

**MD 30 – HAMPSTEAD BYPASS
CL4165370
COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL
FINAL SELECTION RESULTS**

The State Highway Administration has made a determination that the design-build team of Corman Construction/Whitney, Bailey, Cox & Magnani provided the best combined technical & price proposal for the above project. The results of these evaluations are outlined below. The results are provided in no particular order.

DESIGN-BUILD TEAM	BASE PRICE	TOTAL BID (PROPOSED DAYS)	PRICE INCREMENT	OVERALL RATING
Corman Construction Inc./ Whitney, Bailey, Cox & Magnani, LLC	\$40,645,200	\$51,166,800 (822 days)	\$257,822.23	Good(+)
American Infrastructure-MD, Inc./ Dewberry & Davis, LLC	\$39,977,777.77	\$50,908,977.77 (854 days)	0	Susceptible To Become Acceptable
Cherry Hill Construction, Inc./ Johnson, Mirmiran, & Thompson	\$45,363,886	\$54,375,086 (704 days)	\$3,466,108.23	Acceptable
Kibler Construction Company, Inc./ McCormack Tayor, Inc.	\$43,495,410	\$54,823,410 (885 days)	\$3,914,432.23	Good(-)
The Lane Construction Corporation/ Whitman, Requardt & Associates, LLP	\$45,056,200	\$55,283,400 (799 days)	\$4,374,422.23	Good(-)

DEFINITIONS

Total Bid: The price offered by the bidder, plus the product of the proposed calendar days multiplied by the daily road user benefit noted in the contract documents.

Price Increment: The difference between the lowest bid submitted and the Total Bid by an individual Design-Build Team.

Overall Rating: The overall adjectival rating of the Design-Build Team's technical 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 an approach that is considered to significantly exceed stated criteria in a way that is beneficial to the Administration. This rating indicates a consistently outstanding level of quality, with very little or no risk that this Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the solicitation. There are essentially no Weaknesses.

Good – The Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to exceed stated criteria. This rating indicates a generally better than acceptable quality, with little risk that this Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the solicitation. Weaknesses, if any, are very minor.

Acceptable - The Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to meet the stated criteria. This rating indicates an acceptable level of quality. The Proposer demonstrates a reasonable probability of success. Weaknesses are minor and can be readily corrected.

Susceptible to Become Acceptable – The Proposer has demonstrated an approach that fails to meet stated criteria as there are Weaknesses and/or Deficiencies, but they are susceptible to correction through discussions. The response is considered marginal in terms of the basic content and/or amount of information provided for evaluation, but overall the Proposer is capable of providing an acceptable or better.

Unacceptable – The Proposer has demonstrated an approach that indicates significant Weaknesses/Deficiencies and/or unacceptable quality. The Proposal fails to meet the stated criteria and/or lacks essential information and is conflicting and/or unproductive. There is no reasonable likelihood of success. Weaknesses/Deficiencies are so major and/or extensive that a major revision to the Proposal would be necessary.