



Interoffice Memo

DATE: October 25, 2021

FROM: Curtis Scott, Assistant Chief Procurement Officer for Transportation Services

TO: Treasury Young, Chief Procurement Officer

SUBJECT RFQ-484-051121; Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services,
Contract 9 - PI #0017737, Towns County
Ranking Approval

The Office of Procurement's Transportation Services Procurement Section has reviewed and evaluated Statements of Qualifications, Technical Approach, and Past Performance for the above referenced project.

Attached for your review is one (1) set of the following:

- Advertisement and all Addendums
- Consultants' Submission Prescreening Checklist – Phase I
- GDOT Guide for Selection Committee Members (Phase I and II)
- Preliminary Ratings and Comments from Evaluators
- Selection Committee Ratings for Top Respondents – Phase I
- Selection Committee Comments for Top Respondents – Phase I
- Area Class Checklist
- Selection of Finalists Notification and Notice to Selected Finalists
- Consultants' Submission Prescreening Checklist – Phase II
- Selection Committee Overall Ratings for Phase I and Phase II
- Selection Committee Comments for Finalists – Phase II
- Past Performance Reference Checks and any available additional documentation
- Verification of Non-Debarment from SAM Website for Intended Awardee and Team
- Prequalification Certificate for Intended Awardee

The five (5) highest firms in order of ranking are as follows:

1. **Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.**
2. **Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.**
3. **NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.**
3. **Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC**
5. **Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC**

The Selection Committee recommends the selection of the top ranked firm, **Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.**

Concurrence with Award from Responsible Division Director: Certification Procurement Requirements Met:

Albert Shelby, Director of Program Delivery

Treasury Young, Chief Procurement Officer

CS:cd

Attachments



Request for Qualifications

To Provide

Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services

RFQ-484-051121

Qualifications Due: May 11, 2021

**Georgia Department of Transportation
One Georgia Center
600 West Peachtree Street, NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30308**

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

484-051121

Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services

Each Statement of Qualification (SOQ) submittal will require one (1) Contract Consideration Checklist sheet similar to the last page of this RFQ, indicating **ALL** of the contract(s) a firm have submitted SOQs for under RFQ-484-051121. This form is to ensure all SOQs submitted are accounted for and included in the correct Contract evaluation package.

Contract #	PI #	County	Project Description
1	0013064	Meriwether/Pike	SR 109 FROM SR 41/MERIWETHER TO SR 18/PIKE
2	0013591	Catoosa	SR 3 FROM SR 151 TO SR 146
3	0017729	Dawson	SR 53 @ THOMPSON CREEK
4	0017732	Habersham	SR 17/SR 115 @ SOQUEE RIVER
5	0017733	Habersham	SR 255 @ AMYS CREEK
6	0017734	Habersham/White	SR 384 @ CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER
7	0017735	Hall	SR 283 @ FLAT CREEK
8	0017736	Hart	SR 77 @ SHOAL CREEK
9	0017737	Towns	SR 17/SR 75 @ SOAPSTONE CREEK
10	0017739	White	SR 17/SR 75 @ CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER
11	0017770	Henry	SR 42 FROM CS 634/MLK JR BLVD TO CS 680/MARKETPLACE BLVD
12	0017845	Fulton	SR 141 @ CS 119/STATE BRIDGE ROAD

I. General Project Information

A. Overview

The Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) is soliciting Statement of Qualifications (SOQs) from qualified firm(s) to provide Engineering Design Consultant Services for the projects listed below (note that certain projects may be grouped with other projects and awarded as one (1) contract).

This Request for Qualifications (RFQ) seeks to identify potential providers for the Scope of Services for the project/contract listed in Exhibit I -1 thru Exhibit I-12. Firms that respond to this RFQ, and are determined by GDOT to be sufficiently qualified, may be deemed eligible, and invited to offer a technical approach and/or possibly present and/or interview for these services. All respondents to this RFQ are subject to instructions communicated in this document, and are cautioned to completely review the entire RFQ and follow instructions carefully. GDOT reserves the right to reject any or all Statements of Qualifications or Technical Approach, and to waive technicalities and informalities at the discretion of GDOT.

B. **IMPORTANT- A RESTRICTION OF COMMUNICATION IS IN EFFECT FOR THIS PROJECT.**

From the advertisement date of this solicitation until successful respondents are selected and the award is made official and announced, firms are not allowed to communicate about this solicitation or scope with any staff of GDOT including the Commissioner and GDOT Board Members, except for the submission of questions as instructed in the RFQ, or with the contact designated in **RFQ Section VIII.C.**, or as provided by any existing work agreement(s). For violation of this provision, GDOT reserves the right to reject the submittal of the offending respondent.

C. **The Georgia Department of Transportation Board has adopted a 16% overall annual goal for DBE participation on all federally funded projects. This goal is not to be considered as a fixed quota, set aside or preference. The DBE goal can be met by prime contracting, sub-contracting, joint-venture or mentor/protégé relationship.**

Georgia Department of Transportation will monitor and assess each consultant services submittals for their DBE participation and/or good faith effort in promoting equity and opportunity in accordance with the state of Georgia, Department of Transportation Disadvantage Business Program Plan.

For more information on the GDOT DBE Program please contact:

Georgia Department of Transportation
Equal Opportunity Division
One Georgia Center, 7th Floor
600 West Peachtree Street, NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30308
Phone: (404) 631-1972

D. Scope of Services

Under the terms of the resulting Agreements, the selected consultants will provide full engineering design services, for each GDOT Project(s) identified. The anticipated scope of work for each project/contract is included in **Exhibit I-1 thru Exhibit I-12**.

In addition, GDOT desires that the Consultant have the ability to provide, either with its own forces or through a sub-consultant team member, comprehensive services necessary to fulfill all preliminary engineering services which may arise during the project cycle.

E. Contract Term and Type

GDOT anticipates one (1) Multi-Phase, Project Specific contract to be awarded to one (1) firm, for each project/contract identified. GDOT anticipates that the Contract Payment may be Lump Sum, Cost Plus Fixed Fee, Cost per Unit of Work or Specific Rate of Compensation. As a Project Specific contract, it is the Department's intention that the Agreements will remain in effect until successful completion of the preliminary engineering phase of the projects, and may choose to utilize the selected consultant for use on construction revisions as necessary.

F. Contract Amount

Each Multi-Phase, Project Specific contract amount will be determined via negotiations with the Department. If the Department is unable to reach a satisfactory agreement and at reasonable rates to be paid for the services to be provided, the Department reserves the right to terminate negotiations with the highest scoring finalist and begin negotiations with the next highest scoring finalist.

II. Selection Method

A. Method of Communication

All general communication of relevant information regarding this solicitation will be made via the Georgia Procurement Registry (GPR) under RFQ-484-051121. All firms are responsible for checking the GPR on a regular basis for updates, clarifications, and announcements. GDOT reserves the right to communicate via electronic-mail with the primary contact listed in the Statements of Qualifications. Other specific communications will be made as indicated in the remainder of this RFQ.

B. Phase I - Selection of Finalists

Based on the Statements of Qualifications submitted in response to the projects/contracts listed in this RFQ, the Selection Committee will review the **Experience and Qualifications** and **Resources and Workload Capacity** listed in **Section IV. Selection Criteria for Phase I**. The Selection Committee will discuss the top submittals and the final rankings of the top submittals will be determined. From the final rankings of the top submittals, the Selection Committee will identify three (3) to five (5) firms which will be shortlisted.

All firms must meet the minimum requirements as listed in **Section IV.A.** below.

C. Finalist Notification for Phase II

Firms selected and shortlisted as finalists will receive notification and final instructions from GDOT regarding the **Phase II – Technical Approach** response.

D. Phase II - Finalists Response on Technical Approach and Past Performance

GDOT will request a **Technical Approach** of the three (3) to five (5) finalist firms for the project/contract. GDOT reserves the right to request a presentation/interview on any project/contract as determined in its best interests; however, this additional requirement shall typically be reserved for the most complex projects. Each finalist firm shall be notified in writing and informed of the Technical Approach due date. Any additional detailed Technical Approach instructions and requirements, beyond that provided in **Section V. Selection Criteria for Phase II**, for the finalists will be provided in the Finalist Notification. All members of the Selection Committee will review the Technical Approach (and will attend the presentation/interview if so chosen). **Firms shall not address any questions, prior to the award announcement, to anyone other than the designated contact.**

E. Final Selection

Final selection will be determined by carrying the scores from **Phase I** forward for each Finalist and by evaluating the **Technical Approach** and **Past Performance** criteria for **Phase II**. The Selection Committee will discuss the Finalist's Phase II Responses and the final rankings will be determined.

Negotiations will then be initiated with the top-ranked firm(s) to finalize the terms and conditions of the contract(s), including the fees to be paid. In the event a satisfactory agreement cannot be reached with the highest-ranking firm(s), GDOT will formally terminate the negotiations and possibly enter into negotiations with the second highest-ranking firm, and so on in turn until a mutual agreement is established and GDOT awards a contract. The final form of the contract shall be developed by GDOT.

III. Schedule of Events

The following Schedule of Events represents GDOT's best estimate of the Schedule that will be followed. All times indicated are prevailing times in Atlanta, Georgia. GDOT reserves the right to adjust the Schedule as GDOT deems necessary.

PHASE I	DATE	TIME
a. GDOT issues public advertisement of RFQ-484-051121	04/09/2021	-----
b. Deadline for submission of written questions and requests for clarification	04/26/2021	2:00 PM
c. Deadline for submission of Statements of Qualifications	05/11/2021	2:00 PM
d. GDOT completes evaluation and issues notification and other information to finalist firms	TBD	
PHASE II		
e. Deadline for submission of written questions from finalists	TBD	2:00 PM
f. Phase II Response of Finalist firms due	TBD	TBA

IV. Selection Criteria for Phase I - Criteria for Evaluation of Statements of Qualifications

A. Area Class Requirements and Certification

Presented teams must be prequalified in the indicated Area Class(es) in order to be evaluated. Required proof of prequalification shall be submitted as indicated in **Section VI.C.4.** below. All Submittals will be pre-screened to verify that the Prime consultant has the required Area Class(es) and that the overall team has the required Area Class(es). Any submittal in which the Prime consultant or the overall team area class requirements are not met will be disqualified from further consideration.

Each submittal will require a certification to allow the Department to analyze risks in determining if any Firm should be ineligible for award. The certification shall cover a wide variety of information. Any firm which responds in any potentially concerning manner must provide additional information as directed herein for consideration by GDOT to determine if Firm is eligible for award.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 20%

The Selection Committee will evaluate all firms on their Experience and Qualifications, which shall account for a total of twenty (20%) percent of the total evaluation. **The following criteria for scoring Phase I of the evaluation will be utilized to determine which firms are shortlisted:**

1. Project Manager education, registration, relevant engineering experience, relevant project management experience, experience in utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance.
2. Key Team Leaders' education, registration, relevant technical experience, and relevant experience in utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance.
3. Prime Consultant's experience in delivering projects of similar complexity, size, scope, and function.

C. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 30%

The Selection Committee will evaluate all firms on their Resources availability and Workload Capacity which shall account for a total of thirty (30%) percent of the total evaluation. **The following criteria for scoring the Resources and Workload Capacity will be utilized to determine which firms are shortlisted:**

1. Project Manager Workload
2. Workload capacity of Key Team Leader(s)
3. Resources dedicated to delivering project
4. Ability to Meet Project Schedule

V. Selection Criteria for Phase II - Criteria for Evaluation of Technical Approach and Past Performance

A. Technical Approach – 40%

The Selection Committee will evaluate the shortlisted firms (Finalists) on their Technical Approach, which shall account for a total of forty (40%) percent. The Selection Committee shall utilize the following additional criteria for scoring Phase II of the evaluation to determine the highest ranked/most qualified (**NOTE: Scores from Phase I will be carried forward and combined with the scores from the Phase II to determine the final ranking of Finalists**):

1. Provide any unique technical approaches your firm offers relative to addressing anticipated design concepts, use of any alternative methods for delivery (if applicable), and/or management of the project.
2. Identify any unique challenges of the project and how your firm intends to mitigate these challenges, including quality control, quality assurance procedures.
3. Provide any specific qualifications, skills, knowledge of the project and project area which may uniquely benefit the firm and project, and your ability and willingness to meet time requirements.

B. Past Performance – 10%

The Selection Committee may consider information provided via references provided for relevant projects, knowledge any selection committee member has of performance on relevant projects, and performance evaluations or knowledge presented on GDOT projects. The Selection Committee will consider all factors in their totality and score from 0 to 10 when arriving at a final score for the Past Performance.

VI. Instructions for Content and Preparation of Statements of Qualifications – Phase I Response

The Statements of Qualifications submittal must be submitted in accordance with the instructions provided in Section VIII, and must be **organized, categorized using the same headings (in red), and numbered and lettered** exactly as outlined below, and must be responsive to all requested information. For the sections in which page number limits are stated, each section with a stated limit must begin on a new page and end on the last page allowed for the section. **It is not allowed to begin new sections on a page allowed for a previous section, if applicable. This will enable the Department to ensure compliance with the page limitations.**

Cover page – Each project/contract submittal must have a separate cover page for each copy of each submittal for each project/contract and each must list the RFQ#, RFQ Title, proposing firm's full legal name and the specific project contract being submitted on to include the Project Numbers, PI Numbers, County(ies), and Description.

