

**IS 95 – BALTIMORE WASHINGTON PARKWAY TO US 1 (GREENBELT METRO ACCESS)  
PG3335172  
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT AT RISK  
COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL  
FINAL SELECTION RESULTS**

The State Highway Administration has made a determination that Kiewit-Corman Greenbelt, A Joint Venture, 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.

<b>CONTRACTOR TEAM</b>	<b>OVERALL TECHNICAL RATING</b>	<b>PRE-CONSTRUCTION FEE</b>	<b>CMAR MANAGEMENT FEE PERCENTAGE</b>	<b>EVALUATED PRICE PROPOSAL</b>
Kiewit-Corman Greenbelt, A Joint Venture	GOOD	\$563,000	6.50%	\$107,063,000
Facchina	ACCEPTABLE +	\$160,000	4.95%	\$105,110,000
Wagman	ACCEPTABLE +	\$1,000,000	5.50%	\$106,500,000

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 was multiplied by an estimated direct construction cost of \$100,000,000.00, to determine an estimated cost for the CMAR Management Fee. This was then be added to the CMAR Preconstruction Fee and the estimated direct construction cost of \$100,000,000.00 to determine the evaluated Price Proposal.

***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.