

**PUTTY HILL AVENUE OVER I-695
BA1455180
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT AT RISK
COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL
FINAL SELECTION RESULTS**

The Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration has made a determination that Joseph B. Fay 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	OVERALL TECHNICAL RATING	PRE-CONSTRUCTION FEE
Joseph B. Fay Company	GOOD	\$160,095
Concrete General	GOOD -	\$98,000
Corman Kokosing	GOOD -	\$85,000
Kiewit	GOOD -	\$125,000
Wagman	GOOD -	\$53,423
Allan Myers	ACCEPTABLE +	\$30,000
Six M	ACCEPTABLE +	\$73,000

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.

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.