

**MD 97 – South of Brookeville to North of Brookeville
MO7465171
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT AT RISK
COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL
FINAL SELECTION RESULTS**

The State Highway Administration has made a determination that Kiewit Infrastructure Company 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 TEAM	OVERALL TECHNICAL RATING	PRE-CONSTRUCTION FEE	CMAR MANAGEMENT FEE PERCENTAGE	EVALUATED PRICE PROPOSAL
Kiewit Infrastructure	GOOD -	\$238,000	7.00%	\$1,778,000
Corman Construction	GOOD -	\$78,000	10.00%	\$2,278,000
Facchina	GOOD -	\$875,000	9.50%	\$2,965,000
Wagman	ACCEPTABLE +	\$97,000	12.55%	\$2,858,000
Concrete General	ACCEPTABLE +	\$200,000	14.90%	\$3,478,000

As stated in the RFP, the Technical Proposal is significantly more important than the Price Proposal.

DEFINITIONS

Overall Technical Rating: The overall adjectival rating of the Contractor’s technical proposal.

Pre-Construction Fee: Preconstruction Phase service for the scope of work outlined in the RFP. A lump sum price inclusive of all costs and all fees, profit and overhead.

CMAR Management Fee Percentage: The Management Fee identified as a percentage inclusive all profit, general and administrative costs, regional and home office overhead, and other indirect costs.

Evaluated Price Proposal: Each Proposer’s CMAR Management Fee Percentage multiplied by \$22,000,000, which is a middle range cost for Project Classification H, resulting in an estimated cost for the CMAR Management Fee. This Management Fee added to the CMAR Preconstruction Fee was used to determine the evaluated Price 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 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.