



BEL-70 SOQ | Scoring Recommendations

BEL-70-9.35 Interchange Improvement | PID 120547 | Project# 3000 (25)

Belmont County IR-70-9.35 Interchange Improvements

Technical SOQ Evaluation Team’s (TET)

Recommendations to Executive Level Evaluation Team (ELET)

Executive Level Evaluation Team Signatures

Printed Name	Signature
Joshua Bowman Deputy Director – Div of Construction Mgmt.	
Thomas Corey Deputy Director – District 11	
Lori Duguid Deputy Director – Div. of Engineering	

Submitted to Executive Level Group: Dec 17, 2024

SOQ Technical Evaluation Team Signatures

Printed Name	Signature
Jerred Giauque District 11	
Zachary Evick District 11	
Jason Beranek District 11	
Ray Trivoli District 11	
Dave Hoffman District 11	
Eric Kahlig Central Office	
Chase Wells Central Office	
Jamie Fink Central Office	

CONTENTS

BACKGROUND:	3
SCORING PROCESS:.....	4
RFQ SCORING TOPIC: PROJECT MANAGEMENT, UNDERSTANDING AND APPROACH (Maximum 35 Points).....	6
RFQ SCORING TOPIC: DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT TEAM (Maximum 30 Points)	7
RFQ SCORING TOPIC: DESIGN-BUILD TEAM PROJECT EXPERIENCE (Maximum 35 points)	9
SCORING SUMMARY	11

BACKGROUND:

This Project will reconstruct the I-70 mainline structures to enable the widening of SR-149, reconstruct and widen the ramps to and from I-70, reconstruct and widen SR-149 from a two-lanes to five (or more) lanes up to and extending beyond the existing commercial drives, and design and construct other necessary work to complete the Project. The Project completion date will be within 48 months of award.

The Goals of the Project are:

- Award a Design-Build Contract within ODOT Fiscal Year 2025 (Target Award Date: May 12, 2025).
- Design and construct the most cost-effective solution which results in a final configuration that reduces long-term congestion.
- Phase design and construction to minimize delays to the completion of the Project by considering the restrictions of ROW acquisition, NEPA processes, and the final NEPA document.
- Design and construct a project which reasonably ensures ongoing unimpeded access to the existing facilities during construction.
- Successfully coordinate of utility relocations and successfully coordinate with adjacent private developers during construction.
- Complete the Project with 48 months of Award.
- Build an award-winning project with no injuries while safely and efficiently maintaining traffic.

ODOT is using a two-phase procurement process to select a design-build contractor to deliver this Project. ODOT initiated the process with the release of a Request for Qualifications / Instructions to Proposers on 10/18/2024. Interested Offerors were required to provide ODOT with a list of qualifications including a project understanding and approach, past experience of the Offeror team, and capabilities of the Offeror team in the format outlined in the RFQ. After an evaluation by the Department, a Short-list of the Offerors is determined. Short-listed Offerors are to be the three most highly qualified Offerors that submitted SOQs. In the second phase, ODOT will issue the Project

Proposal and Scope of Services (the “RFP”) for the Project to the short-listed Offerors. Only the short-listed Offerors will be eligible to submit bids for the Project.

Statements of Qualifications (SOQs) were received from (5) Offerors on 11/22/2024 by the required deadline from the following:

OFFEROR	DESIGN BUILD CONTRACTOR	DESIGN BUILD DESIGNER
Beaver Excavating Company	Beaver Excavating Company	TRC Engineers, Inc.
Brayman-Swank Joint Venture	Brayman-Swank Joint Venture	Parsons Transportation Group
The Ruhlin Company	The Ruhlin Company	ms consultants, inc.
Shelly & Sands, Inc.	Shelly & Sands, Inc.	American Structurepoint, Inc.
The Triton DBT	Triton Construction, Inc.	E.L. Robinson Engineering

The SOQs were checked-in to verify general formatting and general responsiveness. All submitted SOQs met the general formatting requirements and were thereby accepted as being eligible for review.

This document is a summary of the evaluation performed by the Technical SOQ Evaluation Team.

SCORING PROCESS:

A project specific SOQ Evaluation Manual was established and reviewed by the SOQ Technical Evaluation Team (TET) prior to receiving the SOQs from interested Offerors. This manual is to ensure the impartial, equitable and comprehensive evaluation of each Offeror’s SOQ in accordance with the Design Build Project’s RFQ. This document provided the general methodology and procedures for evaluation of the SOQs.

