

**MD 5 – THE CAUSEWAY TO SOUTH OF CAMP BROWN ROAD
SM7745171
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT AT RISK
COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL
FINAL SELECTION RESULTS**

The Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration has made a determination that Corman Construction is the most advantageous to the State, considering the technical and price evaluations as set forth in the Request for Proposals (RFP). The results of these evaluations are outlined below.

CONTRACTOR	CAPABILITY OF THE PROPOSER - SIGNIFICANT	PROJECT APPROACH - CRITICAL	APPROACH TO COST ESTIMATING - SIGNIFICANT	PRE-CONSTRUCTION FEE
Corman Construction	GOOD -	EXCEPTIONAL -	GOOD -	\$88,000
Kiewit Infrastructure	ACCEPTABLE +	GOOD +	GOOD -	\$73,000
Great Mills Trading Post	ACCEPTABLE -	ACCEPTABLE +	UNACCEPTABLE	\$185,000

The relative importance of the technical evaluation factors was weighted based on the following criteria:

- Critical – Factors or subfactors weighted as Critical are approximately three times the relative importance of Important.
- Significant – Factors or subfactors weighted as Significant are approximately two times the relative importance of Important.

When determining which Contractor’s submittal is the most advantageous to the State, the Technical Proposal is significantly more important than the Price Proposal.

DEFINITIONS

Adjectival Rating Definitions: The Technical Evaluation Factors and the overall Technical Proposal were rated by an adjectival (qualitative/descriptive) method. The following adjectival ratings were used in evaluation of each technical evaluation factor and the overall technical rating of the Proposal:

EXCEPTIONAL: The Proposer has demonstrated a complete understanding of the subject matter and the Proposal advances the Project goals to an exceptional level. The Proposal communicates an outstanding commitment to quality by a highly skilled team in all aspects of the Work. The Proposal outlines a strong approach to mitigating project specific risks and inspires confidence that all contract requirements will be met or exceeded. The Proposal contains significant strengths and minor weaknesses, if any.

GOOD: The Proposer has demonstrated a strong understanding of the subject matter and the Proposal advances the Project goals to a high level. The Proposal communicates a commitment to quality by an experienced team in all aspects of the Work. The Proposal defines an approach to mitigating project specific risks with little risk that the Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the contract. The Proposal contains strengths that outweigh weaknesses.

ACCEPTABLE: The Proposer has demonstrated an adequate understanding of the subject matter and the Proposal meets the Project goals. The Proposal communicates a commitment to quality Work by a qualified team. Project specific risks have been identified and the Proposer has a reasonable probability of successfully completing the Work. The Proposal contains strengths that are offset by weaknesses.

UNACCEPTABLE: The Proposer has not demonstrated an understanding of the subject matter and the Proposal presents an approach which does not address the goals of the Project. The Proposal fails to meet stated requirements and/or lacks essential information. The commitment to quality is not adequate, with Work performed by unqualified or unproven teams. Project specific risks are not addressed, and the Proposal generates little confidence that the Project requirements can be met. The Proposal contains deficiencies, significant weaknesses and minor strengths, if any.