A. Contract Consideration Checklist

Each Statement of Qualification (SOQ) submittal should include one (1) Contract Consideration Checklist sheet similar to the one shown on the last page of the RFQ, indicating all of the contract(s) a firm have submitted SOQs for under RFQ-484-051121. This one (1) checklist will ensure that **ALL** SOQs submitted are accounted for and included in the correct evaluation package(s). In the event that there are inconsistencies between the contract number(s) and the PI number(s) indicated on a firm's SOQ cover page, the PI number(s) indicated will prevail to determine which contract a firm will be considered for. QA/QC is a must to ensure the correct contract submittal.

B. Administrative Requirements

It is required to submit the information below for each copy of each submittal. This is general information and will not be scored but may be used to determine eligibility for selection. Under Administrative Requirements section, only submit the information requested; additional information will be subject to disqualification of your firm.

1. **Basic company information:**

- a. **Company name.**
- b. **Company Headquarter Address.**
- c. **Contact Information** - Name and all contact information (telephone number(s) and e-mail address) of primary proposing contact (this will be the individual with whom the Department will direct all communications).
- d. **Company website** (if available).
- e. **Georgia Addresses** - Identify and provide addresses for the offices located in the State of Georgia.
- f. **Staff** - List the number and disciplines of staff members employed in each office in the State of Georgia.
- g. **Ownership** - Provide form of ownership, including state of residency or incorporation, and number of years in business. Is the Offeror a sole proprietorship, partnership, corporation, limited liability Corporation, or other structure?

2. **Certification Form** - Complete the Certification Form (*Exhibit "II" enclosed with RFQ*), and provide a notarized original within the firm's Statement of Qualifications. This is to be submitted for the Prime **ONLY**.

3. **Georgia Security and Immigration Compliance Act Affidavit** – Complete the form (*Exhibit "III" enclosed with RFQ*), and provide a notarized original within the firm's Statement of Qualifications. This is to be submitted for the Prime **ONLY**.

4. **Addenda** - Signed cover page of any Addenda issued for the Prime **ONLY**.

C. Experience and Qualifications

1. **Project Manager** - Provide information pertaining to the project manager, including but not limited to:

- a. **Education.**
- b. **Registration** (if necessary and applicable.)
- c. **Relevant engineering experience.**
- d. **Relevant project management experience** for projects of similar complexity, size, scope, and function.

- e. **Relevant experience utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance** (Plan Development Process, Design Policy, Environmental Procedures Manual, etc.).

This information is limited to two (2) pages maximum.

2. **Key Team Leaders** - Provide experience of Key Team Leaders (defined as those individuals who oversee project areas determined as particularly important to each specific project, refer to the Project Description in **Exhibit I-1 thru Exhibit I-12, specifically Section 7** for the list of Key Team Leaders for each Project). For each Key Team Leader identified provide:
 - a. **Education.**
 - b. **Registration** (if necessary and applicable.)
 - c. **Relevant experience** in the applicable resource area of the most relevant projects.
 - d. **Relevant experience utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance** (PDP, Design Policy, Environmental Procedures Manual, etc.) which are specific to the key team leader's area.

This information is limited to one (1) page maximum for each Key Team Leader identified in Section 7 of each Exhibit I-1 thru Exhibit I-12. Respondents submitting more than one (1) page for each Key Team Leader identified will be subject to disqualification. Respondents who provide more Key Team Leaders than what is outlined in the requirement will be subject to disqualification as this would provide an advantage over firms who complied with the requirement and had the required number of Key Team Leaders. Respondents who do not provide the required Key Team Leaders will be subject to disqualification as this does not meet the requirements of the project and therefore would deem the respondent and its team unqualified for the award.

3. **Prime Experience** - Provide information on the prime's experience and ability in delivering effective services for projects of similar complexity, size, scope, and function, which demonstrate the firm's capabilities to provide services for GDOT. For each project, the following information should be provided:
 - a. **Client name, project location and dates** during which services were performed.
 - b. **Description of overall project and services performed** by your firm.
 - c. **Duration of project services provided** by your firm, and overall project budget.
 - d. **Experience utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance** (PDP, Design Policy, Environmental Procedures Manual, etc.)
 - e. **Client(s) current contact information** including contact names, telephone numbers and **e-mail address**.
 - f. **Involvement of Key Team Leaders** on the projects.

This information is limited to two (2) pages maximum.

4. **Area Class Summary Form and Notice of Professional Consultant Qualifications** - Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their sub-consultants, who are considered team members. Prime Consultants and their sub-consultant team members must meet the Area Class requirements listed in Exhibit I-1 thru Exhibit I-12 for each project on which they apply. In regards to the required Area Classes, for each project/contract on which they apply, respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in Exhibit IV) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all sub-consultants or joint-venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes and firm's meeting the area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. If a team member's prequalification will expire prior to the due date of the SOQs, documentation must be provided which shows that the firm has submitted its application for prequalification prior to the SOQ due date. The team must maintain its prequalification certification in order to be considered eligible for award if selected. **Additionally, respondents should submit the Notice of Professional Consultant Qualifications (for the Prime Consultant and all sub-consultants for each project) issued by GDOT and attach after the Area Class summary form.**

This information is limited to the one page for the Area Class table (unless the project needs require an extensive list of area classes) and the required Notice of Professional Consultant Qualifications.

D. Resources/Workload Capacity

1. **Overall Resources** - Provide information regarding the overall resources dedicated to delivering the specific project, including:
 - a. **Organizational chart** which identifies the project manager, prime, Key Team Leaders, support personnel, and reporting structure. This chart may be submitted on a 11" x 17" page. **(Excluded from the page count)**
 - b. **Primary Office** - Identify and discuss the primary office which will be responsible for handling the specific project and the number and types of staff within the office and how this office could benefit the project and promote efficiency. **This information to be included on the one (1) page with the Narrative on Additional Resource Areas and Ability.**
 - c. **Narrative on Additional Resource Areas and Ability** – Respondents are to provide information regarding additional resource areas identified as important to the project, to discuss how the key areas will integrate and work together on the project, to discuss any information which is pertinent to these areas, to provide a narrative regarding how the organization of the team, including the PM and Key Team Leaders can deliver the project on schedule given their workload capacity. (GDOT recognizes that some individuals may be able to meet the schedule while carrying heavier project loads.) Respondents may discuss the advantages of your team and the abilities of the team members which will enable the project to meet the proposed schedule as identified in **Exhibit I-1 thru Exhibit I-12** (where applicable). If there is no proposed schedule, discuss the advantages of the team and the abilities of the team members which will enable the project to move as expeditiously as possible. **Respondents submitting more than the one (1) page allowed (combined for D1.b. and D1.c.) will be subject to disqualification.**

2. **Project Manager Commitment Table** - Provide a list of ALL projects (GDOT, other governments and private contracts – Information may be validated and any firm determined not to be listing all projects may be subject to disqualification) on which the proposed project manager is currently committed, to enable the Department to ascertain the project manager’s availability. Utilize a table similar to the following format with a minimum of all criteria indicated to provide the requested information:

Project Manager	PI/Project # for GDOT Projects/Name of Customer for Non-GDOT Projects	Role of PM on Project	Project Description	Current Phase of Project	Current Status of Project	Monthly Time Commitment in Hours

3. **Key Team Leader Project Commitment Table** - Provide a table similar to the below, with a minimum of all criteria indicated, which identifies ALL projects the Key Team Leaders (refer to the Project Description in **Exhibit I-1 thru Exhibit I-12**, specifically **Section 7** for the list of Key Team Leaders for each Project) are committed on to enable the Department to ascertain the available capacity.

Key Team Leader	PI/Project # for GDOT Projects/Name of Customer for Non-GDOT Projects	Role of Key Team Leader on Project	Project Description	Current Phase of Project	Current Status of Project	Monthly Time Commitment in Hours

This information is limited to the organization chart (excluded from page count), one (1) page combined of text (for both the Primary Office and Narrative on Resource Areas and Ability), and the tables.

VII. Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response – Phase II Response

The following information will only be requested of the shortlisted firms. The Selection Committee will evaluate the shortlisted firms using the information provided as requested below (NOTE: Scores from Phase I will be carried forward to Phase II):

The Phase II response must be submitted in accordance with the instructions provided in Section IX, and must be **organized, categorized using the same headings (in red), and numbered and lettered** exactly as outlined below, and must be responsive to all requested information. For the sections in which page number limits are stated, each section with a stated limit must begin on a new page and end on the last page allowed for the section. **It is not allowed to begin new sections on a page allowed for a previous section, if applicable. This will enable the Department to ensure compliance with the page limitations.**

Phase II Cover page – Each submittal must have a separate cover page for each copy of each Phase II submittal and each must indicate the response is for Phase II, list the RFQ#, RFQ Title, proposing firm's full legal name and the specific project contract being submitted on to include the Project Numbers, PI Numbers, County(ies), and Description.

A. Technical Approach

1. Provide any unique technical approaches your firm offers relative to addressing anticipated design concepts, use of any alternative methods for delivery (if applicable), and/or management of the project.
2. Identify any unique challenges of the project and how your firm intends to mitigate these challenges, including quality control, quality assurance procedures.
3. Provide any specific qualifications, skills, knowledge of the project and project area which may uniquely benefit the firm and project, and your ability and willingness to meet time requirements.

This information will be limited to a maximum of three (3) pages.

B. Past Performance

No additional information should be submitted to fulfill this requirement. Information from the relevant projects listed as well as information on file with the Department will be used to fulfill this requirement.

Past performance may be evaluated through the checking of project references for the proposed project manager as well as the firm. The Department will check these references at random. For this reason, attention should be paid to the references provided to ensure that the contact information provided is accurate and the individual references are reachable. Other past performance information which may be utilized includes GDOT consultant performance ratings as well as knowledge that any member of the Selection Committee has pertaining to the past performance of the firm on any project.

VIII. Instructions for Submittal for Phase I - Statements of Qualifications

- A. There is one (1) electronic version submittal required. The Submittal must follow the format and meet the content requirements identified in **Section VI**, entitled **Instructions for Content and Preparation of Statements of Qualifications – Phase I Response**. See **Attachment 1** for a summary of how the submittals should be prepared.
- B. Submittals must be typed on standard (8½" x 11") paper. The pages should be numbered, however, submittal pages will be counted by section to determine compliance with page limits. Responses are limited to the page counts indicated in each section using a minimum of size 11 font. Page counts will be determined by pages with print on them, not by the physical piece of paper. Each Statement of Qualifications shall be prepared simply and economically as indicated above. Colored displays, and promotional materials are not desired. Emphasis must be on completeness, relevance, and clarity of content.

NOTE: Additional pages other than what has been specified above in each section should not be included and will be grounds for disqualification. Submittals are limited to the information requested in Section VI. Instructions for Content and Preparation of Statements of Qualifications - Phase I Response only. Hyperlinks or embedded video are not allowed.

Statements of Qualifications submittals must be a PDF document for each project/contract. Each PDF document must follow the naming convention for electronic records as follows: the proposing firm's full legal name, RFQ#, RFQ Title and the specific project contract number being submitted on. To submit your Statement of Qualification click the following Links:

- Contract 1: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%201%20
 Contract 2: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%202%20
 Contract 3: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%203%20
 Contract 4: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%204%20
 Contract 5: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%205%20
 Contract 6: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%206%20
 Contract 7: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%207%20
 Contract 8: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%208%20
 Contract 9: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%209%20
 Contract 10: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%2010%20
 Contract 11: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%2011%20
 Contract 12: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%2012%20

If a firm is responding to multiple projects/contracts, each submittal must be e-mail separately using the naming convention for electronic records, and **submission link provided**. Upon successful receipt of the electronic submittal, the system will send a receipt confirmation e-mail to the sender. **If you do not receive an email receipt confirmation for your submittal within one (1) hour of your submittal, please contact Folyan Battle at fbattle@dot.ga.gov.**

Statements of Qualifications **must be received by GDOT** prior to the deadline indicated in the Schedule of Events (*Section III of RFQ*).

No submittals will be accepted after the time and date set for receipt.

All expenses for preparing and submitting responses are the sole cost of the party submitting the response. GDOT is not obligated to any party to reimburse such expenses. All submittals upon receipt become the property of GDOT. Labeling information provided in submittals “proprietary” or “confidential”, or any other designation of restricted use will not protect the information from public view. Subject to the provisions of the Open Records Act, the details of the proposal documents will remain confidential until final award.

GDOT reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to waive any technicalities associated with this submittal if deemed in the best interest of the State.

C. Questions and Requests for Clarification

Questions about any aspect of the RFQ, or the project, shall be submitted in writing via e-mail to: **Folyan Battle, e-mail: fbattle@dot.ga.gov**. The deadlines for submission of questions relating to the RFQ are the times and dates shown in the (**Schedule of Events- Section III**). From the issue date of this solicitation until a successful proposer is selected and the award is made official and announced, respondents are subject to the Restriction of Communication in **Section I.B**.

IX. Instructions for Submittal for Phase II – Technical Approach and Past Performance Response

THESE INSTRUCTIONS ARE INTENDED SOLELY FOR THOSE FIRMS IDENTIFIED AND NOTIFIED AS FINALISTS. Final Instructions will be provided to the Finalists in the notification.