The members of the TET independently reviewed each Offeror’s SOQ. Upon completion of these independent reviews, the evaluation group met to discuss the SOQs and determine a consensus scoring recommendation to present to the Executive Level Evaluation Team. The TET conferred on December 4/5, 2024.

For each of the evaluation topics listed in the following table, the TET focused on an open discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of each SOQ.

Topic	Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Scoring Point Assignment
Project Management, Understanding and Approach	Ability of the Offeror to demonstrate the likely achievement of the Project's goals (see Project Expectations) in response to the requirements in Section 2.5.3.	35
Design-Build Project Team	Demonstrated ability of the Offeror to provide a successfully integrated Design-Build Team relative to the requirements of the Project in response to Section 2.5.4.	30
Project Experience	Demonstrated ability of the Offeror to successfully deliver the design and/or construction of past projects with similar scope and complexity, the timely completion of similar projects, and the Key Personnel's engagement as shown in provided Technical Experience Attachments and Evaluation Forms (Part G).	35
Total		100

Strengths and weaknesses as well as other items of note identified during these open discussions are listed in the SOQ Review Notes. Note: not all strengths (and/or weaknesses) were considered absolute value and scoring was commensurate of the group's combined judgement.

Strengths and weaknesses are defined as follows:

Strengths – That part of the SOQ that ultimately represents a benefit to the Project and is expected to increase the Offeror's ability to meet or exceed the Project's goals.

Weaknesses – That part of a SOQ which considerably detracts from the Offeror's ability to meet the Project's goals or may result in inefficient or ineffective performance.

Each of the three rating topics was evaluated as an overall category, considering all the subcomponents of the overall category. .

At the conclusion of open discussion for each rating topic, team members identified the strongest and weakest SOQs relative to the involved topic. In accordance with the Request for Qualifications (RFQ), the highest ranked DBT in the topic received the maximum number of rating points for that topic. Lower ranked DBTs received commensurately lower scores based on a relative comparison to the highest ranked DBT. Initially, sub-sections value was agreed by the evaluation team, and subsections were rated on a scale of 1 to 10. The 1 to 10 scale was then proportionally reflected in a normalized value as one (1) team must be assigned all points of the section. The evaluation group's rationale with respect to ranking of the DBTs is outlined in the below sections.

The evaluation group members achieved consensus on the rating topic scoring for each DBT.

Note: The order of information concerning the submitted SOQs presented in this summary does not indicate any order of preference and is organized alphabetically by the offeror's name.

RFQ SCORING TOPIC: PROJECT MANAGEMENT, UNDERSTANDING AND APPROACH (Maximum 35 Points)

Basis of Evaluation for Project Understanding and Approach:

The TET evaluated the Offerors on how well the Offeror's demonstrated the Offeror's project management and understanding to the Project specifically addressing:

- Describe the Offeror's anticipated approach to engagement with the Department during Phase III of the procurement process in a manner that will achieve ODOT's goals related to schedule, including approach to designated meetings/discussions and development of the Technical and Price Proposal. Reference Section 3 (Request for Proposals – Phase III) and all its subsections for more information.
- Describe how utility relocation, traffic operations, access to existing businesses, and limitations presented by ROW and NEPA may impact sequencing of design and construction. Describe the DBT's approach to managing these issues and mitigating associated risks. Describe the DBT's anticipated pre-award and post-award processes that will ensure the most cost-effective Project while potentially reducing or eliminating Project risks.
- Describe the DBT anticipated approach to ensure acceptable quality of the Work (Design and Construction).

Discussion of Scoring Recommendations for Project Understanding and Approach:

Evaluation: 1 to 10

Section	Score Weight (out of 35)	Beaver	Brayman/Swank	Ruhlin	S&S	Triton
Approach	5	9.5	7	8.5	8	7
Utilities, Traffic, Access, ROW	20	7.5	8.5	9.5	9	6
Approach to Quality	10	8.5	7	7	7	7.5

Normalized Scores

Section	Score Weight (out of 35)	Beaver	Brayman/Swank	Ruhlin	S&S	Triton
Approach	5	4.8	3.5	4.3	4.0	3.5

Statement of Qualifications
Technical SOQ Scoring Recommendations

Utilities, Traffic, Access, ROW	20	15.0	17.0	19.0	18.0	12.0
Approach to Quality	10	8.5	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.5
Total Raw Score		28.3	27.5	30.3	29.0	23.0
	Section Normalized Scores	33	32	35	34	27

The TET identified the following differentiators in the DBTs' project understanding and approach.

