of concern with design criteria report submittal and engage the RPG and Support early as needed.</li> <li>+site visit was held</li> <li>+Low Volume Bridge criteria proposed, and design criteria provided. Existing bridge is 180'- what is proposed bridge length? (Range 180-190 pdf page 12)</li> <li>+retain existing alignment</li> <li>?recommended alt provided: 3 span cored slab bridge</li> <li>+FEMA Zone AE, no -impact cert will be provided</li> <li>+CE anticipated &amp; coordination with USACE possible</li> <li>+no available wetland mitigation available within the area noted</li> <li>+specific stakeholder list provided</li> <li>+Recommend PIM and specific locations for meeting provided</li> <li>+project specific list of protected species provided, bat activity likely</li> <li>+existing UT identified and no conflicts determinations are anticipated</li> <li>+provided aesthetic options provided</li> </ul>
Criteria 2	6.00	<ul> <li>-propose bi-weekly meetings with SCDOT with design team meeting internally once per month. Why does AMT need to meet with SCDOT more than they do internally?</li> <li>+/-good chart showing relevant bridge projects and services provided, but doesn't easily tell me who on this team worked on the subject project and in what capacity.</li> <li>+return calls and e-mails within 24 hours</li> <li>+good breakdown of role, coordination chain and responsibilities.</li> </ul>
Criteria 3	6.00	PM experience outlines bridge examples that are similar to S-277 however Bridge St. Bridge (truss bridge) was not detailed in the SF 330 for additional context. +PM serving only as PM in this org chart, not as bridge lead. +PM Will be the main POC for SCDOT. +Deputy PM has roadway background
Criteria 4	4.00	-CPE scores provided without key staff involvement listed or project descriptions
Criteria 5	6.00	+list of design manuals, criteria, and specific project application table provided
Criteria 6	9.10	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	38.10	

#### EVALUATOR: 2

#### FIRM : AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

		Errors through proposal, some causing confusion on content.
		-Bridge design by ICE (or CTEA?))
		+Stakeholder list provided for PIP
		+Specific list of endangered and protected species provided
		-Why wouldn't the current detour route be used?
Criteria 1	4.00	+site visit held
		+good ROW research to identify potentially 3 property owners without existing plans
		+proposes use of LVB Criteria and hollow cored slab by case in place bent caps and columns
		+anticipate "no impact" finding
		-no clear alternative mentioned, but options presented
		-constructability not mentioned
Critoria 2	F 00	-provided CPE scores and quotes from past performances but no plan on how to be responsive during project
Chiena Z	5.00	development
Critoria 2	4.00	+provided good examples of comparable projects for both the PM and Deputy PM on this team
Criteria 3		-unclear who is running day to day communications on this project with SCDOT
Criteria 4	3.00	-I am not aware of any work AECOM is doing on work on WRCR project.
Criteria 5	4.00	-listed design manuals and what they outline but not how they specifically apply to this project
Criteria 6	8.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	28.30	

#### **EVALUATOR : 2**

FIRM : ATCS, PLC

Criteria 1	5.00	<ul> <li>++ easy to follow format for proposal that tells me what I need to know in the proper locations</li> <li>+proposing LVB criteria and even mentions considerations worth investigating do deliver a more cost effective and timely project.</li> <li>+site visit performed</li> <li>++constructability and material delivery to bridge location considered.</li> <li>+two alternatives evaluated and a preferred identified in the proposal</li> <li>+mentioned aesthetically pleasing structure option</li> <li>no public involvement discussed</li> <li>permitting, endangered species not mentioned?</li> </ul>
Criteria 2	6.00	+provided detailed plan to have open communication about the project that included bi-weekly meetings, calls, progress meetings, and budget/schedule +same day response to calls/emails, and onsite with 24 hour notice.
Criteria 3	4.00	<ul> <li>unclear who is doing the bridge design between Holt ant ATCS since both are listed for this task. How is this work being split?</li> <li>- mainly bio format, would like project specific details</li> </ul>
Criteria 4	4.00	<ul> <li>Key personnel for examples are staff that are not listed on the org chart for this project.</li> <li>some that are listed on the org chart for this project performed different roles.</li> <li>-4 culvert projects, only 2 replacements project. More relevant projects need to be provided.</li> </ul>
Criteria 5	4.00	<ul> <li>-listed design manuals and what they outline but not how they specifically apply to this project</li> <li>-missing roadway manuals</li> </ul>
Criteria 6	9.50	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	32.50	

#### EVALUATOR: 2

#### FIRM : Carolina Transportation Engineers & Associates, PC

Criteria 1	8.00	<ul> <li>+site visit performed</li> <li>completed SC 183 over Twelve Mile Creek bridge replacement 8 miles away</li> <li>+mention of bridge being within the "Superfund Site"</li> <li>+LVBRC</li> <li>+constructability discussed for delivery of girder length discussed</li> <li>+Aesthetic rails discussed to blend into natural surroundings</li> <li>+public involvement discussed, and firm is currently working with some of the same stakeholders on other projects.</li> <li>+PI options provided and locations to hold meetings identified</li> </ul>
Criteria 2	6.00	<ul> <li>+specific examples of responsiveness provided however two were DB projects, different process. One emergency bridge.</li> <li>+good matrix showing firms on the team along with task anticipated in the contract and who can perform what work.</li> <li>+Conflict/issues identified with list of personnel and their experience to handle.</li> </ul>
Criteria 3	7.00	+provided similar projects worked on by Leads and PM along with how they are relevant to S-277 replacement.
Criteria 4	5.00	+CPE scores provided with key staff involvement listed
Criteria 5	7.00	+good matrix showing on-call work performed by CTEA and other firms on the team ++thorough matrix of manuals and guidance references for each discipline and how they apply specifically to this project.
Criteria 6	9.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	42.30	

#### EVALUATOR: 2

#### FIRM : Cox and Dinkins, Inc.

Criteria 1	5.00	<ul> <li>-bridge design, load rating and roadway structure worked preformed by CTEA.</li> <li>-'Gives a recommendation out of list of alternatives reviewed, however the rock excavation was noted but not listed as a con</li> <li>+3 alternative alignments analyzed in detail</li> <li>+list of aesthetic features options provided</li> <li>+public involvement discussed, and firm is currently working with some of the same stakeholders on other projects.</li> <li>+PI options provided and locations to hold meetings identified</li> </ul>
Criteria 2	5.00	<ul> <li>+high CPE scores from DOT on responsiveness to current bridge replacement projects</li> <li>+/- list of bridge replacement projects provided for each key personnel, and their role listed. No similar characteristics outlined outside of being bridge replacements.</li> </ul>
Criteria 3	5.00	+list of similar projects listed for PM and design leads
Criteria 4	5.00	+CPE scores provided with key staff involvement listed
Criteria 5	4.00	-listed design manuals and what they outline but not how they specifically apply to this project
Criteria 6	9.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	33.30	

#### EVALUATOR: 2

#### FIRM : Holt Consulting Company, LLC

		+propose low volume bridge replacement criteria
		+/- similar bridge S-1/4 in Anderson highlighted with similar features, however does not say who on the team
		+on a school bus route
		+list of context sensitive solutions provided along with what design criteria they would be deviating from
Criteria 1	4.00	-PI Director not mentioned
		+Potential PIM locations presented
		-only advantages for preferred and only disadvantages provided for other alternatives
		-constructability discussion missing
		-unsure of anticipated milestone schedules, CON obligation 9/27
		Neither Holt or ATCS currently involved in DB or MEGA projects in SC
Criteria 2	4.00	-two emergency bridge projects shown that were expedited, however does not list staff involved, CPE scores, or
		firms used for design. These were also emergency replacements which are different than DBB project delivery.
		-bridge design being performed by sub (ATCS), examples not provided
Criteria 3	3.00	+PM is single POC for Department
Onteria o		- bridge projects however does not list, CPE scores, and HOLT did not perform the bridge work on any of the
		examples provided.
Criteria 4	5.00	+CPE scores provided, would like to see who said the quotes.
		- how about for subs work?
Criteria 5	4.00	-list of manuals provided but now how they specifically apply to this project.
		+ list of applicable design standards provided
Criteria 6	9.40	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	29.40	

#### EVALUATOR: 2

#### FIRM : J. Bragg Consulting, Inc.

		-overall format is hard to read and jumbled
		-structural design being performed by P&P with roadway design being performed by JBC.
		-QA/QC identifies firms and not individuals
		-Geotechnical is not identified as key individual
Onitonia A	4.00	+Stakeholder list provided
Criteria	4.00	-CE is anticipated, why would design PH be needed?
		- anticipates lighting needs to access Twelve Mile Creek for recreational use.
		+propose utilizing low volume bridge criteria
		+existing UT identified and no conflicts determinations are anticipated
		-ROW by THC
Criteria 2	5.00	+left up to PM on preferred method of responsiveness.
Critoria 2	4.00	-PM has extensive roadway experience, but bridge replacement projects not outlined.
Criteria 3		-lacked relevant project details
Criteria 4	4.00	-testimonials provided however do not directly apply to roles or staffing for this project.
Criteria 5	4.00	-table shows how design manuals apply to other projects the firm has worked on.
Criteria 6	9.50	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	30.50	

#### EVALUATOR: 2

#### FIRM : Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Criteria 1	3.00	++BASF Corporation stakeholder identified Does not recommend utilizing LVBC -recommends other bridge types to be evaluated -alternatives not provided, just will be evaluated in the future. +aesthetically pleasing bridge options will be looked into -constructability issues and mitigating factors were outlined ++ schedule overview schedule provided and potential 408 permit requirements will drive the schedule
Oritoria O	4.00	-RSH performing structural design for project
Criteria 2		-firm structure provided, no plan to be responsive
Criteria 3	4.00	-similar projects listed for N&S and one for RS&H. With RS&H doing the bridge design I would have like to see
Unicita 5		more examples of their bridge replacement projects with key staff
Criteria 4	4.00	-would like to see how the provided CPE scores relate to key individuals proposed for this team.
Ontena 4		The example provided for them was a turn key selection that has recently began.
		+provided similar projects for and how the manuals were utilized.
Criteria 5	6.00	+listed relevant manuals and sections for this project
		+PDP process outlined
Criteria 6	9.00	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	30.00	