Please note that each project/contract will follow an individual schedule which meets the availability of each Selection Committee. For this reason, the Notice to Selected Finalists and resulting Phase II responses may be on different schedules for each project/contract.

- A. There is one (1) electronic version submittal required. The Submittal must follow the format and meet the content requirements identified in **Section VII**, entitled **Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response - Phase II Response**. See **Attachment 1** for a summary of how the submittals should be prepared.
- B. Submittals must be typed on standard (8½” x 11”) paper. The pages should be numbered, however, submittal pages will be counted by section to determine compliance with page limits. Responses are limited to the page counts indicated in each section using a minimum of size 11 font. Page counts will be determined by pages with print on them, not by the physical piece of paper. Each Statement of Qualifications shall be prepared simply and economically as indicated above. Colored displays, and promotional materials are not desired. Emphasis must be on completeness, relevance, and clarity of content.

NOTE: Additional pages other than what has been specified above in each section **should not be included and will be grounds for disqualification.** Submittals are limited to the information requested in Section VII. Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response-Phase II Response only. Hyperlinks or embedded video are not allowed.

- C. **Technical Approach submittal must be a PDF document for each project/contract. Each PDF document must follow the naming convention for electronic records as follows: the proposing firm's full legal name, RFQ#, RFQ Title and the specific project contract being submitted on. To submit your Technical Approach click the following Links:**

Contract 1: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%201%20
 Contract 2: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%202%20
 Contract 3: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%203%20
 Contract 4: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%204%20
 Contract 5: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%205%20
 Contract 6: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%206%20
 Contract 7: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%207%20
 Contract 8: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%208%20
 Contract 9: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%209%20
 Contract 10: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%2010%20
 Contract 11: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%2011%20
 Contract 12: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%2012%20

If a firm is responding to multiple projects/contracts, each submittal must be e-mail separately using the naming convention for electronic records, and **submission link provided.** Upon successful receipt of the electronic submittal, the system will send a receipt confirmation e-mail to the sender. **If you do not receive an email receipt confirmation for your submittal within one (1) hour of your submittal, please contact Folayan Battle at fbattle@dot.ga.gov.**

Technical Approach must be received by GDOT prior to the deadline indicated in Notice to Selected Finalists.

No submittals will be accepted after the time and date set for receipt.

All expenses for preparing and submitting responses are the sole cost of the party submitting the response. GDOT is not obligated to any party to reimburse such expenses. All submittals upon receipt become the property of GDOT. Labeling information provided in submittals "proprietary" or "confidential", or any other designation of restricted use will not protect the information from public view. Subject to the provisions of the Open Records Act, the details of the proposal documents will remain confidential until final award.

GDOT reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to waive any technicalities associated with this submittal if deemed in the best interest of the State.

No submittals will be accepted after the time and date set for receipt.

Responses submitted via facsimile or e-mail will be rejected. All expenses for preparing and submitting responses are the sole cost of the party submitting the response. GDOT is not obligated to any party to reimburse such expenses. All submittals upon receipt become the property of GDOT. Labeling information provided in submittals "proprietary" or "confidential", or any other designation of restricted use will not protect the information from public view. Subject to the provisions of the Open Records Act, the details of the proposal documents will remain confidential until final award.

GDOT reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to waive any technicalities associated with this submittal if deemed in the best interest of the State.

D. Questions and Requests for Clarification

Questions about any aspect of the Phase II Response for Finalists, shall be submitted in writing via e-mail to: **Folayan Battle, e-mail: fbattle@dot.ga.gov, or as directed in the Notice to Selected Finalists, if different.** The deadlines for submission of questions relating to the Phase II Response will be identified in the Notice to Selected Finalists. From the issue date of this solicitation until a successful proposer is selected and the award is made official and announced, respondents are subject to the Restriction of Communication in **Section I.B.**

X. GDOT Terms and Conditions

A. Statement of Agreement

With the submission of a SOQ, the respondent agrees that he/she has carefully examined the Request for Qualifications, and agrees that it is the respondent's responsibility to request clarification on any issues in any section of the Request for Qualifications with which the respondent disagrees or needs clarified. The respondent also understands that failure to mention these items during the question period or in the SOQ will be interpreted to mean that the respondent is in full agreement with the terms, conditions, specifications and requirements in the therein. With submission of a SOQ, the respondent hereby certifies: (a) that this SOQ is genuine and is not made in the interest or on behalf of any undisclosed person, firm, or corporation; (b) that respondent has not directly or indirectly included or solicited any other respondent to put in a false or insincere SOQ; (c) that respondent has not solicited or induced any person, firm, or corporation to refrain from sending a SOQ.

The respondent also understands that failure to provide required information may result in disqualification. Failure to provide administrative information may not result in disqualification. At the Department's discretion, the Department may notify the respondent that administrative information is not provided or there was an error in the information provided, **and** the Department will allow a respondent to provide an update to the administrative information. However, the exception to this is the provision of the required **GEORGIA SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION COMPLIANCE ACT AFFIDAVIT**, which by Georgia Law requires disqualification of the response. The above changes mentioned to administrative information would be considered allowable as these would be limited to changes which **do not** affect the information which the evaluators use to score the respondents. Failure of a respondent to provide the specific administrative information as required in the notice will result in disqualification. Any respondent who provides changes in addition to the information requested in the notice shall be subject to disqualification. Failure of a respondent's SOQ to provide any information pertaining to a respondent and its teams qualifications, of any type, will subject the SOQ to disqualification. The Department will not allow updates to qualifications to be provided to avoid disqualification as this would allow a respondent to modify its SOQ and alter the information which evaluators would score. The above changes related to qualifications would not be allowable as these would allow changes which **do** affect the information which the evaluators use to score the respondents SOQ.

B. Joint-Venture Proposals, Sub-Consultants, and Vendors

GDOT does not generally desire to enter into "joint-venture" agreements with multiple firms. In the event two or more firms desire to "joint-venture", it is strongly recommended that one incorporated firm propose and maintain status as the Program Management firm with the remaining firms participating as major firms. Any joint-venture, proposed and established as a separate business entity, should have its own set of books and supporting documentation sufficient for an audit trail. Transactions should be recorded consistent with the joint-venture agreement, and care must be taken to ensure that the joint-venture bears its equitable share of the costs. Therefore, "unpopulated joint-ventures" would not have an adequate accounting system suitable for cost reimbursement contracts.

However more traditional "populated joint-ventures" are welcomed. A populated joint-venture is where an alliance is brought to life by infusing it with working capital, employees, and control systems. The alliance implements all necessary business systems, including payroll processing, purchasing, property control, etc. The alliance will develop its own indirect rate structure and calculates its own indirect cost rates, based on the direct and indirect costs it incurs.

Sub-Consultants shall generally be considered any team member which is performing any service which typically requires prequalification, which is subject to the Audit and Accounting System Requirements, and whose services are billed as costs. Sub-Consultant Team Members must be written into the resulting Agreement and are subject to all terms and conditions in the Agreement. Vendors shall be considered any team member which is performing any service which typically does not require prequalification, which is not subject to the Audit and Accounting System Requirements, and whose services are billed as direct expenses. Vendors may not be written into the resulting Agreement and may not be subject to all terms and conditions in the Agreement.

C. Non-Discrimination and DBE Requirements

The Georgia Department of Transportation in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 78 Stat. 252, 42 USC 2000d--42 and Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Department of Transportation, Subtitle A, Office of the Secretary, part 21, Nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs of the Department of Transportation issued pursuant to such Act, hereby notifies all proposers that it will affirmatively ensure that any contract entered into pursuant to this advertisement, minority business enterprises will be afforded full opportunity to submit bids in response to this invitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin in consideration for an award.

The Georgia Department of Transportation Board has adopted a 16% overall annual goal for DBE participation on all federally funded projects. This goal is not to be considered as a fixed quota, set aside or preference. The DBE goal can be met by prime contracting, sub-contracting, joint-venture or mentor/protégé relationship.

Georgia Department of Transportation will monitor and assess each consultant services submittals for their DBE participation and/or good faith effort in promoting equity and opportunity in accordance with the state of Georgia, Department of Transportation Disadvantage Business Program Plan.

For more information on the GDOT DBE Program please contact:

Georgia Department of Transportation
Equal Opportunity Division
One Georgia Center, 7th Floor
600 West Peachtree Street, NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30308
Phone: (404) 631-1972

D. Audit and Accounting System Requirements

GDOT reserves the right to reject any proposal with firms that do not meet the following requirements:

1. Firm(s) should have an accounting system in place to meet requirements of 48 CFR Part 31 and, in the case of non-profit organizations, OMB Circular A-122.
2. Any firm that currently has an aggregate contract amount exceeding \$250,000 should have submitted their yearly CPA overhead audit.
3. Firm(s) should have no significant outstanding deficient audit findings from previous contracts with GDOT that have not been resolved.
4. The prime is responsible for being reasonably assured that all sub-consultant(s) presented as a part of the proposed team are similarly in compliance with the above requirements.

E. Submittal Costs and Confidentiality

All expenses for preparing and submitting responses are the sole cost of the respondent submitting the response. The Department is not obligated to any respondent to reimburse such expenses. All submittals upon receipt become the property of the Department. Labeling information provided in submittals as "proprietary" or "confidential", or any other designation of restricted use will not protect the information from public view. Subject to the provisions of the Open Records Act, the details of the proposal documents will remain confidential until a final award.

F. Award Conditions

This request is not an offer to contract or a solicitation of bids. This request and any proposal submitted in response, regardless of whether the proposal is determined to be the best proposal, is not binding upon the Department and does not obligate the Department to procure or contract for any services. Neither the Department nor any respondent submitting a response will be bound unless and until a written contract mutually accepted by both parties is negotiated as to its terms and conditions and is signed by the Department and a respondent containing such terms and conditions as are negotiated between those parties. The Department reserves the right to waive non-compliance with any requirements of this Request for Qualifications and to reject any or all proposals submitted in responses. Upon review of responses, the Department will determine the respondent(s) proposal that in the sole

judgment of the Department is in the best interest of the Department (if any is so determined), with respect to the evaluation criteria stated herein. The Department then intends to conduct negotiations with such respondent(s) to determine if an acceptable contract may be reached.

G. Debriefings

In lieu of Pre-Award and Post-Award debriefings, it shall be the Department's policy to provide the "Selection Package" at the time of the Selection Announcement (also referred to as the Announcement of Entering into Negotiations). The "Selection Package" will include the scores and comments of phases for all firms who responded and will typically be provided as a PDF file and e-mailed. Previously, pre-award debriefings only provided the scores and comments of the firm. It shall be the policy of the Department that all debriefings will typically be conducted in writing.

H. Right to Cancel or Change RFQ

GDOT reserves the right to cancel any and all Request for Qualifications where it is determined to be in the best interest of the Department to do so. GDOT reserves the right to increase, reduce, add or delete any item in this solicitation as deemed necessary.

It is the responsibility of all firms interested in submitting Statement of Qualifications (SOQs) for this advertisement to routinely check the posting on the Georgia Procurement Registry for any revisions to this RFQ.

I. Substitutions, Alternates, Exceptions, and Extensions

No substitutions or alternates will be accepted for this solicitation. Any respondent submitting substitutions or alternates will be considered non-responsive and will not be considered for award.

J. GDOT Code of Conduct Pertaining to Conflict of Interest in the Award and Administration of Contracts

Pursuant to GDOT Policy 3A-17, any GDOT employee who leaves the employment of the Department and subsequently becomes employed with a consultant firm and whose duties while employed with the Department included the direct involvement with the negotiation, administration, or management of a contract in which the firm is either the primary consultant or a sub-consultant **SHALL NOT** be authorized to work on that contract as an employee of that firm for a period of one (1) year after their employment ends.

Additionally, on July 1st of each year, any consultant firm that is under contract with the Department as a prime or sub consultant shall provide to the Department's Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) a current list of all former Department employees employed by the firm and a document that certifies the responsibilities of those employees as it relates to the current contracts with the Department. This certification document shall attest to the fact that over the last year no former Department employee that is employed by their firm has worked on a contract between the Department and their firm where that employee, when employed by the Department, had direct involvement with the selection, award and/or administration of the consultant contract. Any consultant firm entering into a contract with the Department for the first time as a prime or sub consultant shall provide the initial required list of former Department employees and certification prior to the contract effective date. If the Department's CPO determines at any point during a contract that an actual conflict exists as it relates to the above paragraph, then the CPO shall have the authority to issue a stop work order on that contract.

EXHIBIT I-1

Project/Contract

1. Project Numbers: N/A
2. PI Number: 0013064
3. Counties: Meriwether/Pike
4. Description: SR 109 From SR 41/Meriwether To SR 18/Pike
5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in **Exhibit IV**) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

- A. The **Prime Consultant MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL

- B. The **Team** (either the Prime Consultant and/or one or more of their subconsultant team members) **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.09	Location Studies
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operation Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.04(a)	Aerial Photography/ Conventional Aircraft
OR	
5.04(c)	Aerial Photography/ Unmanned Aircraft System (Design Grade)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide development of the environmental document, including all required special studies (Air, Noise, History, Archaeology and Ecology), concept report, preliminary construction plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, preliminary and final roadway plans, staging plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance) and construction services. All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services.

