Based on the evaluation group’s comprehensive review and discussion of the SOQs, we provide the following scoring to the Executive Level Evaluation Team:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Proposal Point Breakdown*** | **Beaver** | **Brayman/Swank** | **Ruhlin** | **Shelly and Sands** | **Triton** |
| **Part B - Project Management, Understanding and Approach (35 points max)** | **33** | **32** | **35** | **34** | **27** |
| **Part C - Design Build Project Team (30 points max)** | **30** | **27** | **27** | **27** | **26** |
| **Part D - Design Build Team Project Experience (35 points max)** | **31** | **33** | **31** | **35** | **28** |
| ***Totals*** | ***94*** | 92 | ***93*** | ***96*** | 81 |

**Summary of Submitted SOQ by Team**

**BEAVER |**TRC Engineers *\*SHORTLIST*

The offeror submitted a responsive SOQ. The Offeror team is very capable with an excellent history as an ODOT partner. The project understanding and approach lacked specifics to show comprehension of the major challenges related to this project.

**BRAYMAN/SWANK |** Parsons

The offeror submitted a responsive SOQ and the firms and personnel proposed have a record of successful work on projects of similar scope and complexity, but under different specifications. The designer was viewed as the strongest candidate.

**RUHLIN |** ms consultants *\*SHORTLIST*

The offeror submitted a responsive SOQ. The contractor is capable and demonstrated an excellent approach to the project, identifying potential risks that other teams didn’t address.

**SHELLY & SANDS |** American Structurepoint *\*SHORTLIST*

The offeror submitted a responsive SOQ and the contractor has a record of successful work on projects of similar scope and complexity. Overall, the offeror showed strong qualifications and a clear understanding of the issues specific to this project.

**TRITON |** EL Robinson

The offeror submitted a responsive SOQ and the firms and personnel proposed have a record of successful work on projects of similar scope and complexity, but most projects identified were performed under different specifications. The project approach lacked project specificity and was more general than other teams.