#### EVALUATOR: 2

#### FIRM : Parrish & Partners, LLC

		-propose off alignment bridge design
		+propose public involvement similar to SC 133
		+utilizing LVBC
Critorio 1	E 00	constructability not discussed
Criteria	5.00	-aesthetics not mentioned
		-proposing larger structure with more impacts
		-existing data not provided
		-design criteria not provided
	4.00	-/+ long list of similar bridge projects provided but HOW are they similar?
Criteria 2		? Is Sawney Creek Bridge an emergency replacement?
		-PM proposes regular meetings with SCDOT
Critorio 2	4.00	-PM proposes regular meetings with DOT
Criteria 3		-PM listed as Deputy PM all project listed in experience
Critorio 4	6.00	+CPEs provided
Cillena 4		+bridge examples and their relevancy listed to S-277
		+listed design manuals and gave some context on how they specifically apply to this project
Criteria 5	6.00	+working on bridge manual updates
		-no RDS discussion
Criteria 6	8.70	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	33.70	

#### **EVALUATOR: 3**

#### FIRM : A. Morton Thomas and Associates, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	Proposes LVC. Assumes horizontal curves are within 15 mph of design speed - not specific. Proposing a small grade raise - +/-1'. Road section recommends 3-span cored slab option but bridge section never specifically confirms this. Proposing single column with hammerhead to eliminate skew issues. Hydraulic section does not discuss specifics of bridge type proposed. Hydraulic section does not discuss and specific elevations for 100-year, low chord, etc. but does state that a no-impact is anticipated to be achieved. Good overall explanation on constructability.
Criteria 2	7.00	Shows good experience on other/similar bridge projects in other states. Are proposing sub-consultants in other areas with SCDOT experience. Proposes bi-weekly progress meetings and to be responsive to calls/emails within 24 hours. Proposing to do both bridge and road design in-house which is preferred due to complexity of the project. Completing 61% of work by AMT
Criteria 3	6.00	PM has 21 years of experience. Proposal lists some similar bridges completed in WV. Deputy PM has 14 years of experience and worked on DOT bridges. Design leads show adequate experience with 10 years being the minimum between them all/
Criteria 4	7.00	Has some good references from non-DOT projects. TransSystems, Three Oaks, and ESP show some good CPE scores.
Criteria 5	8.00	Section not only displays manuals to be used, but also gives a descriptive application to this project. Shows good familiarity with SCDOT standards and practices.
Criteria 6	9.10	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	44.10	

#### **EVALUATOR: 3**

#### FIRM : AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

		Proposes LVC. The road section gives alternatives but states more study is needed before making a
		recommendation. A 3-span cored slab (65-70-65) with standard columns is recommended but skew angle is not
Criteria 1	6.00	discussed. Nothing discussed with constructability due to site constraints. Nothing discussed on whether retaining
		walls or other slope alternatives would be needed. Hydrology section does not mention whether a CLOMR/LOMR
		or 'no-impact' will be obtained. Bridge aesthetics not discussed.
		Good section discussing the company's abilities as well as their proposed sub-consultants abilities for providing
		quality services on this project. AECOM has worked on previous projects for our RPG and has proven to be
Criteria 2	6.00	responsive then as well.
		AECOM is proposing ICE to design the bridge. Given the complexities of the road/bridge design at this site, the
		preference would be for both to be designed in-house.
		PM has 22 years of experience with DOT projects. Has completed more than 80 projects for DOT over her
Critoria 3	7.00	career. Deputy PM has 21 years of experience and a lot of specific DOT experience.
Chilena 5	7.00	
		Design leads have good experience with 17 years being the minimum.
Criteria 4	5.00	Shows some DOT projects with good CPE scores. Has a project (Woodruff Parallel) in this section that they are
		not working on.
Criteria 5	6.00	Section lists manuals to be used on this project and generically how they apply. Would prefer to see more specific
		detail on how they apply to this project.
Criteria 6	8.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	38.30	

#### **EVALUATOR: 3**

#### FIRM : ATCS, PLC

Criteria 1	6.00	Proposes LVC. Proposing to keep road conditions including horizontal curvature the same as context sensitive design as well as steeper than 2:1 slopes. Due to the limited ability to get concrete beams to the site as well as large equipment for construction, a 2-span weathered steel bridge is being proposed. Didn't discuss advantages and disadvantages of steel over other bridge types. Only 1 bent in the channel and it will be skewed to the channel. It is stated that weathered steel helps with structure depth but there's not a lot of detail about holding low chord, raising grade, avoiding large cut/fills, etc. They do state that a 'no-impact' is attainable thus a FEMA map revision is not necessary. Needed environmental discussed.
Criteria 2	6.00	Displays knowledgeable team and experience. Good section on how they would be responsive through meetings and communication. Proposing to keep the bridge in-house but have Holt do the road design. Given site complexities, the preference would be for both bridge and road to be completed by the prime.
Criteria 3	6.00	PM has 34 years of experience in various states. Deputy PM has 10 years of experience. Design leads also have good experience.
Criteria 4	6.00	ATCS shows good scores from other DOTs. Their sub-consultants display good CPE scores on some recent projects.
Criteria 5	7.00	ATCS has done a lot of work with other DOTs , They have done their due diligence and appear to know a lot about our standards and practices already. Holt has done a lot of DOT work and makes a good teaming partner for ATCS.
Criteria 6	9.50	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	40.50	

#### **EVALUATOR: 3**

#### FIRM : Carolina Transportation Engineers & Associates, PC

	7	
Criteria 1	9.00	Proposes LVC. Proposing a 3-span (45-90-45) cored slab/box beam combo. Currently, box beams are not allowed for LVC but they do discuss that standards are being developed and they have already been used on other DOT bridges. They discuss a lot on deliveries to the site and constructability in general and feel a 90' beam can be delivered to the site. Propose to utilize a top down construction approach that will aid in the context sensitive design. Their design eliminates fills into the stream and cuts into the mountains/hills. Discusses skew angle and proposes single column hammerhead bents to correct. Discusses roadway drainage and bridge
	ļ	hydraulics and states a 'no-impact' will be obtained.
Criteria 2	7.00	States that team comprised of small, local firms for aggressive delivery. Doesn't discuss meetings or communication schedule during design. Does list the challenging items for this project and how the proposed personnel will overcome them effectively. Is proposing to have road and bridge design kept in-house by CTEA which should make project go smoother. Specifically mentions 3 projects where responsiveness resulted in projects being completed in an accelerated
		manner.
Criteria 3	8.00	Both PM and Deputy PM have 30+ years of experience and a large amount of DOT experience. Many similar DOT projects listed. Design leads are experienced with DOT work with 25 years experience being the minimum. Many similar DOT
	ļ	projects listed along with their relevance to this project.
Criteria 4	6.00	CTEA has completed a lot of DOT projects and they display good CPE scores on similar projects in this section. Would also like to see some scores of their sub-consultants here as well.
Criteria 5	8.00	Section not only displays manuals to be used, but also gives a descriptive application to this project. Shows good familiarity with SCDOT standards and practices.
Criteria 6	9.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	47.30	

#### **EVALUATOR: 3**

#### FIRM : Cox and Dinkins, Inc.

Criteria 1	5.00	Proposes LVC. Proposing a 3-span type 3/4 combo. Nothing discussed on holding low chord or the grade raise issues this type of bridge would create. Avoiding large cut slopes is mentioned but nothing on fill slopes into the stream or the need for a retaining wall is discussed. The hydrology section isn't specific to the proposed bridge span arrangement. Proposes single column hammerhead piers to overcome poor skew angle.
Criteria 2	5.00	Only proposing to keep 40% of work, including roadway with CTEA doing bridge. The preference would be for road and bridge to be completed by the prime due to site complexities. Nothing specific as to how they would be responsive on this project other than stating immediate responsiveness will be provided. They do show a good CPE score on similar bridge projects in regards to their responsiveness on those projects.
Criteria 3	7.00	<ul> <li>PM has a very extensive amount of DOT relevant bridge design experience. Deputy PM shows 23 years of total experience with 8 years of specific DOT bridge experience.</li> <li>Design leads all have good bridge replacement experience with 15 years being the minimum.</li> <li>Projects listed in this section do not discuss how the specifically relate to this project.</li> </ul>
Criteria 4	6.00	Shows good CPE scores on other DOT projects. Would prefer to see more than 1 score/quote for prime consultant.
Criteria 5	6.00	Lists specific sections in each discipline that will be used for design. Would prefer some more specific details as it relates to this project.
Criteria 6	9.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	38.30	

#### **EVALUATOR: 3**

#### FIRM : Holt Consulting Company, LLC

Criteria 1	7.00	Proposes LVC. Bridge section does not give a proposed bridge length. Proposed length was found in the roadway plan and profile image. A 50-100-50 cored slab box beam combo bridge is proposed. No discussion on getting the 100' box beams to the site. The profile also shows a significant grade raise but not a lot of discussion on overcoming it except that retaining walls may be needed. Mentions skewing abutments but not interior bents. Hydraulic section not specific to bridge type proposed and isn't specific on if a no-impact or map revision will be needed.
Criteria 2	6.00	<ul> <li>Only proposing to keep 31% of work as prime, including roadway with ATCS designing the bridge. Given the complexities of this project, it is preferred that road and bridge design be completed by the prime.</li> <li>Does not discuss anything specific to this project on responsiveness, i.e. attending/coordinating meetings regularly or when issues arise. States that responsiveness to both previously scheduled meetings and emergency meetings will be done at all times. States that schedule can be accelerated through effective collaboration and responsiveness.</li> <li>Lists two projects on examples of responsiveness but not the personnel that worked on them.</li> </ul>
Criteria 3	6.00	PM has 16 years of experience and has completed 50 DOT projects. No assistant/deputy PM listed. Design leads display good overall experience with 15 years being the minimum.
Criteria 4	6.00	Shows good CPE scores on 4 DOT projects completed by Holt. Would be preferred to also so some sub- consultant scores here as well.
Criteria 5	8.00	Section not only displays manuals to be used, but also gives a descriptive application to this project. Shows good familiarity with SCDOT standards and practices.
Criteria 6	9.40	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	42.40	