All deliverables shall be in accordance with, but not limited to, the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), GDOT Design Policy Manual, GDOT Drainage Manual, GDOT Bridge and Structures Design Manual, Plan Presentation Guide, Georgia Environmental Policy Act (GEPA) and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Scoping:

- 1) Analyze project corridor for potential improvement types and locations that meet the defined capacity-improvement purpose and scope of the project. Such alternatives may include developing the corridor as part of a freight route that connects I-85 near Lagrange and I-475 in Macon; segregating the project into multiple projects including bypasses around impacted cities; or limiting the project to addition of passing lanes and/or turn lanes.
- 2) Conduct Traffic Studies.
- 3) Develop traffic projections based on both historic project-specific data and potential changes resulting from development of corridor to a targeted freight corridor.
- 4) Compile a matrix of potential improvements with associated costs for each, and a draft prioritization (Cost/Benefit Analysis). Right-of-way cost estimates must be completed by a GDOT prequalified right-of-way consultant.
- 5) Provide recommendations for specific improvements to be separated/bundled as potential stand-alone projects. The focus of this process will be to expedite the implementation of those projects that can benefit from accelerated design, permitting, and construction.
- 6) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance – Prepare and discuss the matrix and recommendations to GDOT staff to derive an approved list of improvements to implement.
- 7) Prepare Concept Layouts and alignment alternatives for the selected improvements.
- 8) Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 9) Concept Design Data Book.
- 10) Approved Concept Report.
- 11) Approved Public Involvement Plan – Plan must be approved by State Communications Office.
- 12) Compile and maintain contact list of pertinent stakeholders, including, but not limited to individuals; businesses; regulatory agencies; local, State and Federal government officials; emergency service providers, and utilities.
- 13) Coordinate the project's goals and scope with those of PI #s 0008674, 0013063, 0013065, 0013066, and 0013067, and other abutting projects, with the GDOT Planning Office and the Office of Program Delivery.
- 14) Prepare for and attend one (1) Public Information Open House (PIOH).
- 15) Prepare for and attend up to four (4) Stakeholder or Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings.

B. Data Collection:

- 1) Conduct AM & PM Peak Period turning movement counts on SR 109 and all approaches to SR 109.
- 2) Conduct 24-hour classification counts on SR 109 and all on-system approaches to SR 109.
- 3) Conduct early coordination with local governments, regulatory agencies, and targeted stakeholders (e.g., churches, emergency response providers and hospitals, business owners, civic groups) as directed and maintain records of communication.

C. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Conceptual construction cost estimate(s) and conceptual right-of-way estimate(s) using GDOT prequalified right-of-way consultant.
- 3) Prepare concept layouts and alignment alternatives.
- 4) Initial Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 5) Approved Concept Report.
- 6) Concept Design Data Book.
- 7) Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.

D. Environmental:

- 1) Perform Ecology Resources survey and prepare Ecology Survey Report.
- 2) Agency coordination, including multiple meetings to ensure consistency of expectations, design, and clearance limits under each project.
- 3) Perform Historic Resources Survey and Prepare Report.
- 4) Perform Archaeological Resources Survey and Prepare Report.
- 5) Mitigation Credits Screening.
- 6) Aquatic Survey and Report.
- 7) Prepare for and attend Public Involvement (Public Information Open House (PIOH)/Public Hearing Open House (PHOH)/Noise Wall Meetings) and associated coordination with GDOT. One (1) PIOH anticipated.
- 8) Terrestrial Protected Species Survey and Report.
- 9) TPro and P6 updates.
- 10) Prepare for and attend A3M Meeting.

E. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signal Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Staging & Erosion Control Plans.
- 2) Preliminary Bridge Layouts and hydraulic studies.
- 3) Cost Estimation with annual updates.
- 4) Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
- 5) Location and Design Report.
- 6) Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) participation, report, and responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 7) Traffic Studies.
- 8) Preliminary Construction Plans.
- 9) Prepare Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Floodplain Studies, Draft and Final No-Rise Certifications.
- 10) Pavement Evaluation/UST & Monitoring wells/Soil Survey.
- 11) Pavement Type selection.
- 12) Constructability Review meeting.
- 13) Approved Pavement Design.

F. Survey:

- 1) Aerial Photogrammetry/Mapping using GDOT provided aerial photography and LIDAR data.
- 2) Survey Control.
- 3) Complete Survey Database.
- 4) Property Information and Owners (with updates).
- 5) Complete stream hydraulic surveys streams.
- 6) Extend survey limits (if necessary).
- 7) Survey package report.

G. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Attend ROW/Utility Team Meeting.
- 2) Prepare, Revise, and deliver final Right-of Way plans.
- 3) Coordinate field review of right-of-way plans and staking.
- 4) Right-of-Way revisions during acquisitions.
- 5) Coordination with the GDOT Right-of-Way Office during acquisitions.
- 6) Location & Design Approval.

H. Final Design:

- 1) Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) participation, report and responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 2) Erosion Control Plans.

- 3) Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews.
- 4) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 5) Cost Estimation System (CES) Final cost estimate.
- 6) Final Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) Package.
- 7) Amendments & Revisions.
- 8) Final Design Data Book.
- 9) Complete Final Roadway Plans:
 - a. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Final Signal Plans.
 - c. Final Staging & Erosion Plans.
 - d. Final Bridge Plans.

10) Utility Plans:

Utility Relocation Plans.

11) Update all Environmental Special Studies Reports:

- a. History.
- b. Ecology.
- c. Archaeology.
- d. Air.
- e. Noise.
- f. Freshwater Aquatic and other protected species surveys, as needed.

12) Pavement Evaluation.

13) Special Provisions.

I. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Site Condition Revisions.
- 3) Shop Drawings.

J. Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews for all deliverables.

K. Attendance in and meeting minutes of monthly meetings to discuss progress and/or issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

L. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Package, address/respond to comments, and make plan changes. The Consultant shall provide written responses to all Field Plan Review Reports to the Department's project manager no later than 48 hours prior to the distribution deadline.

M. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute preliminary and final plans and all supporting disciplines (signing and marking, erosion control, R/W, Utilities) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

- A. Roadway Design Lead
- B. Bridge Design Lead
- C. Environmental Lead

8. An expected schedule includes the following milestone dates:

- A. Notice to Proceed - Q3 FY 2022
- B. Scoping Report - Q4 FY 2024
- C. Right-of-Way Authorization – Q2 FY 2030
- D. Construction Authorization – Q2 FY 2032

EXHIBIT I-2

Project/Contract

1. Project Numbers: N/A
2. PI Numbers: 0013591
3. County: Catoosa
4. Description: SR 3 From SR 151 To SR 146

5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in **Exhibit IV**) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

A. The **Prime Consultant** **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design
3.02	Urban Roadway Design
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL

B. The **Team** (either the Prime Consultant and/or one or more of their subconsultant team members) **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operation Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.04(a)	Aerial Photography/ Conventional Aircraft
OR	
5.04(c)	Aerial Photography/ Unmanned Aircraft System (Design Grade)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide development of the environmental document, including all required special studies (History, Air, Noise, History, Archaeology, Ecology, Freshwater Aquatic Surveys, and NEPA), concept report, preliminary construction plans, roadway and bridge hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, utility plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, preliminary and final roadway plans, staging plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance) and construction services, including review and approval of structural shop drawings. All required engineering studies are considered part of the scope of services.

All deliverables shall be in accordance with, but not limited to, the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), GDOT Design Policy Manual, GDOT Drainage Manual, GDOT Bridge and Structures Design Manual, Plan Presentation Guide, Georgia Environmental Policy Act (GEPA) and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Scoping:

- 1) Analyze project corridor for potential improvement types and locations that meet the defined capacity-improvement purpose and scope of the project.
- 2) Develop traffic projections based on both historic project-specific data and potential changes resulting from development of the area.
- 3) Compile a matrix of potential improvements with associated construction, utility and right-of-way costs for each, and a draft prioritization (Cost/Benefit Analysis). Right of way cost estimates must be completed by a GDOT prequalified right-of-way consultant.
- 4) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance
- 5) Prepare Concept Layouts and alignment alternatives for the selected improvements.
- 6) Concept Design Data Book.
- 7) Approved Project Execution Plan.
- 8) Approved Public Involvement Plan – Plan must be approved by State Communications Office.
- 9) Compile and maintain contact list of pertinent stakeholders, including, but not limited to, individuals; businesses; regulatory agencies; local, State and Federal government officials; emergency service providers, and utilities.
- 10) Prepare for and attend up to four (4) stakeholder or Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings.
- 11) Prepare Draft Concept Report.

B. Data Collection:

- 1) Conduct AM & PM Peak Period turning movement counts.
- 2) Conduct 24-hour classification counts on SR 3 and all on-system approaches to SR 3.
- 3) Property Information and Owners from available sources.
- 4) Conduct early coordination with local governments, regulatory agencies, and targeted stakeholders (e.g., churches, emergency response providers and hospitals, business owners, civic groups) as directed and maintain records of communication.

C. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Conceptual construction cost estimate(s) and conceptual right of way estimate(s) using GDOT prequalified right-of-way consultant.
- 3) Prepare concept layouts and alignment alternatives.
- 4) Initial Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 5) Approved Concept Report.
- 6) Concept Design Data Book.
- 7) Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 8) Prepare for and attend Public Involvement (Public Information Open House (PIOH)/Public Hearing Open House (PHOH)/Noise Wall Meetings) and associated coordination with GDOT. Two (2) PIOHs anticipated. Each PIOH/PHOH to be held at two different locations.

D. Environmental:

- 1) Perform Ecology Resources survey and prepare Ecology Survey Report.
- 2) Agency coordination, including multiple meetings to ensure consistency of expectations, design, and clearance limits under each project.
- 3) Perform Historic Resources Survey and Prepare Report.
- 4) Perform Air Studies and Prepare Report.
- 5) Perform Noise Studies and Prepare Report.
- 6) Perform Archaeological Resources Survey and Prepare Report.
- 7) Mitigation Credits Screening.
- 8) Aquatic Survey and report.
- 9) UST & Monitoring wells.
- 10) Prepare for and attend Public Involvement (Public Information Open House (PIOH)/Public Hearing Open House (PHOH)/Noise Wall Meetings) and associated coordination with GDOT. Two (2) PIOHs anticipated. Each PIOH/PHOH to be held at two (2) different locations.
- 11) Terrestrial Protected Species Survey and Report.
- 12) TPro and P6 updates.
- 13) Prepare for and attend A3M Meeting.

E. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Signal Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Staging & Erosion Control Plans.
- 2) Prepare for and attend A3M Meeting.
- 3) Preliminary Bridge Layouts and hydraulic studies.
- 4) Geotechnical/Soil Surveys.
- 5) Prepare for and attend Constructability Review Meeting.
- 6) AASHTOWare Cost Estimation with annual updates.
- 7) Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) participation, report, and responses (All plan sets, and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 10) Traffic Studies.
- 11) Preliminary Construction Plans.
- 12) Prepare Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Floodplain Studies, Draft and Final No-Rise Certifications.
- 13) Pavement Evaluation.
- 14) Pavement Type selection.
- 15) Approved Pavement Design.

F. Survey:

- 1) Aerial Photogrammetry/Mapping using aerial photography and LIDAR data provide by GDOT's State Location Bureau (SLB).
- 2) Complete Survey Control.
- 3) Complete Survey Database.
- 4) Right-of-Way Staking.
- 5) Bridge Layout Staking.
- 6) Property Information and Owners (with updates).
- 7) Complete stream hydraulic surveys - streams.
- 8) Extend survey limits (if necessary).
- 9) Survey package report.

G. Right-of-Way Plans:

- 1) Attend ROW/Utility Team Meeting.
- 2) Prepare, Revise, and deliver final Right-of-Way plans.
- 3) Coordinate field review of right-of-way plans and staking.
- 4) Right-of-Way revisions during acquisitions.
- 5) Coordination with the GDOT Right-of-Way Office during acquisitions.
- 6) Location & Design Approval.

H. Final Design:

- 1) FFPR participation, report, and responses (All plan sets, and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 2) Soil Survey Report.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation Report
- 4) Wall Foundation Investigation Report, if needed.
- 5) Culvert Foundation Investigation Report, if needed.
- 6) Erosion Control Plans.
- 7) Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews.
- 8) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 9) AASHTOWare Final cost estimate.
- 10) Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) Package.
- 11) Amendments & Revisions.
- 12) Final Design Data Book.
- 13) Complete Final Roadway Plans:
 - a. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Final Signal Plans.
 - c. Final Staging & Erosion Plans.
 - d. Final Bridge Plans.
 - e. Utility Plans.
 - f. Utility Relocation Plans.
- 14) Update all Environmental Special Studies Reports:
 - a. History.
 - b. Ecology.
 - c. Archaeology.
 - d. Air.
 - e. Noise.
 - f. Freshwater Aquatic and other protected species surveys as needed.
- 15) Approved Pavement Evaluation.
- 16) Special Provisions.

I. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Site Condition Revisions.
- 3) Shop Drawings.

J. Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews for all deliverables.