RFQ SCORING TOPIC: DESIGN-BUILD PROJECT TEAM (Maximum 30 Points)

Basis of Evaluation for the Offeror's Organization and Key Personnel:

The TET evaluated the Offeror's Organization and Key Personnel in relation to the requirements of the Project by evaluating

1. **Organizational Chart and Narrative:** The Offeror shall provide an organizational chart showing the "chain of command" of the required Key Personnel roles proposed for the Offeror's organization regarding the Project. The organizational chart shall include any other roles critical to the Offeror's approach. The organizational chart shall show Key Personnel, key subconsultants, all named firms that will be performing work including those firms identified in association with Section 1.2.1 (Lead Designer and Sub-consultants Prequalification) and Section 1.2.2 (Contractor & Subcontractor Prequalification), and other anticipated members integral to the success of the Project. The Offeror may include a narrative to describe the interactions between positions, functions of shown intended roles, and other planned team integration techniques intended.
2. **General Offeror Experience:** Describe the general experience of the firms that are part of the Offeror. Focus on specific firm experience that relates to carrying out the proposed Project and how the experience will ensure success of the Offeror's general approach to the Project. Describe any notable expertise or other special capabilities of identified members of DB project team that are critical to your project approach. Firms shown on the Table of Organization and/or represented in the technical experience attachments (Part D) shall be specifically addressed as to their role on the Offeror's team.
3. **Key Personnel:** Identify the Key Personnel as described in the subsequent table. Provide information within the SOQ to demonstrate the abilities of all identified Key Personnel through a description of qualifications, experiences, and performance of similar tasks on previous similar recent relevant projects, background, and education. These qualifications and experience should provide confidence to the Department that the Project will be effectively managed through personal competence and accountability. This information shall be expounded through resumes provided in Part E. Resumes for individuals who are not identified in the SOQ as Key Personnel shall not be included.

KEY PERSONNEL	DUTIES
DBT Project Manager	The DBT Project Manager shall be ultimately responsible for the Offeror's performance. Ensures that personnel and other resources are made available. Responsible for contractual matters. This position is required for the duration of all design and construction-related activities on the Project. Preferred experience of seven (7) years of experience on highway construction projects. This position is required for the duration of the Project.
DBT Construction Project Manager	The DBT Construction Project Manager actively manages the overall construction of the project. Must be an employee of the Lead Contractor. Responsible for overall construction. The DBT Construction Manager shall have a minimum of five (5) years of similar experience on highway projects. The DBT Construction Project Manager shall be on a full-time basis for the construction duration of the Project.
DBT Lead Design Engineer	The DBT Lead Design Engineer shall be responsible for ensuring all key design aspects on the Project are completed and all design requirements are met. Shall have a minimum of seven (7) years of recent similar experience on highway projects. Must be an Ohio P.E. at time of award or be able to obtain licensure by award of contract. This position is required for the duration of all design-related activities on the Project.

The Evaluation team assessed how the Offeror's description of the Key Personnel provided confidence to ODOT that the Project and the Project risks will be effectively managed through competence, accountability, and relevant experience. Considering the following:

1. The individual's position and authority within the Offeror.
2. Previous projects, similar in nature to the proposed project or other significant efforts for which the individual has performed a similar function.
3. Relevant experience, professional registrations, education, and other components of qualifications applicable to this project.
4. Any unique qualifications.
5. A statement indicating that the individual is currently employed by a member of the Offeror at the time of the SOQ submittal.

Evaluation: 1 to 10

Part C - Design Build Project Team (30 points max)			Section Rankings (out of 10)				
Section No.	Section	Score Weight (out of 30)	Beaver	Brayman/Swank	Ruhlin	S&S	Triton
1	Organizational Chart	2	9	8.5	8.5	7	8
2	General Experience	2	8.5	8	8.5	7	7.5
3A	DBT Project Manager	8	8.5	7	8	7.5	6.5
3B	DBT Construction PM	10	9	7.5	8	9	7.5
3C	DBT Lead Design Engineer	8	9	9.5	8	7.5	9