#### **EVALUATOR: 3**

#### FIRM : J. Bragg Consulting, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	Proposes LVC but 11' lanes and 6' shoulders. Proposes to match existing roadway widths and add proper shoulders. Proposing a 3-span (70-70-70) type III bridge for superelevation requirements. Due to type III structure depth, a grade raise would be necessary but not discussed. Retaining walls are proposed for embankment fills but nothing on if cut slopes will be necessary into hill sides. No discussion on constructability or difficulties getting materials to the project site. Hydraulic section states that more study is needed to determine if low chord will need raised.
Criteria 2	7.00	Covers methods of communication to be used and also that proper availability results in responsiveness. Good section on their team and abundant, relative experience. Proposing to keep 46% of work in house with P&P designing the bridge. Would prefer that road and bridge stay with the prime due to the complexities of this project.
Criteria 3	6.00	<ul> <li>PM has 27 years of experience with a lot of DOT transportation experience but doesn't list a lot of bridge project experience. No assistant PM listed.</li> <li>Design leads listed in section 3 have relevant DOT experience with 17 years being the minimum.</li> <li>Did not provide relevant details for the projects listed.</li> </ul>
Criteria 4	7.00	Shows a good CPE score for a bridge replacement project that they were a sub-consultant on. Shows good CPE scores of proposed sub-consultants for this project.
Criteria 5	6.00	Displays knowledge of the manuals but would prefer to be more specific to this project.
Criteria 6	9.50	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	41.50	

#### **EVALUATOR: 3**

#### FIRM : Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Criteria 1	5.00	State that channel is greater than 100' wide and thus not low volume criteria. As a result, proposing wider section of 11' lanes and 6' shoulders which would be very difficult at this site. Proposes a steel bridge but does not discuss costs or reason for steel versus other bridge types. Proposes soldier pile walls and the desire to minimize large cuts into hillsides. With larger typical section and road grade raise, this would have the large impacts to the site.
Criteria 2	7.00	<ul> <li>Proposing to keep 60% of the work in-house. Has RSH doing structural design. Due to complexities of this project, it is preferred that road and bridge be done by the prime.</li> <li>Discusses their offices man-power increases ability to handle workload but nothing specific to responsiveness for this project in regards to meetings, communication, etc.</li> <li>Shows good future availability for staff proposed for this project.</li> </ul>
Criteria 3	7.00	PM has 22 years of experience with relative DOT bridge experience. No assistant PM listed. DM and design leads also have relative DOT bridge design experience with several similar bridge projects listed.
Criteria 4	8.00	N-S has completed a lot of DOT projects and they display good CPE scores on similar projects in this section. Also shows some good scores of their sub-consultants as well.
Criteria 5	6.00	Displays knowledge of the manuals but would prefer to be more specific to this project.
Criteria 6	9.00	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	42.00	

#### **EVALUATOR: 3**

#### FIRM : Parrish & Partners, LLC

Criteria 1	6.00	Proposes LVC. Proposing a 3-span (70-70-70) type III bridge with significant grade raise. States type III being proposed due to super-elevation required, but doesn't specifically state how supering the bridge will correct horizontal curves. Not much discussion on constructability or getting materials to the site. Due to grade raise, proposing retaining walls on NW and SE quadrants of bridge but no mention of affected cut slopes. Hydraulic section doesn't give specific elevations or low chord information and thus isn't clear on whether a map revision or no-impact will be needed.
Criteria 2	8.00	<ul> <li>Proposing to keep 66% of work in-house, including bridge, road, and hydrology which is preferred given the complexity of this project.</li> <li>Displays an extensive similar project list that shows proper experience to handle this project as well as personnel and specific projects they worked on.</li> <li>Discusses using in person and online meetings as well as weekly design meetings for proper communication and responsiveness.</li> </ul>
Criteria 3	6.00	PM has 17 years of experience and designed more than 25 bridge projects for DOT. DMs are experienced with DOT bridge replacement projects with 15 years being the minimum.
Criteria 4	8.00	Shows similar projects and also describes their relevancy to this project. Shows good CPE scores for prime. Has a section for sub-consultants similar projects and their relevancy to this project but no CPE scores.
Criteria 5	8.00	Good section overall. Displays knowledge of the manuals and then how they would apply specifically to this project.
Criteria 6	8.70	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	44.70	

#### **EVALUATOR : 4**

#### FIRM : A. Morton Thomas and Associates, Inc.

	r	
		bridge is in a sag curve.
		AMT proposes to design using LVBC unless crash history is higher than state average. This would allow them to design using existing alignment if it met within 15 mph of design speed.
		Recommended alternative is 3 span cored slab to minimize grade raise, but introduces 2 interior bents. AMT acknowledges that the low point in the sag needs to be away from the bridge ends. 2 of the 3 bridge alternatives have the same overall length, which introduces conflict points for substructure installation. LVBC also states bridge limits cannot be within existing limits. One alternative mentions boxed beams, but that type is not allowed per LVBC. DOT DB Bridge Package does not mean Preconstruction will allow boxed beams. AMT notes that the proposed bridge spans are less than the existing truss spans, so delivering to site will not be an issue. Disassembly of the existing bridge can be achieved using medium cranes one span at a time. Preferred alternative of cored slab will only allow 15 degree skew, whereas 45 degrees is mentioned as desirable. Project site currently has a debris issue.
Criteria 1	6.00	AMT proposes a lower test level barrier given the ADT and speed, suggesting to investigate using crash cushions to avoid extended guardrail that may not fit site conditions. Retaining walls are proposed at each end to limit fill impacts.
		A basic chart of the project development process is shown to illustrate development of ROW and CON plans. AMT understands the importance of coordinating with the RPG and Eng Support early on in the project. AMT is doing both road and bridge design.
		AMT states that this project may be a good candidate for Open Roads Designer. I would not recommend using a closed bridge as a pilot project, if schedule is a driving factor.
		Open-faced railing and textured concrete barriers are mentioned for aesthetics.
		No-impact FEMA is anticipated. AE (sub) notes that the bridge crossing doesn't have a floodway designation (2008 study), but there is a floodway upstream (2011 study). The generic hydraulic requirements are mentioned, and a potential design variance is mentioned but not detailed.

	6.00	Proposal lists 5 relevant bridge replacement projects with three under AMT. The table shows that AMT was involved in at least 75% of tasks requested in the RFP, including the major design tasks. Bridges ranged from 165' long to 402' long and included prestressed concrete beams and steel beam structures.
Criteria 2		Key individuals collectively have almost 200 years of experience, with the lowest individual experience being 9. AMT has performed engineering work for 7 various state DOTs, several being within the region.
		Promissory statement to return calls and emails within 24 hours. Anticipate to hold biweekly updates. A table is presented with each person's role, their coordination efforts, and responsibilities. AMT demonstrates a good understanding of how each role coordinates with others in various tasks, but this doesn't speak much to the ability to be responsive. Testimonials or past experience should be provided.
Criteria 3	4.00	PM has 21 years of experience in design and plan development. Proposal doesn't distinguish specific amount of years as PM of bridge replacement projects. Out of the 3 provided project examples, 1 is over a waterway at approximately the same bridge length with minimal similarity to the RFP project.
		Road lead and DPM does not list years of experience in this section (overall and with respect to PM/DPM). Two relevant bridge projects are listed; one utilizing LVBC.
		Structures lead has 10 years of experience. Earth retaining structure design is not mentioned. Both bridge projects listed are not relevant to RFP project, other than being over waterways.
		Hydraulics lead has 21 years experience and lists 2 relevant FEMA Zone AE bridge replacement projects over waterways.
		Geotech lead has over 30 years of experience. Environmental lead has over 17 years of experience.
		Overall, previous work examples listed should reflect bridges similar to the RFP, at approximately 150'-200' in length of anticipated superstructure types with similar challenges in constructability and ROW/construction impacts.

Criteria 4	3.00	Scores and testimonials for the subconsultants indicate good past performance. However, AMT did not provide any project relevant testimonials. Additionally, the remarks are more descriptions of services/tasks performed and do not speak to the performance of those tasks (with the exception of one comment addressing schedule acceleration). No specific names are provided. Testimonials/remarks from the clients on past bridge projects (over waterways) should be provided, detailing AMT's performance, responsiveness, accessibility, communication, etc.
Criteria 5	5.00	A table of design manual references and applicability to the project is provided. AMT includes a Design Build addendum as applicable to include boxed beams. Preconstruction (design-bid-build) projects do not necessarily align with Design Build criteria. Applicable LVBC provisions are included, specifically the 15 mph difference for existing alignment.
Criteria 6	9.10	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	33.10	