- K. Attendance in and meeting minutes of monthly meetings to discuss progress and/or issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).
 - L. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Package, address/respond to comments, and make plan changes. The Consultant shall provide written responses to all Field Plan Review Reports to the Department's project manager no later than 48 hours prior to the distribution deadline.
 - M. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute preliminary and final plans and all supporting disciplines (signing and marking, erosion control, R/W, Utilities,) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.
7. Related Key Team Leaders:
- A. Roadway Design Lead
 - B. Bridge Design Lead
 - C. NEPA Lead
8. An expected schedule includes the following milestone dates:
- A. Notice to Proceed - Q3 FY 2022
 - B. Scoping Report - Q4 FY 2024
 - C. Right of Way Authorization - Q2 FY 2028
 - D. Construction Authorization - Q2 FY 2030

EXHIBIT I-3

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017729
3. County: Dawson
4. Description: SR 53 @ Thompson Creek
5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in **Exhibit IV**) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

- A. The **Prime Consultant MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

- B. The **Team** (either the Prime Consultant and/or one or more of their subconsultant team members) **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide concept development, field surveys and database enhancements, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, roadway and bridge hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans, final bridge plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process, Electronic Data Guidelines, Plan Presentation Guide, NEPA and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4) Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design, including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4),, if applicable.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions during Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals, including Railroad (RR).
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans, as required.

G. Final Design:

1) Complete Final Roadway Plans:

- a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
- b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
- c. Final ESPCP.
- d. Final Utility Plans.
- e. Final Staging Plans.
- f. Final Drainage Design including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
- g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.

- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

- A. Roadway Design Lead
- B. Bridge Design Lead
- C. NEPA Lead

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. PFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-4

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017732
3. County: Habersham
4. Description: SR 17/SR 115 @ Soquee River
5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in **Exhibit IV**) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

- A. The **Prime Consultant MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

- B. The **Team** (either the Prime Consultant and/or one or more of their subconsultant team members) **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide concept development, field surveys and database enhancements, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, roadway and bridge hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans, lighting plans, final bridge plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process, Electronic Data Guidelines, Plan Presentation Guide, Bridge and Structures Design Manual, NEPA and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4) Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design, including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
 - g. Preliminary Lighting Plans.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study and Approved Preliminary Layout.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions During Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals, including Railroad (RR).
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans as Required.

G. Final Design:

- 1) Complete Final Roadway Plans, including, but not limited to:
 - a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
 - b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Final ESPCP.
 - d. Final Utility Plans.
 - e. Final Staging Plans.
 - f. Final Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.
 - g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.
 - h. Final Lighting Plans.
- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

- A. Roadway Design Lead
- B. Bridge Design Lead
- C. NEPA Lead

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. PFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-5

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017733
3. County: Habersham
4. Description: SR 255 @ Amys Creek
5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in **Exhibit IV**) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

- A. The **Prime Consultant MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

- B. The **Team** (either the Prime Consultant and/or one or more of their subconsultant team members) **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide concept development, field surveys and database enhancements, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, roadway and bridge hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans, final bridge plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the scope of services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process, Electronic Data Guidelines, Plan Presentation Guide, Bridge and Structures Design Manual, NEPA and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for ROW Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4))Practical Alternatives Review (PAR Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design, including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study and Approved Preliminary Layout.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Review Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions During Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals.
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans, as required.

G. Final Design:

- 1) Complete Final Roadway Plans:
 - a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
 - b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Final ESPCP.
 - d. Final Utility Plans.
 - e. Final Staging Plans.
 - f. Final Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.
 - g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.
- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

- A. Roadway Design Lead
- B. Bridge Design Lead
- C. NEPA Lead

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. PFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-6

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017734
3. Counties: Habersham/White
4. Description: SR 384 @ Chattahoochee River
5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in **Exhibit IV**) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

- A. The **Prime Consultant** **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

- B. The **Team** (either the Prime Consultant and/or one or more of their subconsultant team members) **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide concept development, field surveys and database enhancements, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, roadway and bridge hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans, final bridge plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the scope of services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process, Electronic Data Guidelines, Plan Presentation Guide, Bridge and Structures Design Manual, NEPA and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for ROW Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4) Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study and Approved Preliminary Layout.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Review Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions During Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals.
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans, as required.

G. Final Design:

1) Complete Final Roadway Plans:

- a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
- b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
- c. Final ESPCP.
- d. Final Utility Plans.
- e. Final Staging Plans.
- f. Final Drainage Design, including MS4, if applicable.
- g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.

- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

- A. Roadway Design Lead
- B. Bridge Design Lead
- C. NEPA Lead

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. PFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-7

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017735
3. County: Hall
4. Description: SR 283 @ Flat Creek
5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in **Exhibit IV**) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

- A. The **Prime Consultant MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

- B. The **Team** (either the Prime Consultant and/or one or more of their subconsultant team members) **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide concept development, field surveys and database enhancements, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, roadway and bridge hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans, final bridge plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the scope of services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process, Electronic Data Guidelines, Plan Presentation Guide, Bridge and Structures Design Manual, NEPA and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4) Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study and Approved Preliminary Layout.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Review Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions During Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals.
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans, as required.

G. Final Design:

- 1) Complete Final Roadway Plans:
 - a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
 - b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Final ESPCP.
 - d. Final Utility Plans.
 - e. Final Staging Plans.
 - f. Final Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.
 - g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.
- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

- A. Roadway Design Lead
- B. Bridge Design Lead
- C. NEPA Lead

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. PFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-8

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017736
3. County: Hart
4. Description: SR 77 @ Shoal Creek
5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in **Exhibit IV**) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

- A. The **Prime Consultant** **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

- B. The **Team** (either the Prime Consultant and/or one or more of their subconsultant team members) **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide concept development, field surveys and database enhancements, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, roadway and bridge hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans, final bridge plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the scope of services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process, Electronic Data Guidelines, Plan Presentation Guide, Bridge and Structures Design Manual, NEPA and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4) Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study and Approved Preliminary Layout.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Review Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions During Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals.
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans, as required.

G. Final Design:

1) Complete Final Roadway Plans:

- a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
- b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
- c. Final ESPCP.
- d. Final Utility Plans.
- e. Final Staging Plans.
- f. Final Drainage Design, including MS4, if applicable.
- g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.

- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

- A. Roadway Design Lead
- B. Bridge Design Lead
- C. NEPA Lead

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. PFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-9

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017737
3. County: Towns
4. Description: SR 17/SR 75 @ Soapstone Creek
5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in **Exhibit IV**) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

- A. The **Prime Consultant MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

- B. The **Team** (either the Prime Consultant and/or one or more of their subconsultant team members) **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide concept development, field surveys and database enhancements, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, roadway and bridge hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans, final bridge plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the scope of services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process, Electronic Data Guidelines, Plan Presentation Guide, Bridge and Structures Design Manual, NEPA and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4) Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study and Approved Preliminary Layout.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions During Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals, including Railroad (RR).
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans, as required.

G. Final Design:

1) Complete Final Roadway Plans:

- a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
- b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
- c. Final ESPCP.
- d. Final Utility Plans.
- e. Final Staging Plans.
- f. Final Drainage Design, including MS4, if applicable.
- g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.

- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

- A. Roadway Design Lead
- B. Bridge Design Lead
- C. NEPA Lead

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. PFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-10

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017739
3. County: White
4. Description: SR 17/SR 75 @ Chattahoochee River
5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in **Exhibit IV**) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

- A. The **Prime Consultant MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
3.04	Rural Interstate Highway Design

- B. The **Team** (either the Prime Consultant and/or one or more of their subconsultant team members) **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design – CONDITIONAL
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide concept development, field surveys and database enhancements, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, roadway and bridge hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans, final bridge plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the scope of services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process, Electronic Data Guidelines, Plan Presentation Guide, Bridge and Structures Design Manual, NEPA and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4) Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study and Approved Preliminary Layout.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions During Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals.
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans, as required.

G. Final Design:

1) Complete Final Roadway Plans:

- a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
- b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
- c. Final ESPCP.
- d. Final Utility Plans.
- e. Final Staging Plans.
- f. Final Drainage Design, including MS4, if applicable.
- g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.

- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

- A. Roadway Design Lead
- B. Bridge Design Lead
- C. NEPA Lead

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. FFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-11

Project/Contract

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Number: 0017770
3. County: Henry
4. Description: SR 42 From CS 634/MLK Jr Blvd To CS 680/MarketPlace Blvd
5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in **Exhibit IV**) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint-venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

- A. The **Prime Consultant** **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Urban Highway Design

- B. The **Team** (either the Prime Consultant and/or one or more of their subconsultant team members) **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
1.01	Statewide Systems Planning
1.02	Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning
1.05	Alternate System and Corridor Location Planning
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.09	Location Studies
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.09	Traffic Control Systems Analysis, Design and Implementation
3.10	Utility Coordination
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
3.15	Highway Lighting
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.02	Major Bridges Design
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
	Must meet one of the Area Classes below in the 5.04 series.
5.04(a)	Aerial Photography/ Conventional Aircraft
5.04(b)	Aerial Photography/Unmanned Aircraft System (Concept Grade)
5.04(c)	Aerial Photography/Unmanned Aircraft System (Design Grade)
5.05	Aerial Photogrammetry

	Must meet one of the Area Classes below in the 5.06 series.
5.06(a)	Topographic Remote Sensing (LIDAR) (Conventional Aircraft, Terrestrial Sensors and Mobile Vehicle, Boat, or Rail Units) (Design Grade)
5.06(b)	Topographic Remote Sensing (Unmanned Aircraft System LIDAR) (Design Grade)
5.06(c)	Topographic Remote Sensing (Unmanned Aircraft System LIDAR) (Concept Grade)
5.06(d)	Topographic Remote Sensing (Sonar)
5.06(e)	Topographic Remote Sensing Thermal and Infrared Sensors
5.08	Subsurface Utility Engineering
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.03	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Soils and Foundation)
6.05	Hazard Waste Site Assessment Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESP/CP) Preparation

6. Scope:

The project proposes to widen SR 42 from CS 634/MLK Jr Blvd to CS 680/Marketplace Blvd in Henry County. The Consultant should consider a full range of alternatives to recommend the best concept to GDOT. At this time, the proposed project only has a scoping phase funded.

The proposed project will be delivered via a series of Task Orders throughout the Master Contract duration. Currently the project only has a scoping phase with no PE, ROW, or CST funds identified. Task Order 1 is anticipated to be some concept level activities with the anticipated deliverable to be a concept report. This initial task order will include the following:

- Examine the possibility of creating a one-way pair.
- Examine locations throughout the Norfolk Southern rail line within the project limits for multiple crossing points and rank them by type of crossing and feasibility.
- Provide existing and projected traffic and volume data on the affected road network.
- Provide railroad utilization data for the corridor within the study area including frequency, length, and average road travel delays due to blocked crossings.
- Provide safety information relative to the rail crossings within the study area.
- Identify restraints due to topography, utilities, flood, soils, other environmental factors, historic properties, and land use.
- Attend meetings with a Steering Committee and the City Council as needed and at least one meeting with the general public.
- Contact stakeholders.
- Present a minimum of two (2) up to five (5) alternatives with future impacts and cost estimates.

It is not likely that all standard concept activities will be completed due to limited scoping funds. All deliverables shall be in accordance with, but not limited to, the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), GDOT Design Policy Manual, GDOT Drainage Manual, GDOT Bridge and Structures Design Manual, Plan Presentation Guide, National / Georgia Env Policy Act (NEPA/GEPA) and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Conceptual right-of-way cost estimate utilizing vendor from GDOT's Right-of-Way services prequalified contractor list.
- 3) Conceptual construction cost estimate.
- 4) Prepare concept layouts and alignments alternatives.
- 5) Initial Concept meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.

B. Environment Document:

- 1) GDOT will complete the Environmental Resource ID (Ecology, Archeology, & History) in advance of anticipated Consultant's Notice to Proceed. The Consultant will complete all other necessary Environmental Special Studies (Air, Aquatics, and Protected Species, as required) and Assessment of Effects (AOEs).
- 2) Agency coordination including multiple meetings to ensure consistency of expectations, design, and clearance limits.
- 3) Preparation of Section 404 Permit Application/Local Coordination Procedures.
- 4) Section 7 Coordination.
- 5) Protected Species Surveys including Aquatic & Terrestrial Surveys, as required.
- 6) Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
- 7) Execution of Public Involvement Plan (PIP) including the Public Involvement (Public Information Open House (PIOH) and associated coordination with GDOT.
- 8) Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), Constructability Review, and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 9) Preparation of Environmental Commitments Table "Green Sheet" and Environmental Resource Impact Table (ERIT).
- 10) Certification for Let.
- 11) TPro and P6 Updates.

C. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signal Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Staging & Erosion Control Plans.
- 2) Preliminary Bridge Layouts, as required.
- 3) Cost Estimation System (CES) Preliminary cost estimate with annual updates.
- 4) Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
- 5) Location and Design Report.
- 6) Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) participation, report, and responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 7) Traffic Studies.
- 8) Preliminary Construction plans.
- 9) Railroad Coordination.
- 10) Pavement Evaluation/UST & Monitoring wells/Soil Survey.
- 11) Pavement Type selection.
- 12) Constructability Review meeting.
- 13) Approved Pavement Design.