Normalized Scores

Section No.	Section	Score Weight (out of 30)	Beaver	Brayman/Swank	Ruhlin	S&S	Triton
1	Organizational Chart	2	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.4	1.6
2	General Experience	2	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.4	1.5
3A	DBT Project Manager	8	6.8	5.6	6.4	6.0	5.2
3B	DBT Construction PM	10	9.0	7.5	8.0	9.0	7.5
3C	DBT Lead Design Engineer	8	7.2	7.6	6.4	6.0	7.2
			26.5	24.0	24.2	23.8	23.0
	Section Normalized Score		30	27	27	27	26

RFQ SCORING TOPIC: DESIGN-BUILD TEAM PROJECT EXPERIENCE (Maximum 35 points)

Basis of Evaluation for DBT Capabilities:

The TET evaluated how well the Offeror demonstrated their design, construction and management experience and capabilities and how well does their experiences and capabilities relate to this Project. The TET identified difference in Offerors by noting any strengths or weaknesses for the evaluation topics.

The narratives should demonstrate experiences in the following areas: information:

- Construction of projects of similar scope, size, and complexity, as applicable to the Contractor
- Design of projects of similar scope, size, and complexity, as applicable to the Designer
- Timely completion of projects of similar scope, size, and complexity
- Proposed Key Personnel members' roles (if applicable) and/or firms' role with the project, and the ability to function in a coordinated high performing team
- Mitigation efforts utilized by the Offeror to overcome unexpected project challenges which may translate to the proposed project.

Statement of Qualifications
Technical SOQ Scoring Recommendations

- Each technical experience attachment must clearly include the following information:
 - General Description of the Overall Project.
 - Detailed description of the work or services provided, and percentage of the overall project actually performed (as relative to costs).
 - Sponsoring/Owner Agency's Project Name, Project Location, and contract type (e.g. DB, DBB, CMGC). Provide any commonly known industry-wide name (if applicable) and Owner's project number (If applicable).
 - Name of the representative Firm (i.e., Offeror's Lead Contractor, Subcontractors, Lead Designer or Sub-Consultants) and the firm's responsibility.
 - Overall Project contract value. Provide represented firms contract value for which firm was directly responsible (excluding subcontracted values).
 - The sponsor/owner's contact information (project manager name, phone number, e-mail address). If the owner's project manager is no longer with the owner, provide an alternate contact at the agency that is familiar with the project. The alternate contact must have played a leadership role for the owner during the project.
 - Dates of design (if applicable to the Designer) and construction (if applicable to the Contractor).
 - Description of original scheduled completion deadlines and actual completion dates, as applicable to the Designer and/or Contractor. Describe reasons for completing the project in advance of the contract completion deadline. Describe reasons for completing the projects later than the contract completion deadline specified within the original contract. Provide the value of any liquidated damages and/or penalties, and reasons for assessed liquidated damages and/or penalties, if applicable.
 - Provide evaluation forms for each project, for contractor and consultant similar to ODOT C-95's and CES. Include this information in only Part G (Note: C-95 and CES forms for ODOT projects do not need to be provided).

Evaluation: 1 to 10

Section	Score Weight	Beaver	Brayman/Swank	Ruhlin	S&S	Triton
Projects	35	8.5	9	8.5	9.5	7.5

Normalized Scores

Section	Score Weight (out of 35)	Beaver	Brayman/Swank	Ruhlin	S&S	Triton
Projects	35	29.8	31.5	29.8	33.3	26.3
		29.8	31.5	29.8	33.3	26.3
	Section Normalized Score	31	33	31	35	28

SCORING SUMMARY

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

<i>Proposal Point Breakdown</i>	Beaver	Brayman/Swank	Ruhlin	Shelly & Sands	Triton
Part B - Project Management, Understanding and Approach (35 points max)	32	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
<i>Totals</i>	94	92	93	96	81

While the Technical SOQ Evaluation Team is confident that all interested Offerors are capable, the evaluation team is recommending to the Executive Level Evaluation Team that the following DBTs be shortlisted and invited to participate in the ATC and Bidding process as they appear to be the most qualified:

DESIGN BUILD CONTRACTOR	w/ DESIGN BUILD DESIGNER
Beaver Excavating Company	TRC Engineers, Inc.
The Ruhlin Company	ms consultants, Inc.
Shelly & Sands, Inc.	American Structurepoint, Inc.

Executive Level Evaluation Team concurrence is required prior to advancing to the next stage in procurement.