#### **EVALUATOR : 4**

#### FIRM : AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	<ul> <li>Accound others these general, key considerations on the project. Bindge Alternate Study, Constructionity Reviews, Bridge work is under a subconsultant.</li> <li>Accound and Stream Impacts/Permitting, Minimize Impacts, Utility Impacts, NEPA, and Construction Costs.</li> <li>Bridge work is under a subconsultant.</li> <li>Accound and Stream Impacts/Permitting, Alternative Responsible Mitigation plan will be created, given that there are no mitigation credits in this area. CE analysis is anticipated for NEPA. Potential PIM locations and stakeholders are identified under Public Involvement. Endangered species are identified, and 3 Oaks includes discussion on potential bat presence. Lake Hartwell is owned by USACE Savannah District, so potential coordination with them may be needed.</li> <li>Accound states that the bridge is in a FEMA Zone AE area, and based on LiDAR, the existing low chord meets the 2' freeboard design requirement.</li> <li>Three utilities are identified in the project area. No contacts or potential conflicts are noted. Three tract owners are identified, including the nearby pump station.</li> <li>Accound will design the bridge to adjust the vertical alignment to meet hydraulic requirements and ensure low points are kept at least 10' from the ends of approach slabs (other proposals mention 50'). AECOM proposes to use a 3-span cored slab bridge on drilled shafts (given shallow rock presence) at the interior bents and steel piles drilled into rock at the end bents, utilizing DM 0120 to reduce the number of slab units needed. They acknowledge that LVBC may used for this bridge given the ADT and secondary route, but will need to confirm the other criteria are met. Constructability constraints are not discussed.</li> <li>Geotech section does not include whether drilling from the existing bridge for borings is feasible.</li> <li>AECOM proposes several alternatives for addressing the existing alignment that only meets a 20 mph design speed. (steper slopes and guardrail, etc. The several alternativ</li></ul>
------------	------	--

Criteria 2	4.00	A table presents each task in the RFP with its responsible firm and team members. All tasks are identified. However, experience of the firms/team members is not demonstrated for each respective task. For Spring 2023 CPEs, AECOM averaged 8.47/10 for 20 separate contracts. Three testimonials from DOT PMs are provided, speaking to AECOM's communication and collaboration.
Criteria 3	4.00	<ul> <li>PM has 22 years of experience, managing 11 bridge replacements for DOT within past 10 years. Relevant experience lists a bridge replacement over a waterway with little detail on how it relates to the RFP project.</li> <li>DPM has 21 years of experience, managing over 25 bridge replacements (17 with DOT, 8 with AECOM). 8 bridge projects over waterways are listed as relevant experience, but no details are provided on how they relate to the RFP project.</li> <li>Constructability reviewer has 30 years of experience with 25 years in construction management and inspection. Environmental lead has 20 (or 23?) years of experience. Structures lead has 19 years of experience. Roadway lead has 17 years of experience. Geotech lead has 25 years of experience. Hydraulics lead has 39 years of experience. None of these key personnel list relevant past experience.</li> </ul>
Criteria 4	6.00	Six bridge replacement projects are presented with 5 being over waterways. Testimonials include a good representation of AECOM key team members, with CPE scores averaging 7.9. Testimonials speak well to communication, responsiveness, performance, and schedule adherence. Three CPE sheets for Spring 2023 were included in the proposal that speak well of PM and DPM. Proposal incorrectly lists AECOM as the firm for Woodruff Road project.
Criteria 5	4.00	A list of relevant manuals and specifications are presented with generic criteria. A graphic showing specific sections/subsections of relevant design manuals, procedure, and specs should have been included with how they are applicable to this project. A table of the team members is presented with their total years of experience and years on DOT projects, which vaguely demonstrates that they're practiced in developing DOT projects.
Criteria 6	8.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	32.30	

#### **EVALUATOR: 4**

#### FIRM : ATCS, PLC

Criteria 1	5.00	ATCS proposes to follow the LVBC for this project, citing a relevant past project they've worked in Anderson County. A table of similarities is provided, notably the sag curve (low point removal) and challenging vertical and horizontal alignment. However, the past project was performed as a design-build project. Specific site challenges listed included sharp horizontal curve at north end, non-existent shoulder on bridge, mountain face near existing guardrail, angle of stream, and hydraulic creek conditions. A table of context sensitive solutions is provided, showing the relevant LVBC requirements and how they will be used or deviated from. Retaining walls and compressed guardrail are proposed to reduce fill impacts. Roadway and Bridge leads are not the same firm. For roadway design, functional classification is accurately shown with 10' lanes and 4' shoulders. Super elevation will be carried throughout the bridge, which is preferred per RDM and BDM. The roadway plan development process is not accurately stated. Design criteria should be the first step. There should be a Design Field Review prior to ROW Plans submittal. Other than this section, an understanding of the project development process was not demonstrated.
		The recommended bridge configuration is a two span weathering steel beam bridge (90' spans) with substructure at a 30 degree skew to appease recreational users and address potential debris/scour. ATCS states that typical prestressed concrete girders would be difficult to transport to the site given the mountainous terrain. Steel beams will be lighter weight and varying lengths that can be field spliced if necessary. Weathering steel gives a certain aesthetic that matches the existing bridge and surrounding area. ATCS provides a relevant past bridge project that utilized weathering steel beams, architectural concrete finish form liners for the substructure, and open rustic bridge barriers. Proposed substructure includes shallow spread foundation keyed into competent rock.
		rig to obtain borings. No-impact FEMA is anticipated. AE (sub) notes that the bridge crossing doesn't have a floodway designation (2008 study), but there is a floodway upstream (2011 study). The generic hydraulic requirements are mentioned, and a potential design variance is mentioned but not detailed. Environmental services are not discussed.

Criteria 2	4.00	Key individuals collectively have more than 60 years of experience. The section on personnel/experience is lacking. A chart showing each of the key personnel and their years of experience in the RFP requested tasks should have been provided.
		DPM is locally based. Subconsultants are based locally.
		One testimonial is provided speaking to the PM's responsiveness.
		A graphic is provided, stating that ATCS will conduct biweekly meetings, have frequent communication, hold monthly progress meetings, and provide monthly financial reports (all as expected).
		Proposal states that calls and emails will be returned the same day, and face-to-face meetings can be accommodated with 24 hours notice.

	1	
Criteria 3	4.00	PM has 34 years of experience and has a bridge design background. Years of experience as a PM is not detailed. Background information shows PM is very knowledgeable and practice in structural design, analysis, and plan preparation. 4 bridge replacement projects (all prestressed concrete) are listed. 1 is over a waterway. 0 are utilized steel superstructures. Relevant projects listed do illustrate why they are relevant (lacking similar project site constraints and challenges).
		DPM has 10 years of experience with a traffic background. Traffic related tasks are minor for this project. Relevant projects listed are not relevant; only 1 bridge replacement shown without any details.
		Structural lead has 22 years of experience. Background information shows good knowledge and practice in structural design and analysis. Relevant projects listed include 4 bridge projects (2 of which are over waterways). No details are provided for the projects.
		Second structural lead has 15 years of experience. Steel design is not specified. 3 relevant bridge projects are listed, but no details are given.
		Road lead (? - not shown as key personnel) has 16 years of experience and lists 4 relevant bridge projects, but not details are given. Second road lead has 15 years of experience with 3 bridge projects listed (no details given).
		Environmental lead has 26 years of experience. Projects listed are not relevant. Do not anticipate an EIS for this project (likely will be a CE). Geotech lead has 11 years of experience. Hydraulic lead has 11 years of experience.
		Overall, specific project experience is lacking in information and detail. Cannot adequately assess how listed projects are relevant to RFP project.

Criteria 4	3.00	Six past projects are listed. 4 of the 6 are culvert projects, and 2 are bridge replacements. 1 of the 2 bridges are over waterways. One bridge utilized steel beams for the superstructure. The 2 bridge projects do not list bridge design services as part of the project for ATCS. Overall, the 6 projects presented lack relevancy to the RFP project with respect to structure type, project terrain challenges, and hydraulic challenges. Subconsultant (non key-personnel) has good/very good past performance ratings and testimonials for the listed bridge projects. Testimonials speak to subconsultant PM as being responsive and having good performance. Two testimonials are included for the ATCS PM, speaking to his responsiveness and pleasure to work with. Overall, the ratings and testimonials should speak to key personnel, specifically prioritized tasks like PM, bridge design, and environmental services.
Criteria 5	3.00	A table of manuals and specifications anticipated for this project are listed. Design memos are not mentioned. The listed criteria under each manual is very generic. Specific manual/specification sections are not identified that would be applicable to this project.
Criteria 6	9.50	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	28.50	

#### **EVALUATOR : 4**

#### FIRM : Carolina Transportation Engineers & Associates, PC

		bridge has adequate freeboard currently. Site challenges mentioned include mountainous terrain in delivering certain structural beams to the site, substandard horizontal alignment, and demolition/constructability impacts to the recreational use of the area. CTEA has a bridge replacement project on SC 183 over Twelve Mile Creek (upstream of RFP project).
		CTEA states no utilities are within anticipated construction limits.
Criteria 1	8.00	CTEA proposes to replace bridge on existing alignment, utilizing LVBC with anticipated criteria updates (no time table given on that). A 3-span (45' cored slab, 90' box beam, 45' cored slab) bridge on single column interior bents and spread footing or piles drilled in rock for end bents is recommended. CTEA mentions using top down construction, where they would construct the end spans first, designing them to support crane loads to construct the middle span. An additional slab than what's required for the bridge will be provided to add roadway curvature onto the bridge to aid with the substandard horizontal alignment. The hydraulics will be improved with use of a single column bent instead of a wall pier that was not aligned with the creek flow. The 90' box beam should span the creek width, including 5' setbacks from stream limits. CTEA states that the maximum practical girder length limit to be delivered to the site is 90', but will confirm with the trucking company used primarily in the state. The north end bent is proposed to be constructed in front of existing end bent if hydraulic analysis supports this. This design choice would allow the 20 mph roadway design speed and eliminate cut slopes or retaining walls, but require a design variance. CTEA mentions having the super elevation transition on the bridge, which is not preferred per the RDM. Low point will be relocated off of the bridge; a specific distance isn't mentioned.
		CTEA presents a table showing 6 road alternatives for the project that were analyzed before settling on the recommended 45-90-45 configuration. Each alternative details the pros and cons. Alternatives included shorter steel beam sections to be field spliced, prestressed concrete girders, and curved bridge alignment.
		For aesthetics, a MASH compliant rail from TXDOT is recommended. This rail was approved for SC 72 RBO CSX in Whitmire. On the north approach, CTEA proposes a moment slab barrier wall to address any guardrail post installation concerns given the shallow rock presence.
		CTEA will develop a Project Management Plan. A chart of the typical contract milestone schedule is included, showing the flow of the project development process.