D. Survey:

- 1) Survey Control.
- 2) Complete Survey Database.
- 3) Property Information and Owners (with updates).
- 4) Complete stream hydraulic surveys streams.
- 5) Extend survey limits (if necessary).
- 6) Survey package report.

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare, Revise and deliver final Right-of-Way plans.
- 2) Coordinated field review of right-of-way plans and staking.
- 3) Right-of-Way revisions during acquisitions.
- 4) Coordination with the GDOT Right-of-Way Office during acquisitions.
- 5) Location & Design Approval.

F. Final Design:

- 1) FFPR participation, report, and responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 2) Erosion Control Plans.
- 3) Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews.

- 4) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 5) Cost Estimation System (CES) Final cost estimate.
- 6) Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) Package.
- 7) Amendments & Revisions.
- 8) Final Design Data Book.

- 9) Complete Final Roadway Plans:
 - a. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Final Signal Plans.
 - c. Final Staging & Erosion Plans.

- 10) Utility Plans.

- 11) Update all Environmental Special Studies Reports:
 - a. History.
 - b. Ecology.
 - c. Archaeology.
 - d. Air.
 - e. Noise.
 - f. Freshwater Aquatic and other protected species surveys, as needed.

- 12) Pavement Evaluation.
- 13) Special Provisions.
- 14) Railroad Coordination.
- 15) Final Bridge Plans.
- 16) Bridge Foundation Studies.

G. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Site Condition Revisions.
- 3) Shop Drawings.

H. Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews for all deliverables.

I. Attendance in and meeting minutes of monthly meetings to discuss progress and/or issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

J. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute Field Plan Review (FPR) Packages, address/respond to comments, and make changes. The Consultant shall provide written responses to all Field Plan Review Reports to the Department's project manager no later than 48 hours prior to the distribution deadline.

K. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute preliminary and final plans and all supporting disciplines (signing and marking, erosion control, R/W, utilities,) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

- A. Roadway Design Lead
- B. Bridge Design Lead
- C. NEPA Lead

8. An expected schedule includes the following key milestone date:

Notice to Proceed - Q2 FY 2022

EXHIBIT I-12

Project/Contract

1. Project Numbers: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017845
3. County: Fulton
4. Description: SR 141 @ CS 119/State Bridge Road
5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in **Exhibit IV**) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint-venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

- A. The **Prime Consultant** **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
3.02	Urban Roadway Design
3.03	Complex Urban Roadway Design

- B. The **Team** (either the Prime Consultant and/or one or more of their subconsultant team members) **MUST** be prequalified by GDOT in the area classes listed below:

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.09	Traffic Control Systems Analysis, Design and Implementation
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.13	Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Design
3.15	Highway Lighting and Outdoor Lighting
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.03	Hydraulic and Hydrologic Studies (Soils & Foundation)
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

This is an intersection improvement, safety project proposed at the intersection of SR 141 @ State Bridge Road.

The Consultant shall provide the development of the following scopes of services items. All deliverables shall be in accordance with, but not limited to the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), GDOT Design Policy Manual, GDOT Drainage Manual, Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Environmental Procedures Manual (EPM).

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Environmental Document:

- 1) Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports, and Assessment of Effects for Air, Noise, Ecology, Aquatics, Archaeology, History, and NEPA.
- 2) Agency coordination including multiple meetings to ensure consistency of expectations, design, and clearance limits.
- 3) Preparation of Section 404 Permit Applications and Stream Buffer Variances.
- 4) Section 7 Coordination.
- 5) Protected Species Surveys including Aquatic and Terrestrial Surveys, as required.

- 6) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Environmental Approval.
 - b. NEPA Re-evaluations, as required.

- 7) Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), Constructability Review, and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Certification for Right-of-Way.
- 9) Certification for Let.
- 10) TPro and P6 Updates.
- 11) Preparation of Environmental Commitments Table "Green Sheet" and Environmental Resource Impact Table (ERIT).

B. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signal Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Staging and Erosion Control Plans.

- 2) Cost Estimation System (CES) Preliminary Cost estimate with annual updates.
- 3) Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews.
- 4) Location and Design Report.
- 5) PFPR participation, report, plan production and distribution, and responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 6) Traffic Studies.
- 7) Preliminary Construction Plans.
- 8) Pavement Evaluation/UST & Monitoring Wells/Soil Survey.
- 9) Pavement Type Selection.
- 10) Constructability Review Meeting.
- 11) Approved Pavement Design.
- 12) SUE Plans (Quality Level-B).

C. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare, revise and deliver final Right-of-Way plans.
- 2) Coordinated field review of right-of-way plans and staking.
- 3) Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.
- 4) Coordination with the GDOT Right-of-Way Office during acquisition.
- 5) Location and Design Approval.
- 6) Attend Property Owners Meeting.

D. Final Design.

- 1) FFPR participation, report, plan production and distribution, and responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 2) Erosion Control Plans.
- 3) Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews.

- 4) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 5) Cost Estimation System (CES) Final Cost Estimate.
- 6) Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) Package.
- 7) Amendments and Revisions.
- 8) Final Design Databook.

9) Complete Final Roadway Plans:

- a. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
- b. Final Signal Plans.
- c. Final Staging and Erosion Control Plans.

10) Utility Plans.

11) Update Environmental Special Studies and NEPA re-evaluation:

- a. History.
- b. Ecology.
- c. Archaeology.
- d. Air.
- e. Noise.
- f. Freshwater Aquatic and other protected species surveys, as needed.

12) Special Provisions.

E. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Site Condition Revisions.

F. Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews for all deliverables.

G. Attendance in and meeting minutes of monthly meetings to discuss progress and/or issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

H. All special provisions, design files, supporting documentation, analyses, and studies.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

- A. Roadway Design Lead
- B. NEPA Lead

8. An expected schedule includes the following milestone dates:

- A. Notice to Proceed – Q3 FY 2022
- B. Right-of-Way Authorization – Q4 FY 2023
- C. Construction Authorization – Q4 FY 2024

**EXHIBIT II
CERTIFICATION FORM**

I, _____, being duly sworn, state that I am _____ (title) of _____

_____ (firm) and hereby duly certify that I have read and understand the information presented in the attached proposal and any enclosure and exhibits thereto.

Initial each box below indicating certification. The person initialing must be the same person who signs the Certification Form. (If unable to initial any box for any reason, place an "X" in the applicable box and attach a statement explaining the non-certification. The Department will review and make a determination as to whether or not the firm shall be considered further or disqualified).

I further certify that to the best of my knowledge the information given in response to the Request for Qualifications is full, complete and truthful.

I further certify that the submitting firm and any principal employee of the submitting firm has not, in the immediately preceding five (5) years, been convicted of any crime of moral turpitude or any felony offense, nor has had their professional license suspended, revoked or been subjected to disciplinary proceedings, nor is any team members/principals currently under indictment for any reason related to actions on public infrastructure projects.

I further certify that I understand that Firms included on the current Federal list of firms suspended or debarred are not eligible for selection and that the submitting firm has not, in the immediately preceding five (5) years, been suspended or debarred from contracting with any federal, state or local government agency, and further, that the submitting firm is not now under consideration for suspension or debarment from any such agency.

I further certify that the submitting firm has not in the immediately preceding five (5) years been defaulted in any federal, state or local government agency contract and further, that the submitting firm is not now under any notice of intent to default on any such contract, nor has been removed from a contract or failed to complete a contract as assigned due to cause or default.

I further certify that the firm or any affiliate(s) has not been involved in any arbitration, litigation, mediation, dispute review board or other dispute resolution proceeding with a client, business partner, or government agency in the last five (5) years involving an amount in excess of \$500,000 related to performance on public infrastructure projects.

I further certify that there are not any pending regulatory inquiries that could impact our ability to provide services if we are the selected consultant.

I further certify that there are no possible conflicts of interest created by our consideration in the selection process or by our involvement in the project.

I further certify that the submitting firm's annual average revenue for the past five (5) years is sufficient to allow the services to be delivered effectively by our firm and that there are no trends in the revenue which may be concerning other than normal market fluctuations.

I further certify that in regards to Audit and Accounting System Requirements, that the submitting firm:

- I. Has an accounting system in place to meet requirements of 48 CFR Part 31 and, in the case of non-profit organizations, OMB Circular A-122.
- II. Has submitted its yearly Certified Public Accountant overhead audit if it currently has an aggregate contract amount exceeding \$250,000.
- III. Has no significant outstanding deficient audit findings from previous contracts with GDOT that have not been resolved.
- IV. Is responsible for being reasonably assured that all sub-consultant(s) presented as a part of the proposed team are similarly in compliance with the above requirements.

I acknowledge, agree and authorize, and certify that the proposer acknowledges, agrees and authorizes, that GDOT may, by means that either deems appropriate, determine the accuracy and truth of the information provided by the proposer and that the GDOT may contact any individual or entity named in the Statement of Qualifications for the purpose of verifying the information supplied therein.

I acknowledge and agree that all of the information contained in the Statement of Qualifications is submitted for the express purpose of inducing the GDOT to award a contract.

A material false statement or omission made in conjunction with this proposal is sufficient cause for suspension or debarment from further contracts, or denial or rescission of any contract entered into based upon this proposal thereby precluding the firm from doing business with, or performing work for, the State of Georgia. In addition, such false statement or omission may subject the person and entity making the proposal to criminal prosecution under the laws of the State of Georgia of the United States, including but not limited to O.C.G.A. §16-10-20, 18 U.S.C. §§1001 or 1341.

Sworn and subscribed before me

This ____ day of _____, 20____.

Signature

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires: _____

NOTARY SEAL

EXHIBIT III

GEORGIA SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION COMPLIANCE ACT AFFIDAVIT

Consultant's Name:	
Address:	
Solicitation No./Contract No.:	RFQ-484-051121
Solicitation/Contract Name:	Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services

CONSULTANT AFFIDAVIT

By executing this affidavit, the undersigned Consultant verifies its compliance with O.C.G.A. § 13-10-91, stating affirmatively that the individual, entity or corporation which is engaged in the physical performance of services on behalf of the Georgia Department of Transportation has registered with, is authorized to use and uses the federal work authorization program commonly known as E-Verify, or any subsequent replacement program, in accordance with the applicable provisions and deadlines established in O.C.G.A. § 13-10-91.

Furthermore, the undersigned Consultant will continue to use the federal work authorization program throughout the contract period and the undersigned Consultant will contract for the physical performance of services in satisfaction of such contract only with sub-consultants who present an affidavit to the Consultant with the information required by O.C.G.A. § 13-10-91(b). Consultant hereby attests that its federal work authorization user identification number and date of authorization are as follows:

 Federal Work Authorization User Identification Number
 (EEV/E-Verify Company Identification Number)

 Date of Authorization

 Name of Consultant

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct

 Printed Name (of Authorized Officer or Agent of Consultant)

 Title (of Authorized Officer or Agent of Consultant)

 Signature (of Authorized Officer or Agent)

 Date Signed

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN BEFORE ME ON THIS THE

____ DAY OF _____, 20____

 Notary Public

[NOTARY SEAL]

My Commission Expires: _____

**EXHIBIT IV
Area Class Summary Example**

Respondents should complete a table similar to the below and indicate by placing an “X” in the appropriate column indicating the firm which meets each required area class for each specific project with particular emphasis on the area classes which the Prime must hold as well as the sub-consultants. The below table is a full listing of all area classes. Since no single advertisement would require every area class, Respondents should delete all the area classes which are not applicable to the project they are pursuing and only include the ones applicable. Particular attention should be paid to the date that consultants certificate expires.

