

RFQ# 905514 -CWWTP Capacity Improvements & CSO Reduction Construction Manager At Risk (CMAR)-Round 1

Evaluation Criteria (Max Points)	Archer Western Construction, LLC	Brasfield & Gorrie, LLC	Garney Companies, Inc	Kiewit Infrastructure South Co.	PC Construction Company
Project Methodology & Approach (35 Points)	23	33	25	34	30
Firm Experience (30 Points)	15	28	24	27	26
Personnel Experience (25 Points)	15	23	18	22	23
Diversity Plan (10 Points)	10	8.5	7	8.5	7.5
Round 1 Total (100 Points)	63.00	92.50	74.00	91.50	86.50

RFQ# 905514 -CWWTP Capacity Improvements & CSO Reduction Construction Manager At Risk (CMAR)-Round 2

Evaluation Criteria (Max Points)	Archer Western Construction, LLC	Brasfield & Gorrie, LLC	Garney Companies, Inc	Kiewit Infrastructure South Co.	PC Construction Company
Interviews/Questions and Answers (100 Points)	Did not advance to round 2.	92.50	Did not advance to round 2.	80.00	89.00
Round 2 Total (100 Points)	0.00	92.50	0.00	80.00	89.00

RFQ# 905514 -CWWTP Capacity Improvements & CSO Reduction Construction Manager At Risk (CMAR)-Round 3

Evaluation Criteria (Max Points)	Archer Western Construction, LLC	Brasfield & Gorrie, LLC	Garney Companies, Inc	Kiewit Infrastructure South Co.	PC Construction Company
Cost Criteria (100 Points)	Did not advance to round 3.	98.32	Did not advance to round 3.	99.20	100.00
Round 3 Total (100 Points)	0.00	98.32	0.00	99.20	100.00

Cumulative Total Score (Rounds 1-3)	63.00	283.32	74.00	270.70	275.50
--	--------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------

Strengths & Weaknesses

Archer Western Construction, LLC (63.00 Points)

Strengths: Detailed statement of commitment; detailed strategic approaches and methodologies to ensure maximum participation by SMWSDVB suppliers; detailed methods to ensure prompt payments of SMWSDVBs.

Weaknesses: Failed to address potential areas to could be self-performed; opinion of probable construction costs (OPCCs) lacked detail; weak sustainable construction practices; firm's methodology and approach to ensure successful completion of the project lacked detail; firm's methodology and approach to working with design team in a collaborative manner lacked detail; failed to provide a management plan; risk table lacked detail; failed to describe firm's policies for ensuring project will be environmentally friendly; failed to provide projects of similar size, scope, and complexity; low Experience Modification Rating (EMR) rating; firm's demonstration of expertise in managing construction projects lacked detail; description of key personnel's involvement in preconstruction and construction for the project lacked detail; organizational chart lacked detail; resume for key personnel lacked relevant project experience; project involvement for key personnel lacked detail.

Brasfield & Gorrie, LLC (283.32 Points)

Strengths: Detailed policy for ensuring project will be environmentally friendly; detailed procurement strategy approach; detailed cost estimating approach for maintaining opinion of probable construction costs (OPCCs); detailed safety plan; detailed description of roles for key personnel; detailed statement of commitment; detailed response on the approach to the South grit tank modifications.

Weaknesses: Management plan for closeout lacked detail; failed to describe firm's approach for buying out the job; firm's packaging approach lacked detail and insight; firm's strategic approach and methodologies to ensure maximum participation by SMWSDVB suppliers lacked detail; firm's prompt payment method of SMWSDVBs lacked detail; firm's response to building a partnership between the client, and the design team lacked detail; strategic approaches to maximizing DBE utilization lacked detail; DBE management team lacked relevant experience in maximizing DBE participation on similar sized projects.

Garney Companies, Inc (74.00 Points)

Weaknesses: Failed to quantify potential areas for self-performance; firm's buy out strategy lacked detail; firm's sustainability construction practices lacked detail; failed to address firm's methodology and approach to ensure successful completion of the project; risk table lacked detail; firm's management plan for permitting lacked detail; firm's strategy for procurement packaging approach lacked detail; low Experience Modification Rating (EMR) rating; failed to provide projects of similar size, scope, and complexity; key individuals (Project Manager and Preconstruction Manager) lacked relevant CMAR experience; resumes failed to show the estimated involvement of key personnel; strategic approach to ensure maximum participation by SMWSDVB suppliers lacked detail; methods to ensure prompt payment of SMWSDVBs lacked detail.

Kiewit Infrastructure South Co. (270.70 Points)

Strengths: Detailed method and approach for working with the design team to ensure timely completion of project; detailed methodology and approach to ensure successful completion of project and working in a partnering environment; detailed cost estimation approach for maintaining current opinion of probable construction costs (OPCCs); detailed strategy for procurement packaging approach; detailed disclosure of potential areas firm could potentially self-perform; detailed description of firm's knowledge and experience in CMAR projects; relevant CMAR construction experience for key personnel; relevant preconstruction CMAR experience for key personnel; detailed response to building a partnership between the firm, the client, and the design team; detailed strategies for achieving and exceeding DBE target including creative plans to promote utilization in areas of the work where it may be more difficult to identify available DBEs.

Weaknesses: Firm's policy for ensuring project will be environmentally friendly lacked detail; failed to provide projects of similar scope (did not include Waste Water Treatment projects); low Experience Modification Rating (EMR); resumes did not include Waste Water Treatment Plant experience; key personnel's estimated involvement throughout the project lacked detail; methods to ensure prompt payment of SMWSDVBs lacked detail; firm's response to the collaborative tools and philosophy of the CMAR approach lacked detail; response to all of the possible change orders of the CMAR lacked detail; foundation modification response lacked detail; Maintenance of Plant Operations (MOPO) response lacked detail regarding specifics of the project; response to challenges associated with working with multiple design teams for this project lacked detail; response regarding contingencies as a part of the GMP lacked detail.

PC Construction (275.50 Points)

Strengths: Detailed innovative approach to reduce costs associated with project; detailed description of potential areas firm could potentially self-perform; detailed demonstration of firm's knowledge and experience in CMAR projects; detailed organizational chart; detailed description of firm's close out management plan for project; detailed response to the importance of partnership between the CMAR, the design team, and the client; detailed response on the bid packaging sequencing process for the project; detailed response to the risk mitigation process; detailed strategies for achieving and exceeding DBE target including creative plans to promote utilization in areas of the work where it may be more difficult to identify available DBEs; relevant project experience of DBE management team maximizing DBE participation on similar sized projects.

Weaknesses: Firm's approach to cost estimating and producing accurate opinion of probable construction costs (OPCCs) lacked detail; management plan for permitting, quality control, safety, and scheduling lacked detail; failed to provide Experience Modification Rating for past 5 years; failed to provide projects of similar size; failed to include estimated involvement of key personnel throughout project; project delivery method lacked detail; discussion regarding the Maintenance of Plant Operations (MOPO) lacked detail; response to the "greatest benefit" of MWS for the firm's involvement in the design and the preconstruction activities lacked detail; response to the modification of the South grit tank addressing the operational restrictions lacked detail.

Enter Solicitation Title & Number Below

CWWTP Capacity Improvements & CSO Reduction Construction Manager
At Risk (CMAR); RFQ# 905514

Offeror's Name	Bids	RFP Cost Points
PC Construction Company	\$26,549,500.00	100.00
Kiewit Infrastructure South Co.	\$26,762,300.00	99.20
Brasfield & Gorrie, LLC	\$27,003,144.00	98.32