Criteria 2	6.00	CTEA provides a table showing the services requested in the RFP and which firms have experience in those services. Years of service are not provided.
		Another table is provided showing the RFP project's potential conflicts/issues and how the team personnel can address those from previous experience. All 10 various issues and past experience are relevant and fairly recent.
		With respect to responsiveness, 3 previous bridge projects are listed, each with a project description, testimonial, and project schedule. The testimonials speak well to CTEA's responsiveness and communication. Accelerated project schedules were requested and achieved on all projects.
	8.00	PM has 28 years of various experience working with DOT, ranging from roles in maintenance, construction, project management, and asset management. Years specific to project management are not provided. 3 relevant bridge replacement projects are listed, one being over the same creek as the RFP project. Sufficient detail is included for each project in how it relates to the RFP project.
Criteria 3		APM/Structures lead has more than 34 years of experience in planning, design, and management, and he has managed and/or designed over 100 bridge projects. 3 relevant bridge replacement projects are listed, one being over the same creek as the RFP project. Sufficient detail is included for each project in how it relates to the RFP project. 1 of the projects is the bridge replacement 8 miles away from RFP project. Project in Anderson County uses LVBC and has recreational facilities.
		Road lead has 35 years of experience in management/design.
		Constructability lead doesn't list years of experience. 3 relevant bridge replacement projects are listed, similar to the Structures lead. Lead has familiarity with the PCB contamination on the other Twelve Mile Creek project.
		Hydraulic lead has over 36 years of experience. 2 of the 3 projects listed are relevant to the RFP project. Scour assessment and management system isn't applicable here given the presence of shallow rock.
		Environmental lead has 23 years of experience.
Criteria 4	7.00	5 projects are listed with a good representation of key personnel involved. 4 of those projects are bridge replacements over waterways. CPE scores range from 7.7 to 8.3. Testimonials from RPGs other than Upstate attest to the consultant's ability to meet milestones, responsiveness, and quality deliverables. Specific key staff names are listed, instead of the firm.

Criteria 5	7.00	CTEA demonstrates good knowledge of SCDOT practices and procedures based on their involvement with developing the department's design manuals, standards, and details. Additionally, they participate in local civil engineering committees. A table of project relevant design manual criteria is presented for bridge, hydro, roadway, environmental, and geotech. Most criteria are accurate and applicable.
Criteria 6	9.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	45.30	

#### **EVALUATOR: 4**

#### FIRM : Cox and Dinkins, Inc.

		Anticipated replacement challenges are listed. Among those are the existing horizontal alignment for low speeds, clear zone issues, recreational user issues, mountainous terrain impacting delivery of construction materials, and debris. Road and bridge design work are performed by different firms.
Criteria 1		3 roadway alternatives are presented, one of which is not feasible givens the ROW and environmental impacts of replacing bridge off alignment. Alt 3 is similar to Alt 1 in bridge length and alignment, with Alt 3 (the preferred alternative for C&D) introducing roadway curvature on the north end span to address the existing, substandard horizontal alignment. Both Alt 1 and 3 are 3 span (45'-90'-45') configurations and utilize single column interior bents with hammerheads. To achieve the curvature on the bridge, the beams will still be straight but angled slightly. Similar to other proposals, interior bents are drilled shafts, and end bents are either drilled steel piles or spread footings on rock. Proposed beams are prestressed AASHTO Type III for end spans and Type IV for main span, which will likely require grade raise. The impacts of raising grade are not discussed.
	5.00	C&D include a section on liability concern for DOT with current on shoulder parking near the bridge. A graphic from the Twelve Mile River Blueway shows recreational roadside parking at the bridge, despite the limited shoulder space to accommodate vehicles. The potential solution proposes to extend guardrail limits and install signage to prevent parking. Additionally, C&D recommends the county get an easement from BASF corporation to allow parking near the their pump station. While this is a solution to address safety, it prevents DOT from being able to adequately address recreational access and relies on a private entity to grant access (which is not likely).
		Public involvement is highlighted as their first priority. Key stakeholders are identified, and the context sensitive design coordinator lives 8 miles away. Aesthetic features are listed and include brown color dye in the concrete mix, stone formed face for the parapets, brown painted steel beams (even though a steel bridge option wasn't presented), and weathered steel guardrail with wood posts. C&D did not discuss whether guardrail would be MASH compliant.
		C&D anticipates a CE for this project. They acknowledge that the creek is owned by USACE Savannah District and may involve USACE coordination/permitting per their shoreline management plan. Potential FERC coordination is mentioned, despite the lake being owned by USACE and not a private entity. Due to no wetland presence and limited stream impacts, a Regional General Permit 4 is expected. Stream credits are shown to be available from nearby mitigation bank. Protected species are listed with recommendations for survey times

Criteria 2	6.00	<ul> <li>A graphic is provided with each firm and their respective tasks and personnel/experience. All firms show past experience (generic) with respect to DOT projects, standards, and practices.</li> <li>A table shows the list of key personnel, their respective tasks, and specific project experience. The project experience column lists numerous bridge replacement projects over waterways. However, there are no details speaking to project relevant specifics.</li> <li>CPE scores are presented for four review periods of three different bridge replacements. Scores are 8 or 9 out of 10 with the same evaluator stating consultant has good or excellent responsiveness. The table should include CPE scores from various evaluators if possible, and not the same one.</li> </ul>
Criteria 3	4.00	<ul> <li>PM has 39 years experience, with 38 years being DOT related projects. He has managed the design of over 100 bridges for DOT. Seven bridge replacement projects over waterways are listed, with the half being related to the RFP project with respect to length, on-alignment replacement, recreational use, and roadway width.</li> <li>For the APM and other leads, the number of years of experience or projects worked on/managed are not listed in this section. 2 to 3 projects are listed for each lead, with almost all being bridge replacements over waterways. However, the descriptions to these projects are fairly short.</li> <li>For future proposals, I recommend a one to two sentence description of years experience in related task and number of projects worked on/managed for each lead in this section. Additionally for each listed project, list key words that relate the presented projects to the RFP project.</li> </ul>
Criteria 4	7.00	The proposal include a good representation of DOT CPE scores and testimonials for the key personnel involved. Scores range from 7.7 to 9.2. Testimonials speak to good responsiveness, collaboration, schedule adherence, engagement, and flexibility. One particular testimonial speaks to flexibility to incorporate new DOT requirements that were not scoped originally. This may be the case given the new Structures Design Manual being issued soon.
Criteria 5	5.00	A table of applicable design standards, practices, and procedures is provided for various tasks. No potential design variances are listed and what design criteria they would be applied to. LVBC is generically stated, but subcriteria and conformance examples would be helpful.
Criteria 6	9.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	36.30	

#### **EVALUATOR: 4**

#### FIRM : Holt Consulting Company, LLC

	1	וחטוג טוטטטפיג גע עצי בע אנגו ווועוגוטופ פציומגוטווג וטר גווג טוטופנג. גווווומן גע מ טוטופנג נוופע כטווטופגפט וו
Criteria 1	6.00	Anderson County. Some similarities include upstate location, secondary road using LVBC, steep slopes at bridge end, sharp horizontal curvature, and low point on existing bridge. One deviation includes use of retaining walls at south end instead of 2:1 slopes. Holt plans to use the LVBC allowing existing horizontal and vertical alignment to be maintained if within 15 mph of design speed. Some other context sensitive solutions include using compressed shoulder guardrail, super elevation throughout the bridge and approaches, using wall abutments in lieu of spill through, using box beams as the main span, and using shallow foundations. The roadway profile will be slightly raised to accommodate the new structure and move the low point off of the bridge and at least 50' away from bridge ends. From the provided graphic of the anticipated profile, the grade rise looks to be approximately 4'. Impacts and from grade rise and mitigation strategies were not discussed thoroughly. Bridge and road design work are performed by different firms.
		Two alternative are provided: on-alignment replacement and off-alignment. The off-alignment is not preferred due to multiple disadvantages, such as ROW/environmental impacts and rock presence. The preferred bridge alternative uses cored slab end spans and box beam main span due to multiple factors, including ease of construction, least amount of cost, and schedule convenience. Prestressed concrete beams (FIB and AASHTO) were considered, but ultimately ruled out due to delivery concerns and roadway tie-in work. Weathering steel girder was considered, but ruled out due to price fluctuation and corrosion issues. Spread footings may be used if permitted. Otherwise, interior bents will be drilled shafts socketed in rock, and end bents will be steel piles drilled into rock. No discussion on how many shafts per bent or type of cap to address debris entrapment.
		Under the plan development section, Holt presents a table for anticipated project milestones with a Letting in 9/2027. The current programmed scheduled has 12/2026 letting, which is at least in the same fiscal year. Roadway plan development is not accurately described. DOT expects Design Criteria first, then preliminary plan development with a DFR before ROW Plans submittal. Proposal lists DFR post ROW Plans submittal, but does not include one before. The proposal includes a section on the QC/QA process under Holt's QMP, detailing how QC checklists per PCDM 22 and use of Bluebeam will be used.
		A PCE is expected for this project. Holt confirmed that there are no active FERC licenses on Lake Hartwell, so no FERC coordination is required. A table of NEPA considerations is presented with impacts marked as anticipated or not. Hazardous materials was stated as not having impacts. However, based on other proposals, PCB contaminants were present previously (and cleaned up). There should be an analysis to determine if construction activities (is drilling) will agitate any latent containments. Holt correctly identifies coordination proded with LSACE

