

**MD 210 at Livingston Road/Kerby Hill Road Interchange Construction  
PG7005170  
COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL  
FINAL SELECTION RESULTS**

The State Highway Administration has made a determination that the Design-Build Team of Concrete General/Whitman Requardt & Associates provided the best combined technical & price proposal for the subject project. The results of these evaluations are outlined below.

<b>DESIGN-BUILD TEAM</b>	<b>PRICE PROPOSAL</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>ADJUSTED PRICE</b>	<b>OVERALL RATING</b>
Concrete General/Whitman Requardt & Associates	\$82,553,134.00	November 27, 2018	\$97,598,134.00	GOOD
Shirley/Dewberry	\$80,556,754.00	April 5, 2019	\$97,123,954.00	GOOD -
Corman/Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson	\$98,360,000.00	November 16, 2018	\$113,275,200.00	GOOD -

**DEFINITIONS**

**Price Proposal:** The total price of all items as listed in the Schedule of Prices.

**Completion Date:** The Calendar Day entered by the proposer in the Contract Time or the Price Proposal.

**Adjusted Price:** The sum of the Price Proposal and the time adjustment. The time adjustment was calculated based on the number of calendar days from June 1, 2015 to the Completion Date proposed by the Design-Builder multiplied by \$11,800 per calendar day.

**Overall Rating:** The overall adjectival rating of the Design-Build Team’s technical proposal.

**Adjectival Rating Definitions:** A quality rating assigned for the overall quality rating of each proposal based on the following quality rating criteria:

**Exceptional** – The Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to significantly exceed stated objectives/requirements in beneficial way to the Administration. This rating indicates a consistently outstanding level

of quality, with very little or no risk that this Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the solicitation. There are essentially no Weaknesses as defined in the Request for Proposals.

***Good*** – The Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to exceed stated objectives/requirements. This rating indicates a generally better than acceptable quality, with little risk that this Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the solicitation. Weaknesses, if any, are very minor.

***Acceptable*** – The Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to meet the stated objectives/requirements. This rating indicates an acceptable level of quality. The Proposer demonstrates a reasonable probability of success. Weaknesses are minor and can be corrected.

***Susceptible to Become Acceptable*** – The Proposer has demonstrated an approach that fails to meet stated criteria as there are weaknesses and/or deficiencies, but they are susceptible to correction through Discussions. The response is considered marginal in terms of the basic content and/or amount of information provided for evaluation, but overall the Proposer is capable of providing an acceptable or better Proposal.

***Unacceptable*** – The Proposer has demonstrated an approach that indicates significant weaknesses/deficiencies and/or unacceptable quality. The Proposal fails to meet the stated criteria and/or lacks essential information and is conflicting and/or unproductive. There is no reasonable likelihood of success. Weaknesses/deficiencies are so major and/or extensive that a major revision to the Proposal would be necessary.