Area Class #	Area Class Description	Prime Consultant Name	Sub-Consultant #1 Name	Sub-Consultant #2 Name	Sub-Consultant #3 Name	Sub-Consultant #4 Name	Sub-Consultant #5 Name	Sub-Consultant #6 Name
	DBE – Yes/No ->							
	Prequalification Expiration Date							
1.01	Statewide Systems Planning							
1.02	Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning							
1.03	Aviation Systems Planning							
1.04	Mass and Rapid Transportation Planning							
1.05	Alternate Systems Planning							
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation							
1.06(b)	History							
1.06(c)	Air Studies							
1.06(d)	Noise Studies							
1.06(e)	Ecology							
1.06(f)	Archaeology							
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys							
1.06(h)	Bat Surveys							
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)							
1.08	Airport Master Planning (AMP)							
1.09	Location Studies							
1.10	Traffic Projections							
1.11	Traffic and Toll Revenue Studies							
1.12	Major Investment Studies							
1.13	Non-Motorized transportation Planning							
2.01	Mass Transit Program (Systems Management)							
2.02	Mass Transit Feasibility and Technical Studies							
2.03	Mass Transit Vehicle and Propulsion System							
2.04	Mass Transit Controls, Communication and Information Systems							
2.05	Mass Transit Architectural Engineering							
2.06	Mass Transit Unique Structures							
2.07	Mass Transit Electrical and Mechanical System							
2.08	Mass Transit Operations Management and Support Services							
2.09	Airport Design (AD)							
2.10	Mass Transit Program (Systems Marketing)							
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design							
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane urban Roadway Design							
3.03	Multi-Lane Urban Roadway Widening and Reconstruction							
3.04	Multi-lane Rural Interstate Limited Access Design							
3.05	Multi-lane Urban Interstate Limited Access Design							
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies							
3.07	Traffic Operations Design							
3.08	Landscape Architecture Design							

3.09	Traffic Control Systems Analysis, Design and Implementation							
3.10	Utility Coordination							
3.11	Architecture							
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)							
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians							
3.14	Historic Rehabilitation							
3.15	Highway and Outdoor Lighting							
3.16	Value Engineering (VE)							
3.17	Toll Facilities Infrastructure Design							
4.01	Minor Bridge Design							
4.02	Major Bridge Design							
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)							
4.05	Bridge Inspection							
5.01	Land Surveying							
5.02	Engineering Surveying							
5.03	Geodetic Surveying							
5.04(a)	Aerial Photography/Conventional Aircraft							
5.04(b)	Aerial Photography/Unmanned Aircraft System (Concept Grade)							
5.04(c)	Aerial Photography/Unmanned Aircraft System (Design Grade)							
5.05	Aerial Photogrammetry							
5.06(a)	Topographic Remote Sensing (LIDAR) (Conventional Aircraft, Terrestrial Sensors and Mobile Vehicle, Boat, or Rail Units) (Design Grade)							
5.06(b)	Topographic Remote Sensing (Unmanned Aircraft System LIDAR) (Design Grade)							
5.06(c)	Topographic Remote Sensing (Unmanned Aircraft System LIDAR) (Concept Grade)							
5.06(d)	Topographic Remote Sensing (Sonar)							
5.06(e)	Topographic Remote Sensing Thermal and Infrared Sensors							
5.07	Cartography							
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)							
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies							
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies							
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies							
6.03	Hydraulic and Hydrologic Studies (Soils & Foundation)							
6.04(a)	Laboratory Testing of Roadway Construction Materials							
6.04(b)	Field Testing of Roadway Construction Materials							
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies							
8.01	Construction Engineering and Supervision							
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan							
9.02	Rainfall and Runoff Reporting							
9.03	Field Inspection for Erosion Control							

ATTACHMENT 1

Submittal Formats for GDOT
Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services

	# of Pages Allowed
Cover Page	-> 1
A. Contract Consideration Checklist	-> 1
B. Administrative Requirements	
1. Basic Company Information	
a. Company name	
b. Company Headquarter Address	
c. Contact Information	
d. Company Website	
e. Georgia Addresses	
f. Staff	
g. Ownership	Excluded
2. Notarized Certification Form (Exhibit II) for Prime	-> 1
3. Notarized Georgia Security and Immigration Compliance Act Affidavit (Exhibit III)	-> 1
4. Signed Cover Page of any Addenda Issued	-> 1 (each addenda)
C. Experience and Qualifications	
1. Project Manager	
a. Education	
b. Registration	
c. Relevant engineering experience	
d. Relevant project management experience	
e. Relevant experience using GDOT specific processes, etc.	2
2. Key Team Leader Experience	
a. Education	
b. Registration	
c. Relevant experience in applicable resource area	
d. Relevant experience using GDOT specific processes, etc.	1 (each)
3. Prime's Experience	
a. Client name, project location, and dates	
b. Description of overall project and services performed	
c. Duration of project services provided	
d. Experience using GDOT specific processes, etc.	
e. Clients current contact information	
f. Involvement of Key Team Leaders	2
4. Area Class Table and Notice of Professional Consultant Qualifications for Prime and Sub-Consultants	-> Excluded
D. Resources/Workload Capacity	
1. Overall Resources	
a. Organization chart	-> Excluded
b. Primary office to handle project and staff description of office and benefits of office	
c. Narrative on Additional Resource Areas and Ability	1
2. Project Manager Commitment Table	-> Excluded
3. Key Team Leaders Project commitment table	-> Excluded

**Project Consideration Checklist –
RFQ-484-051121
Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services**

This form must be completed and included in the Statement of Qualification(s) in Section VI. A. Contract Consideration Checklist with **all** applicable boxes checked.

This form **will NOT** be counted in the maximum number of pages.

ALL The submitted team meets the prequalification requirements for **All** projects and would like to be considered on **All** projects.

OR

The submitted team meets the prequalification requirements and would like to be considered on the following checked contracts.

Contract #	PI #	Count(ies)	Project Description
1	0013064	Meriwether/Pike	SR 109 FROM SR 41/MERIWETHER TO SR 18/PIKE
2	0013591	Catoosa	SR 3 FROM SR 151 TO SR 146
3	0017729	Dawson	SR 53 @ THOMPSON CREEK
4	0017732	Habersham	SR 17/SR 115 @ SOQUEE RIVER
5	0017733	Habersham	SR 255 @ AMYS CREEK
6	0017734	Habersham/White	SR 384 @ CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER
7	0017735	Hall	SR 283 @ FLAT CREEK
8	0017736	Hart	SR 77 @ SHOAL CREEK
9	0017737	Towns	SR 17/SR 75 @ SOAPSTONE CREEK
10	0017739	White	SR 17/SR 75 @ CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER
11	0017770	Henry	SR 42 FROM CS 634/MLK JR BLVD TO CS 680/MARKETPLACE BLVD
12	0017845	Fulton	SR 141 @ CS 119/STATE BRIDGE ROAD

ADDENDUM NO. 1

ISSUE DATE: 4/28/2021

This Addendum shall become and form a part of the RFQ for:

RFQ-484-051121 – Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services

NOTE: PLEASE REVIEW CAREFULLY! THERE MAYBE CHANGES TO THE INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED. FAILURE TO ADHERE TO ANY CHANGES ADDRESSED IN THIS ADDENDUM MAY RESULT IN DISQUALIFICATION.

In the event of a conflict between previously released information and the information contained herein, the latter shall control.

NOTE: A signed acknowledgment of this addendum (this page) MUST be attached to your SUBMITTAL for Phase I.

Firm Name _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Typed Name and Title _____

Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT)
Office of Transportation Services Procurement
One Georgia Center
600 West Peachtree Street, NW
19th Floor
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

This Addendum, including all questions and answers, shall become and form a part of the original RFQ package and shall be taken into account when preparing your proposal.

The purpose of this addendum is to provide the answers to the written questions received during the question and answer period of the RFQ Phase as follows:

	Questions	Answers
1.	Our current prequalification does not expire until August 9, 2021. We are currently prequalified in 5.06 Remote Sensing. Will this suffice for this area class for this RFQ submittal?	If a consultant is currently prequalified in 5.06, they are considered “grandfathered in” and are prequalified in area classes 5.06(a), 5.06(b), 5.06(c), 5.06(d) and 5.06(e). When it comes time for the consultant to renew their prequalification status, they will have to choose which new area classes to apply for (5.06(a), 5.06(b), 5.06(c), 5.06(d), 5.06(e) since 5.06 has been discontinued. Please note: if the consultant wishes to apply for 5.06(b) they will have to fly and pass the GDOT UAS test site.
2.	Exhibit I-1, Section 6.A Part 4 states: “Right-of-way cost estimates must be completed by a GDOT prequalified right-of-way consultant.” The prequalification area classes listed in Sections 5.A. and 5.B do not include right-of-way consultant area classes. What right-of-way consultant area class is required to perform this service? Is this area class a requirement of the Prime Consultant or the Team? If it is required, will the prime consultant be required to demonstrate this prequalification as required by submission instructions?	Right-of-Way (ROW) area classes are not required as part of project delivery. Firms just need to make sure when submitting the annual ROW cost estimate, it is performed by a consultant prequalified by GDOT to perform this task. The prequalified list can be found here: http://www.dot.ga.gov/PartnerSmart/Documents/ROW/RW-ValuationAppraiser.pdf ROW cost estimates will not be accepted if not performed by a firm or individual from this list.

3.	Should survey area classes be included as part of Contract #12?	No. Survey will be completed by GDOT and is not required as part of this contract.
4.	No Database phase is listed in the scope (Exhibit I-12). Please confirm if an approved database is being provided by the Department.	See Answer to Question 3.
5.	In reference to Contract 12, PI # 0017845 / Fulton County, SR 141 at CS 119/State Bridge Road: Are we able to add a Key Team Member resume for Traffic Operations and Design?	No. A Key team lead resume for Traffic Operations and Design is not required for this Contract.
6.	Contract 12 (Exhibit I-12) does not require a Traffic Key Team Lead. Are traffic studies being provided by the Department or through another contract? It seems the traffic studies/analysis would be a major role in this type of alternative intersection project.	See Answer to Question #5. Traffic studies will be completed by GDOT.
7.	In reference to Contract 12, PI # 0017845 / Fulton County, SR 141 at CS 119/State Bridge Road: Will concept validation be a part of the scope since concept development is not included?	No, the approved concept will be provided by GDOT.
8.	No Concept Development phase is listed in the scope (Exhibit I-12). Please confirm if an approved Concept Report being provided by the Department.	See Answer to Question #7.

ADDENDUM NO. 2

ISSUE DATE: 5/24/2021

This Addendum shall become and form a part of the RFQ for:

RFQ-484-051121 – Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services

NOTE: PLEASE REVIEW CAREFULLY! THERE MAYBE CHANGES TO THE INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED. FAILURE TO ADHERE TO ANY CHANGES ADDRESSED IN THIS ADDENDUM MAY RESULT IN DISQUALIFICATION.

In the event of a conflict between previously released information and the information contained herein, the latter shall control.

NOTE: THIS ADDENDUM IS FOR NOTIFICATION PURPOSES ONLY FOR:

Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT)
Office of Transportation Services Procurement
One Georgia Center
600 West Peachtree Street, NW
19th Floor
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

The purpose of this addendum is to provide an update to the RFQ to confirm the following:

RFQ Section X: GDOT Terms and Conditions, Item H. Right to Cancel or Change RFQ, 1st paragraph states:

GDOT reserves the right to cancel any and all Request for Qualifications where it is determined to be in the best interest of the Department to do so. GDOT reserves the right to increase, reduce, add or delete any item in this solicitation as deemed necessary.

Therefore, Exhibit I-11, Project/Contract 11, PI Number: 0017770, SR 42 FROM CS 634/MLK JR BLVD TO CS 680/MARKETPLACE BLVD, is being DELETED in its entirety.

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	 Georgia Department of Transportation
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services	
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	May 11, 2021	
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm	

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Exhibit II - Certification	Exhibit III - GSICAA	Signed Addendum If Applicable	Compliant with Page # Limitations	Compliant with Required Format	Consideration CheckList
1	American Engineers, Inc.	5/10/2021	2:00 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
2	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	5/11/2021	12:13 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
3	CDM Smith, Inc.	5/11/2021	1:08 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
4	Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.	5/11/2021	1:43 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
5	Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.	5/11/2021	12:13 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
6	Croy Engineering, LLC	5/11/2021	12:42 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
7	DRMP, Inc.	5/11/2021	11:23 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
8	EFK Moen, LLC	5/11/2021	1:55 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
9	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	5/11/2021	9:08 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
10	HNTB Corporation	5/11/2021	11:12 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
11	Holt Consulting Company, LLC	5/11/2021	11:51 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
12	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	5/11/2021	10:23 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
13	KCI Technologies, Inc.	5/11/2021	12:58 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
14	Keck & Wood, Inc.	5/11/2021	10:02 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
15	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	5/10/2021	12:50 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
16	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	5/11/2021	12:20 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
17	Long Engineering, LLC	5/11/2021	1:40 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
18	Lowe Engineers, LLC	5/11/2021	11:21 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
19	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	5/11/2021	12:04 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
20	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	5/11/2021	11:05 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
21	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	5/11/2021	1:24 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
22	Practical Design Partners, LLC	5/11/2021	8:11 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
23	RS&H, Inc.	5/11/2021	8:06 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
24	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	5/10/2021	11:25 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
25	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.	5/11/2021	11:53 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
26	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	5/11/2021	2:03 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
27	Thompson Engineering, Inc.	5/11/2021	12:47 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
28	TranSystems Corporation	5/11/2021	11:47 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X

GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

RFQ-484-051121

Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services

Contract 9 – PI #0017737

This ENTIRE GUIDE must be reviewed carefully by all Selection Committee Members BEFORE the evaluation of submittals.

Coordination and Communication

Charnele Dobbins will coordinate the overall submittal evaluation process and serve as Facilitator of any Selection Committee Meetings through the completion of the evaluation. All Committee members will be provided copies of submittals and related information, and will be notified of any proposed (if applicable) meetings, conference calls, and deadlines. **IMPORTANT-** *All written communication* (e-mails, memos, scoresheets, handwritten notes in SOQs, Proposals, etc.) related to the evaluation can be subject to public record. Therefore, all such communication should be limited to objective and verifiable information.