Criteria 2	5.00	A table shows which key members and other critical members can perform the various tasks include in the RFP. Years of experience for each member would have been helpful.
		Two design build bridge package projects are listed as examples of responsiveness with durations between NTP dates and RFC plans being short. Bid-build projects would be better representations of the RFP project.
		Instead of the generic write-up on responsiveness, the proposal should speak to responsiveness to QC/QA reviews, discussions with Support on potential design variances, or addressing any RPG comments on the anticipated Bridge Alternate Report.
	4.00	PM has managed and/or designed 50 DOT projects. The team has been involved in 250 projects. The key individuals have 122 combined years of DOT experience.
Criteria 3		PM has 16 years of experience in management, design, and development, but number of projects isn't listed. 4 bridge replacement projects are listed as relevant experience, 3 of which utilized LVBC.
		Road lead has 14 years of experience, but number of projects isn't listed. 3 bridge replacement projects are shown, one utilizing LVBC.
		Structures lead has 34 years of experience, but number of projects isn't listed. 3 non relevant bridge replacement projects are listed. None utilize the preferred superstructure, and all are over turnpikes.
		Hydro lead has 21 years of experience. Geotech lead has 15 years of experience. Environmental/NEPA lead has 22 years of experience. Listing relevant project experience for NEPA would be helpful.
		5 bridge replacement projects are listed, showing staff projects role and related project elements, with 2 projects using LVC. Projects listed do not include Structures lead in any role. 2 of the projects feature a bridge configuration similar to what is being proposed by Holt (roughly 160' in length, cored slabs, 30' wide).
Criteria 4	6.00	The proposal includes a table with CPE scores and testimonials for 4 bridge replacement projects over waterways. CPE scores averaged around 7.5 out of 10 for review periods dating back to Fall 2021. Testimonials speak well of PM's performance, responsiveness, and communication, as well as schedule adherence. This section needs more representation of key personnel and not just the PM.

Criteria 5	4.00	<ul> <li>Holt presents a table, highlighting their relevant project experience and it relates to the requested types of services. 9 different projects are listed, 3 of them using LVBC and 5 using precast concrete beams.</li> <li>A generic table of applicable manuals is presented. A table of specific design standards is included. It would have been helpful to list any potential deviations, variances, exceptions and the applicable criteria.</li> <li>The proposal discusses how the roadway classification is rural, yet a curb and sidewalk design criteria is listed (not applicable).</li> </ul>
Criteria 6	9.40	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	34.40	

#### **EVALUATOR: 4**

#### FIRM : J. Bragg Consulting, Inc.

		Jubragy contectly identifies some of the existing project site conditions from the Stak report and held observation, T
		as well as the recreational use near the project. Bridge and road design work performed by different firms.
		The Project Organization and Management section correctly identifies some of the key tasks and responsibilities to be performed for any project. JBragg commits to delivering the project ahead of the proposed FY 2027 letting if funding is available earlier.
		CE is anticipated for this project. Wetlands are not present, but if discovered to be, a Permittee Responsible Mitigation plan will be prepared (no wetland mitigation credits available). Proposal identifies two stream mitigation banks available. Potential coordination may be required with USACE Savannah District. Endangered species are listed. The PCB contamination cleanup is mentioned. General Permit is anticipated from USACE. Permit from SCDHEC is required for navigable water.
		Public Involvement section identifies potential PIM locations and stakeholders.
Criteria 1	4.00	A roadway design criteria table is presented. For lane and shoulder widths, J Bragg recommends using 11' lanes and 6' shoulders if the truck % on the SI&A form is accurate. This option would have large ROW and environmental impacts given the current footprint of 9' lanes and 2'-3' shoulders. The vertical alignment subsection recommends using LVBC to retain existing alignment, but keep low point off bridge and 50' away from ends. No discussion is included about LVBC criteria (+/- 15 mph design speed) for the horizontal alignment, which could be helpful. However, the ultimate recommendation following the table prefers to keep existing alignments with minor shoulder improvements and potentially paved shoulder widening for recreational users.
		Bridge is located in a FEMA Zone AE with no floodway designation. However, mapping and studies may be outdated. Potential overtopping of the bridge in the past is mentioned and will be investigated, but J Bragg notes that the deck elevation is 5' above the FEMA 100 year flood elevation. Bridge design event will be 25 year storm. CLOMR/LOMR is not anticipated.
		The proposal states that the bridge will use LVBC without design exceptions, but a design variance may be needed for minor alignment improvements. Proposed bridge is a curved 3-span (70'-70'-70') AASHTO Type III beam bridge. Cored slabs were ruled out due to super elevation requirements based on design speed. Interior bents are proposed to be single column on top rock-socketed drill shafts with hammerhead bent caps to address debris accumulation. End bonts will be knowed into rock. Walks are proposed at the approaches to limit fill.

		PM has 28 years of experience (mostly non bridge projects).
Criteria 2	5.00	Environmental documentation/NEPA lead has 22 years of experience with several bridge projects listed. PI lead has 17 years of experience. Environmental permitting lead has 17 years of experience with some bridge projects listed. Structures lead has 17 years of experience. Roadway lead has 24 years of experience. Hydro lead has 24 years of experience. Geotech lead has 14 years of experience. Overall, the proposal includes an above average amount of experience for the required tasks.
		PM commits to responding within 24 hours. Testimonials speaking to responsiveness are not provided in this section. Availability is presented for the key personnel and other task leads.
Criteria 3	3.00	PM has 27 years of experience in managing and designing, but number of projects is not listed. 2 bridge projects are listed, with one project involving three bridge replacements over waterways. Listed projects used cored slab structures, which is not the type proposed for the RFP project. Relevant project details are not included.
		For the Structures lead, 3 bridge projects are listed, where he served as bridge lead and PM. None of the project include descriptions or relevant facts.
		For the Road lead, 3 projects are listed with one being a bridge replacement over waterway. Relevant project details are not listed.
		For the Hydro lead, 3 projects listed are bridge replacements over waterways, but lack descriptions and relevant details.
		Environmental documentation lead has 22 years of experience. None of the listed projects are relevant.
Criteria 4	7.00	The proposal includes a table of past projects, the respective client, and the CPE scores and/or testimonials. The table has a good representation of the key personnel involved. While the listed projects are not representative of the RFP project, the testimonials speak highly of the PM's responsiveness, adaptability, and competence.
		The two testimonials for the bridge lead speak well to delivering quality products on schedule. The testimonials for the Geotech lead speak well to their communication and quality.

Criteria 5	4.00	The proposal includes a table of generic manuals applicable to the project. Another table is included to demonstrate their knowledge of standards. However, none of the listed projects are relevant to the RFP project. J Bragg participated in the development of the 2017 RDM and the 2009 Hydraulic Design Studies. The last section discusses applicable design criteria for the project. The LVBC for retaining existing alignments is noted. The rest of the criteria are generic. I'd recommend including the jointless bridge provision since Type III bridge is proposed. If super elevation is required, list applicable rates and where transitions are allowed per RDM.
Criteria 6	9.50	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	32.50	

#### **EVALUATOR : 4**

#### FIRM : Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	<ul> <li>No acknowledges that design variances and exceptions will be needed to delive intris project. The proposal states the anticipated purpose is to address the structural deficiencies (replacement) and then enhance access to the river for recreational users. NS correctly details the existing facility, specifically noting the substandard vertical and horizontal alignment, given the posted 35 mph speed. The proposal notes that while the AADT meets the LVBC, it suggests that the channel width is at or above 100'. Other proposals note that width being 80', meeting LVBC. Design exceptions would be used to reduce the construction impacts. A design speed of 25 mph will be proposed. The proposal roadway includes 11' wide lanes and 6' wide shoulders, which is larger than the anticipated 10' lanes, 4' shoulders.</li> <li>Non-programmatic CE is anticipated. Anticipated permits include USACE: Section 404, Shoreline Management, potential Section 408, SCDHEC: Section 401, Navigable waters, DOE/FERC, and USCG Exemption. Note, other proposals state no private entity uses Lake Hartwell for power generation, so FERC coordination wouldn't be needed. NS states that no wellands are present, and stream impacts are minimal to allow project to be permitted under Regional General Permit 4. USACE coordination would be with Savannah District. NS points out that there are stream credits from a nearby mitigation bank. Due to the Twelve Mile Blueway Trail presence, potential Section 4F permitting may be needed. A list of protected species is included.</li> <li>The Public Involvement section identifies key stakeholders and potential PIM locations. NS notes that BASF Corp is a unique key stakeholder, since they own a raw water intake structure on the creek near the project site.</li> <li>NS states that close and detour is the preferable traffic control option due to low traffic volumes. Note, the bridge is currently closed. Therefore, close and detour should be the only option.</li> <li>Old road bed from existing alignment would be used</li></ul>
------------	------	---

11/7/2023 Page 51 of 67

Criteria 2		The proposal includes a table showing the previous working relationships of the design team, stating the specific project, project features, duration, and the various project members. The table shows a good representation of the tasks requested in the RFP.
		8 projects are listed. 4 of the 8 show good past working relationships among the NS members, F&ME, R&D, PAN, and OLH. Only 1 project include the Structural Lead (RS&H).
	6.00	Qualifications for key personnel are presented in Technical Criteria 3. This section presents the qualifications of other team members. For the key personnel, PM has 22 years of experience. DM has almost 20 years of experience. Structures lead has 15 years; Roadway lead has 12 years; Hydraulics lead has 23 years; Geotech lead has 15 years; NEPA lead has 23 years; Permitting lead has 9 years. The majority of past projects listed for the key personnel are bridge replacements over waterways.
		In the responsiveness section, testimonials from 4 different projects are included (from 3 DOT PMs). Each speak highly of NS's responsiveness.
		Bridge and road work performed by different firms.

Criteria 3	6.00	PM has 22 years of experience in project management, design management, and roadway design. 3 bridge replacements projects are listed (2 over waterways). 1 of those 3 is semi-relevant. I anticipated to see more similar projects to the RFP project. The projects listed are larger in scale and limits, being US routes.
		This is the only proposal to list a DM role, which will be very helpful, given that this is more of a design project than ROW/util/public involvement project. DM has had at least 14 years working with a DOT. 3 bridge replacement projects are listed (2 over waterways). The two waterway projects include relevant project details (USFWS, NFS, substandard roadway geometry, secondary roads).
		Structural lead has 15 years of experience. Two bridge replacements over waterways are included, one being on a secondary road and one on an interstate. The secondary road project has future tenses for plan development. The interstate project was under a design-build project. Listed projects should be relevant projects, ideally under traditional design-bid-build, performed in the past.
		Roadway lead does not feature relevant past projects. Overall, I would have preferred relevant past projects to include more secondary road ways, some utilizing LVBC, recreational user access, and challenging surrounding terrain.
		Other leads experience is noted in review of Technical Criteria 2.
Criteria 4	6.00	NS includes 5 past bridge replacement projects (4 over waterways). US 301 project includes one relevant project detail (mitigation strategies to minimize river impacts). US 601 project include several relevant details (complex bridge geometry, constructability challenges given alignment, innovative geotechnical design, Zone AE FEMA). US 76 over US 601 does not have relevant project details. The design bid package listed does not provide relevant project details. S-752 project (in progress) includes RS&H structures involvement. Relevant project details are not listed.
		Proposals should include more relevant projects.
		8 client testimonials are provided, providing good representation of four lead firms (NS, RS&H, F&ME, R&D). All speak highly to quality, responsiveness, and communication. 7 CPE ratings are provided, ranging from 7.0 to 9.0, for NS. RS&H has a one rating at 7.4. F&ME have 2 ratings, averaging 9.0.

Criteria 5	6.00	NS has worked with various DOTs for 30 years, holding multiple on-call contracts. Two design members have past participation on SCDOT/ACEC-SC Roadway Design committee. The proposal includes a chart with three projects that have similar applicable design criteria. One of those criteria lists Public Involvement coordination on determining a detour. The bridge in RFP is currently closed and detoured. NS includes a very detailed flow chart of the project development process that shows good understanding of DOT's process. A list of recent design memos is included, demonstrating that NS is engaged with DOT communications. The list of BDM applicable criteria is fairly generic. Weathering steel provisions are listed. Given the early discussion on use of design exceptions and variances being necessary, this section should have listed which design criteria would need that.
Criteria 6	9.00	*** As of 8 25 23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator )
	3.00	
TOTAL	39.00	

#### **EVALUATOR: 4**

#### FIRM : Parrish & Partners, LLC

Criteria 1	6.00	<ul> <li>Par states contextuar components to the project need to be understood (le historic steer itsis bridge, historic dams, PCB sediment contamination, and river recreation). USACE has indicated that sediment testing would be required as part of acquiring additional ROW within the lake shoreline area; not sure how far up that extends along the creek. P&amp;P points out that the Blueway Trail Map identifies the bridge site as an unofficial access location, despite there being limited roadside parking.</li> <li>The proposal evaluates several alternatives: on-alignment, off-alignment, and minimal relocated centerline (preferred). The preferred alt would correct existing substandard horizontal alignment, minimize impacts to large cuts, and create more river access; however, requires earth retaining structures. The proposed bridge is a curved 3-span (70'-70'-70') AASHTO Type III beam bridge, supported by single drilled shaft with a hammerhead bent cap. The single column interior bents provide less obstruction for recreational users. However, a single interior bent (like existing structure) would be optimal. Overtopping of the bridge is noted. Several structural alts are presented with pros and cons. For single span bridges, P&amp;P evaluates prestressed beams, steel beams, and cored slab/box beams. Cored slabs were ruled out because they require straight roadway alignment, but roadway horizontal curvature could be started on the bridge if widened enough to the west. The preferred option ended up being prestressed beams given less maintenance. Since the main channel is approximately 80', I expected a more balanced 3-span bridge configuration (roughly 60'-90'-60'). This would allow interior bents out of the stream. P&amp;P doesn't discuss the aesthetics possible with prestressed bridge or the parapets (form face patterns, see through rails, etc). Low points will be placed 50' from ends of bridge. Once survey is received, P&amp;P will analyze whether the existing K values for the vertical curves meet the LVBC for using exis</li></ul>
		protected species is included. Coordination with USACE Savannah District (point of contract provided) will be required. No wetlands were identified in the project site. PCB sediment testing would be required for removal of the existing spread footing in channel, and F&ME has past experience with PCB testing and remediation. P&P anticipates a CE for this project. Based on preliminary talks with the USACE, no FERC or USACE Section 408 permitting will be required. P&P provides the great detail with respect to USACE coordination for new ROW if

		The proposal lists 29 bridge replacements over waterways as similar bridge project experience (9 being on secondary routes).
		A table of key/critical members are included with their role, years of experience, and project experience. The PM/Structures Lead has 17 years of experience. Roadway lead has 25 years; Environmental Lead has 31 years, and Hydro lead has 25 years. Collectively, the table includes 10 team members, totaling for 241 years of experience.
Criteria 2	6.00	The proposal also includes a table with the selected subconsultants and how many previous P&P projects they have worked on. P&P have had good previous experience with F&ME and NSA. The rest of the subconsultants do not. The environmental firm only has 1 previous project with P&P.
		They offer to have weekly meetings if desired for a collaborative approach. A past project timeline is presented with a duration of approximately 3.5 months from NTP to RFC plan submittal. The timeline is impressive, but not necessarily speaking to responsiveness. I expected some testimonials from this project to speak to communication and responsiveness.
		Bridge and road design work are performed by same firm.

Criteria 3		PM has 17 years of experience and has served as the APM and/or Lead Bridge Engineer for more than 25 DOT bridge replacement projects. Has a bridge background. Background info indicates he has experience with various types of superstructure materials. 7 bridge replacement projects are listed under experience (all over waterways; 4 being secondary roads). Relevant project details are not listed. Proposal should include any past LVBC projects.
	6.00	Roadway lead has 25 years of experience, which helps in understanding the coordination involved with other disciplines. None of the list projects under experience are relevant to the RFP project. If bridges are included in the listed widening projects, they need to be listed.
		Environmental lead has 31 years of experience in NEPA, Section 401/404 permitting, agency coordination, and public involvement. She currently manages General Permits for other DOT bridge projects. 5 projects are listed under experience (all bridge replacements, with 4 being over waterways). Relevant project details are not listed.
		Hydraulic lead has 25 years of experience. 3 bridge replacement projects over waterways and participation in DOT Statewide Bridge Scour Assessment are listed under experience. Given the shallow presence of rock, I don't anticipate scour being critical. Relevant project details are not listed.
		Geotech lead has 15 years of experience.

		The proposal includes 9 past projects (5 of them under P&P and the rest under the subconsultants). All projects show an above average representation of key personnel involved. Each project includes average relevant details to the RFP project. 3 of the 5 projects are primary (US, SC) routes, and the other 2 are secondary routes.
		Two of the projects involved recreational access. US 521 and S-39 were both 3-span AASHTO type beam bridges, similar to what is proposed for the RFP project.
Criteria 4	6.00	I anticipated more secondary bridge replacements of similar low volume nature, specifically designed to LVBC, or even including a bridge with steel girders to show range in bridge design.
		THC is incorrectly labeled as survey on-call. For NSA, archaeological and historic resources are listed as a past project, but is not relevant for the RFP project. R&D and NSA should have projects listed that reflect recreational access/permits and navigable, USACE coordination projects.
		8 CPE ratings and testimonials are provided with scores ranging from 6 to 8.6. Testimonials speak well to exceeding schedule milestones and being responsive.
		The proposal includes a table of P&P SCDOT Experience with 8 different team members having a total of 200 years of SCDOT experience on 745 SCDOT projects.
	6.00	P&P notes that they are currently tasked with revising SCDOT structural standard drawings to reflect the new, forth-coming Structures Design Manual.
Unteria 3	0.00	The proposal includes another table, highlighting 3 project specific BDM requirements: hammerhead caps, bent locations and setbacks, and deck overhang widths.
		Another table shows the specific SC Design practices unique to this site. Most of the referenced criteria are fairly generic, applying to most bridges.
Criteria 6	8.70	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	38.70	

#### **EVALUATOR : 5**

#### FIRM : A. Morton Thomas and Associates, Inc.

Criteria 1	8.00	Recognizes importance to local community and paddlers when making design decisions during the development process. States good candidate for design per Low Volume Criteria. Recommends 3 span cored slab bridge resulting in minimal profile adjustments. All proposed options have single column interior bents that will allow for a skewed bridge and reduce debris collection. Hydro section is generic and states requirements that need to be met however lacks project/alternative specific impacts.
Criteria 2	8.00	Team demonstrates they have the personnel and experience to provide all services. Major design discipline (Bridge and Road) are performed by the prime. States PM and DPM strive to return calls and emails within 24hr.
Criteria 3	7.00	Proposal provides specific experience of the project manager and design leads, however does not list specific experience of other key individuals.
Criteria 4	8.00	Proposal shows references for two of their bridge replacement projects one of which state AMT exceeded expectations. Proposal also show favorable CPE scores obtained by there supporting sub consultants in the areas of Load Rating, Permitting and Geotechnical services.
Criteria 5	9.00	Proposal shows many of the departments design standards and their project specific application.
Criteria 6	9.10	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	49.10	

#### **EVALUATOR : 5**

#### FIRM : AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	Inconsistent bridge lead shown on work chart and in Plan Development section (p10). Proposes 3 span(65'-70'- 65') prestressed concrete cored slab bridge which will minimize grade raise. Proposal states there is shallow rock and drilled piles/shallow foundation may be used at end bents with drilled shafts at interior bents. Shows three alternate alignments based on Low Volume Bridge Criteria, 25mph design speed and 35mph design speed. Off alignments options would cause significant impacts. There is no mention on bridge skew or if a super elevated bridge deck will be required due to close proximity to the roadway curves.
Criteria 2	6.00	Team demonstrates they have the personnel and experience to provide all services. It is preferred that bridge design services be performed by the prime. Demonstrates the ability to be responsive by quoting favorable comments by past clients.
Criteria 3	6.00	Proposal provides a general bio of the design leads however lacks specific project examples. Specific experience is provided for PM and DPM.
Criteria 4	5.00	Proposal provides a number of CPE score as well as quotes from past clients for bridge replacement projects for the prime firm (AECOM) and well as ICE. Scores range from 7.4 to 9.0. AECOM is shown as preparing plans for Woodruff Road however they did not.
Criteria 5	7.00	Proposal shows many of the departments design standards, however it is very general to how they apply.
Criteria 6	8.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	38.30	

#### **EVALUATOR : 5**

#### FIRM : ATCS, PLC

Criteria 1	7.00	Disadvantages to the proposed preferred alternative are not discussed in the alternatives section (p4). Proposal has an alternate then states in disadvantages that the alternative is not constructible. Provide true constructible alternatives. Recognizes importance to local community and paddlers when making design decisions during the development process. Proposes maintaining the existing structure depth of approximate 38" as to not control the need for substantial grade raise. Recommends 2-span (90-90) weathering steel bridge. Proposed 30degree bridge skew. Hydro section is generic and states requirements that need to be met however lacks project/alternative specific impacts.
Criteria 2	7.00	Team demonstrates they have the personnel and experience to provide all services. It is preferred that road design services be performed by the prime. Commits to respond to email and phone calls the same day as well as being on the project site or available to meet face to face within a 24hr notice.
Criteria 3	7.00	Proposal provides bios for PM's and design leads as well as other key individuals. They also provide a general list of relevant projects that is lacking detail on project specifics,
Criteria 4	6.00	ATCS provides project descriptions of past bridge replacement projects, however some show key personnel that are not anticipated to work on this project and are not in the work chart such as PM and Road Design Lead for BR-0009 Replace Bridge and BP9-R007 Replace Bridge No The project descriptions do not show any performance measures. ATCS provides favorable quotes for past clients as well as CPE score for sub consultant HOLT
Criteria 5	7.00	Proposal shows many of the departments design standards, however it is very general to how they apply.
Criteria 6	9.50	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	43.50	

#### **EVALUATOR : 5**

#### FIRM : Carolina Transportation Engineers & Associates, PC

Criteria 1	9.00	Recognizes importance to local community and paddlers when making design decisions during the development process. States they are using a LVBRC that will include updates anticipated to be in effect before NTP. Criteria 1 clearly states consultants preferred alternate which uses cored slabs for end spans and box beam for interior span. Also recommends slight widening of shoulder to accommodate cure at north end. Proposal also state this widening will remove the need for retaining walls. Addresses road approaches and guardrails stiffness transitions with the use of moments slabs. Addresses bridge supperelevation and how asphalt will be use for the transition. Hydraulic section states that the bridge is not anticipated to be hydraulically controlled.
Criteria 2	8.00	Team demonstrates they have the personnel and experience to provide all services. Major design discipline (Bridge and Road) are performed by the prime. Includes a chart with specific tasks and issues that may arise and who on their team would be responsible. Team demonstrates the ability to be responsive by show a chart which includes specific projects with aggressive schedules and favorable comments form these clients.
Criteria 3	9.00	Proposal provides bios and specific project experience for PM, design leads, and key individuals that is relevant to this contract. Projects are described in-depth and relevance is also detailed.
Criteria 4	8.00	Proposal shows five CPE scores for bridge replacement projects averaging around 7.5. Key staff involved are shown on work chart. Along with these scores are favorable quotes from past clients. Mention awards that have been won.
Criteria 5	9.00	Proposal shows many of the departments design standards and their project specific application.
Criteria 6	9.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	52.30	

#### **EVALUATOR : 5**

#### FIRM : Cox and Dinkins, Inc.

Criteria 1	7.00	Proposal shows three different alignment alternatives. Their preferred alignment shows an on alignment
		r toposai shows three different alignment alternatives. Their preferred alignment shows all on alignment
		replacement with a proposed 250'R cure at the north side of the bridge. The last bridge span will be constructed
		on the horizontal cure. Proposal shows Type III beams at end spans and Type IV beams at the interior span. This
		superstructure type could cause a increase in grade raise and additional impacts.
Criteria 2	7.00	Team demonstrates they have the personnel and experience to provide all services. It is preferred that bridge
		design services be performed by the prime. Cox and Dinkins shows scores of 8 & 9 (out of 10) for
		responsiveness.
Criteria 3	7.00	Proposal provides experience of PM, APM and other key individuals, as well as non key individuals that have
		years of design experience. Specific experience is shown by listing past project however project list lack specific
		project detail and role and responsibilities.
Criteria 4	8.00	Proposal shows six CPE scores for the prime and subs on bridge replacement projects averaging around 8.4.
		Along with these scores are favorable quotes from past clients.
Criteria 5	8.00	Proposal shows many of the departments design standards, however it is general to how they apply.
Criteria 6	9.30	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	46.30	

#### **EVALUATOR : 5**

#### FIRM : Holt Consulting Company, LLC

Criteria 1	6.00	Team proposes 100' box beam interior span to span channel with 2-50' end spans. Team only lists advantages for their preferred alignment approach and disadvantages for their non preferred alignment approach. It would be helpful to know advantages and disadvantages for both alternatives. Team's off alignments approach states a disadvantage as not constructible due to creek alignment. Provide true constructible alternatives. There is concern if a 100' beam can be delivered to site.
Criteria 2	7.00	Team demonstrates they have the personnel and experience to provide all services. It is preferred that bridge design services be performed by the prime. Demonstrates the ability to be responsive by providing examples of two bridge replacement project with aggressive schedules.
Criteria 3	6.00	Proposal provides bios and specific project experience for PM, design leads, and key individuals that is relevant to this contract. Projects are described in-depth and relevance is also detailed. Prime was not involved in bridge design of shown example projects. Provide example of sub that have bridge design experience,
Criteria 4	7.00	Proposal shows four bridge replacement projects each with a number of CPE scores averaging out around 7.4. Performance evaluation scores are only provided for the proposed PM, recommend adding performance measures for other key individuals and subs.
Criteria 5	8.00	Proposal shows many of the departments design standards and their project specific application. It is not anticipated curbed sections of roadway will be used.
Criteria 6	9.40	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	43.40	

#### **EVALUATOR : 5**

#### FIRM : J. Bragg Consulting, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	Team is proposing a 3 span Type III beam bridge that is curved. Due to beam type there is a good possibility that retaining walls will be required. Proposed single column bents will help hydraulic requirements as proposed bridge is not skewed to the channel. Recommend 11' land and 6' shoulders that would increase project impacts. This is not consistent with proposed I ow Volume Criteria
Criteria 2	7.00	Team demonstrates they have the personnel and experience to provide all services. It is preferred that bridge design services be performed by the prime. States they are know to be responsive within 24hr. Shows table with and average availability of key and task leads at 23hr/week.
Criteria 3	7.00	Proposal provides bio's and project references that are related to this project. Team member references specific tasks that they performed on that project. Also client contacts are included for the referenced projects.
Criteria 4	8.00	Proposal provides one CPE score and positive quotes from past clients for the PM. Also shows CPE scores and positive testimonials of major sub consultants. Total average CPE score is around 8.4
Criteria 5	7.00	Proposal shows many of the departments design standards and notes on how they where used past, however it is not specific to how they apply to this specific project.
Criteria 6	9.50	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	44.50	

#### **EVALUATOR : 5**

#### FIRM : Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

Criteria 1	6.00	Team states Low Volume Criteria cannot be met. It is recommended Low Volume Criteria be pursued in order to limit roadway impacts. Proposes 2-Span 192' long steel girder bridge. Team should show other alternated considered with advantages and disadvantages of each.
Criteria 2	6.00	Team demonstrates they have the personnel and experience to provide all services. It is preferred that bridge design services be performed by the prime. Proposal show favorable quoted relating to responsiveness from past clients. Individuals shown in "Structural Design" are not shown in work chart as performing structural design only QA/QC.
Criteria 3	9.00	Proposal provides bios and specific project experience for PM, design leads, and key individuals that is relevant to this contract. Projects are described in-depth and relevance is also detailed.
Criteria 4	8.00	Proposal provides positive quotes form past clients as well as recent CPE scores for prime and major sub consultants. Total average of cpe score provided is around 8.2
Criteria 5	8.00	Proposal shows design manual and standards used by the department, department policy used on past projects and in general show design standards that will likely be most applicable to project. Shows project development chart.
Criteria 6	9.00	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	46.00	

#### **EVALUATOR: 5**

#### FIRM : Parrish & Partners, LLC

Criteria 1	8.00	Team is proposing a 3 span Type III beam bridge that is curved. Due to beam type there is a good possibility that retaining walls will be required. Proposed single column bents will help hydraulic requirements as proposed bridge is not skewed to the channel. Team give advantages and disadvantages to both road alignments and bridge types.
Criteria 2	7.00	Team demonstrates they have the personnel and experience to provide all services. Major design discipline (Bridge and Road) are performed by the prime. Demonstrates responsiveness by showing an example of Sawneys Creek a bridge replacement that was completed and open to traffic 1 year from NTP. Similar bridge projects shown does not specifically show how they relate to this project.
Criteria 3	7.00	Proposal shows bio's and specific experience for PM and design leads. Specific project experience is shown as a list of projects however project list lacks specific project detail and role and responsibilities.
Criteria 4	6.00	Proposal provides a number of project summaries for bridge replacement projects. It also included a number of CPE scores and positive quotes for the prime consultant. Average total of provided CPE scores is 7.5. CPE score of sub consultants should also be included.
Criteria 5	9.00	Describes specific manuals and procedures and how they will be specifically applied to the project
Criteria 6	8.70	*** As of 8.25.23 (This score was added by an utilization evaluator.)
TOTAL	45.70	