Evaluation Process

The evaluation and scoring will be handled in two phases. Phase I will be the evaluation of the written Statements of Qualifications received from all respondents. Phase II will be the evaluation of the written responses from the Finalists. The scoring for the Finalists will be carried forward from Phase I and added to the scores from Phase II to determine the highest ranked Finalists and hence with whom negotiations will be initiated. The criteria to be utilized in the evaluation and scoring are as follows:

Phase I

- **Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – (20% or 200 Points)**
- **Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – (30% or 300 Points)**

Phase II

- **Technical Approach – (40% or 400 Points)**
- **Past Performance – (10% or 100 Points)**

Phase I Evaluation of Statements of Qualifications

Evaluation of Eligible Submittals

Submittals determined eligible must be read thoroughly with careful attention to the presence of required submittal content. The reader should keep the evaluation criteria in mind when assessing each submittal. As Reviewers read the responses, they will determine the rating for each criteria as follows:

- Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability
- Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects
- Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work
- Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects
- Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas

Directions for use of the Evaluation Preliminary Scoring Forms:

Scoring forms will be distributed to all Selection Committee members along with copies of submittals which were received and validated. Evaluators will have the option of using the hard copy forms or an electronic version of the form. However, to ensure that Open Records Request can be filled in compliance with the law, Evaluators who choose to use the electronic version of the form should only maintain one version of the form and must provide the electronic version of the form to Procurement. Each evaluator will use their numbered scoring form for scoring all submittals. Evaluators must ensure that the

name of the Firm being evaluated is written in the appropriate box to identify the Firm to whom the ratings and comments belong. Using the criteria categories in **Evaluation of Eligible Submittals** above, each submittal will be given a **preliminary score** for each of the criteria. The Reviewer should provide comments for each section which support the rating. Reviewers should not seek to write down everything that the submittal contains. Rather, Reviewers should first determine the rating and then answer why they feel the rating is warranted.

The review, preliminary scoring, and comments MUST be completed prior to the Selection Committee Meeting and must be sent to the Procurement Facilitator by the deadline given in order to make efficient and effective usage of all Selection Committee Members time.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATING AVAILABILITY

Through working with the consultant industry, they asked that when considering their availability, we consider more than merely the number of projects they have listed. With this in mind we have allowed space in their SOQ for the respondents to provide a narrative in their ability. This narrative will allow them to discuss how the organization of the team, including the PM and Key Team Leaders can deliver the project on schedule given their workload capacity. It also recognizes that some individuals may be able to meet the schedule while carrying heavier project workloads and allows them to discuss the advantages of their team and the abilities of their team members which will enable the project to meet the proposed schedule. If there is no schedule provided, they can discuss the advantages of the team and abilities of the team members which will enable the project to move as expeditiously as possible. You **MUST** consider this narrative along with the workload table when rating the SOQs. You **MUST NOT** merely look at the workload table solely for making the rating decision.

Evaluation Meeting:

All completed Scoring Forms with the preliminary scores and comments for each criteria of each firm, must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Friday, June 25, 2021. The completed forms must be turned in at the conclusion of the meeting.

Prior to the meeting, the Facilitator will use the scores and subsequent ranks to determine where the majority of the discussion should be focused. Generally, the majority of the discussion will center on the top submittals. The Selection Committee will discuss and determine a final committee rating for each criteria and will provide summary comments as to why the Committee feels the rating is warranted.

The final rankings will be used to determine the three to five Finalists who will proceed and have their scores carried forward to Phase II of the evaluation.

It is important to note, that all evaluation scoring, notes, and comments will be subject to open records and there is a very high likelihood they will be reviewed by a wide variety of individuals. For this reason, it is extremely important to adhere to all guidelines and suggestions contained in this Guide for Selection Committee Members.

Phase II

Evaluation of Technical Approach and Past Performance

- Finalists will be required to submit a written response which must detail the Technical approach (including design concepts and use of alternative methods).
- **Past Performance - Procurement will be checking references and will provide the results of the reference checks to the Selection Committee for review. The Selection Committee will also be allowed to share and review any other documented information made available for consideration regarding the Firm's performance on any project/contract, along with the reference checks to provide a group rating with comments.**

With the increased lack of responses to the reference checks, Procurement is requesting that prior to attending the Phase II meeting that each of the selection committee members perform the following action to add to the past performance discussion.

- The Selection Committee should be prepared to share personal work experience while working with each shortlisted firm, provide project P.I. number and any performance issues, concerns and/or positive feedback about the Prime Consultant and its team that may hinder or improve their overall rating for past performance.
- Selection committee members that do not have any personal prior work experience with any of the shortlisted firms, must seek additional documented material through discussion with their Office Management, CMIS (Vendor evaluation), inter-office documentation (emails, written correspondence, cure letters, etc.) to help aid in the discussion during the Phase II meeting.

Submittals and Past Performance information must be read/considered thoroughly with careful attention to the presence of required submittal content. The reader should keep the evaluation criteria in mind when assessing each submittal. As Reviewers read the responses, they will make notes in the submittals and must be prepared to discuss their position in the Selection Committee Meeting for Phase II. **The review and notes MUST be completed prior to the Selection Committee Meeting.**

Evaluation Meeting:

All notes must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Monday, September 13, 2021. The Selection Committee will discuss and determine a final committee rating for each criteria and will provide summary comments as to why the Committee feels the rating is warranted. The Committee will assign the following ratings:

- Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability
- Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects
- Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work
- Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects
- Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas

FINAL SCORING AND SELECTION

The scores from Phase I and Phase II will be added together, and a final overall ranking will be determined and provided for Selection Committee approval.

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE PRELIMINARY SCORING AND RANKING OF SUBMITTALS

Solicitation Title:		Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services	1	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	
Solicitation #:		RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	2	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	
PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Preliminary Scoring based on Published Criteria			3	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	
(This Page For GDOT Use)					
SUBMITTING FIRMS		(RANKING)		6	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC
		Sum of		7	RS&H, Inc.
		Individual	Group	8	Holt Consulting Company, LLC
		Rankings	Ranking	9	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC
				10	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.
American Engineers, Inc.		46	17	11	TranSystems Corporation
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC		28	6	12	CDM Smith, Inc.
CDM Smith, Inc.		40	12	13	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.
Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.		79	23	14	HNTB Corporation
Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.		45	16	15	DRMP, Inc.
Croy Engineering, LLC		83	27	16	Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.
DRMP, Inc.		44	15	17	American Engineers, Inc.
EFK Moen, LLC		82	24	18	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.		60	21	19	Thompson Engineering, Inc.
HNTB Corporation		43	14	20	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.
Holt Consulting Company, LLC		30	8	21	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		30	9	22	Practical Design Partners, LLC
KCI Technologies, Inc.		13	4	23	Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.
Keck & Wood, Inc.		83	25	24	EFK Moen, LLC
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC		105	28	25	Keck & Wood, Inc.
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		12	3	26	Long Engineering, LLC
Long Engineering, LLC		83	26	27	Croy Engineering, LLC
Lowe Engineers, LLC		16	5	28	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.		32	10		
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.		7	2		
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		6	1		
Practical Design Partners, LLC		63	22		
RS&H, Inc.		29	7		
Southeastern Engineering, Inc.		41	13		
T.Y. Lin International, Inc.		55	20		
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.		47	18		
Thompson Engineering, Inc.		49	19		
TranSystems Corporation		35	11		






Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications

Resources and Workload Capacity

Evaluator 1

<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	Phase One Evaluator 1 Individual	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Engineers, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	3
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Adequate	Good	325	1
CDM Smith, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	3
Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.	Adequate	Poor	100	28
Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.	Adequate	Adequate	250	17
Croy Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	17
DRMP, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	3
EFK Moen, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	17
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	3
HNTB Corporation	Good	Adequate	300	3
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	17
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	17
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	3
Keck & Wood, Inc.	Poor	Adequate	150	26
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	Poor	Adequate	150	26
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	3
Long Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	17
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	3
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	1
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	3
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	3
Practical Design Partners, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	3
RS&H, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	3
Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	3
T.Y. Lin International, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	17
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	Good	Adequate	300	3
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	17
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Adequate	250	17
<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	500	%

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 1			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	American Engineers, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
>Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts. >PM will be extension of GDOT PM and will take ownership to make GDOT PM's job easier. PM will use Primavera SureTrak.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
>PM is >50% available.			
Firm Name:	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts. >Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
>PM is >50% available. >Prime will include a deputy PM. Prime will assign someone to track schedule and critical path.			
Firm Name:	CDM Smith, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts. >PM will use bi-weekly calendar reminders to update Tpro and P6. >Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
>PM is >50% available.			
Firm Name:	Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts. >Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts. >Prime will establish master calendar for tracking. >Prime will prepare a procurement plan. >Incorrect PM listed on workload table, indicating lack of quality assurance.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Poor
>Incorrect PM listed on workload table.			
Firm Name:	Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts. >Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
>PM is >75% available.			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
 Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
 Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
 Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points
 Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm Name:	Croy Engineering, LLC		
-------------------	-----------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM states Croy changed ENV process because of funding but does not explain.
>Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM is >75% available.

Firm Name:	DRMP, Inc.		
-------------------	------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Good
--	-----------------	--------	-------------

>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
>PM has advanced knowledge of Primavera.
>Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
>Prime sites \$200K savings by rehabilitating a bridge instead of replacing but does not detail how the decision was made.
>Several pages of the SOQ were blacked-out.
>Prime will implement static LiDAR technology to reduce survey time.
>KTL's will work together to produce and communicate detailed schedule after NTP.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM is >50% available.

Firm Name:	EFK Moen, LLC		
-------------------	---------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
>PM experience notes several projects which were delivered ahead of schedule and under budget but does not provide details.
>PM will utilize Deltek Vision and Excel for scheduling.
>Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
>Prime experience lists project that went from concept to construction in 10 months but does not provide details.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM is >25% available.

Firm Name:	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.		
-------------------	-------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Good
--	-----------------	--------	-------------

>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
>PM experience notes several projects which were delivered ahead of schedule and under budget but does not provide details.
>Prime will advance FFPR date so comments can be addressed before ENV lockdown plans.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM is >75% available.

Firm Name:	HNTB Corporation		
-------------------	------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Good
--	-----------------	--------	-------------

>PM implemented an enhanced dry swale to obtain a stream buffer variance and maintain schedule.
>Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
>Prime states it reduced concept development time but does not explain how.
>PM created a risk registry to participate in two FHWA cost reviews on a P3 project. PM will hold daily check-ins w/ Deputy PM, hold weekly team meetings, maintain Gantt chart with resources and deadlines.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
 Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
 Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
 Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points
 Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

>PM is >25% available.

Firm Name:	Holt Consulting Company, LLC		
-------------------	------------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
 >Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM is >50% available.

Firm Name:	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		
-------------------	---	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
 >Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM is >75% available.

Firm Name:	KCI Technologies, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Good
--	-----------------	--------	-------------

>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
 >PM will develop very specific procurement plan detailing scope of all task orders.
 >Prime experience notes recovering a 5-month delay by expediting PFPR and ROW plans.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM is >75% available.

Firm Name:	Keck & Wood, Inc.		
-------------------	-------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Poor
--	-----------------	--------	-------------

>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
 >PM lists managing numerous PI#'s. All PI#'s listed were designed by GDOT, and Mr. Buckley was not the project manager for any of them.
 >PM lists managing bridge batch, but the PI#'s listed were designed by in-house and not part of a batch advertisement.
 >Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM is >25% available.

Firm Name:	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC		
-------------------	--	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Poor
--	-----------------	--------	-------------

>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
 >PM states will mitigate procurement risks but does not provide examples from previous projects.
 >Roadway KTL claims working in District 3 Design but did not.
 >Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM is >75% available.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
 Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
 Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
 Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points
 Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm Name:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
-------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	------

>PM provides various examples of project coordination, including task order development.
>Prime produced a CST estimate which was within 5% of the low bid. Prime successfully met bridge bundle concept date. Prime coordinated several stakeholder meetings which resulted in incorporating special lighting/landscaping. Prime also provided before/after renderings. Prime provided numerous examples of coordinating with various stakeholders. Prime minimizes improvements to only those critical to scope. Prime is dedicated to timely submittals of scoping documents, assumptions, and man-hours and has a procurement plan.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
--	-----------------	---	----------

>PM is >50% available.

Firm Name:	Long Engineering, LLC		
-------------------	-----------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
--	-----------------	---	----------

>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
>Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
--	-----------------	---	----------

>PM is >50% available.

Firm Name:	Lowe Engineers, LLC		
-------------------	---------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	------

>PM notes using 3D Laser scanner to collect data and save time and money.
>Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
--	-----------------	---	----------

>PM is >50% available.

Firm Name:	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.		
-------------------	---------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
--	-----------------	---	----------

>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
>Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	------

>PM is >75% available.
>Deputy PM included.

Firm Name:	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.		
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	------

>PM will use Project Management Plan which establishes expectations, objectives, deliverables, and roles.
>Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
--	-----------------	---	----------

>PM is >50% available.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
 Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
 Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
 Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points
 Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm Name:	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Good
--	-----------------	--------	-------------

>PM overcame 9-month delay by accelerating PFPR and ROW plans.
>PM submitted a cost estimate that was within 1% of lowest bid contractor.
>PM submitted a limited scope concept 4 weeks after NTP.
>PM used GIS surface data to prepare A3M plans just 3 months after NTP.
>Prime submitted a cost estimate that was within 1% of lowest bid contractor.
>Prime will include procurement team and use tracked info to assist in procurement.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM is >50% available.

Firm Name:	Practical Design Partners, LLC		
-------------------	--------------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Good
--	-----------------	--------	-------------

>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
>Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
>Prime will work on more aggressive, but realistic schedule.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM is >75% available.

Firm Name:	RS&H, Inc.		
-------------------	------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Good
--	-----------------	--------	-------------

>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
>PM will complete a host of activities within 4 weeks of NTP, including Project Execution Plans and Procurement Plans.
>Prime recently let a project where their cost estimate was only 2% over the average bid.
>Prime will discuss earned value monthly.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM is >50% available.

Firm Name:	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.		
-------------------	--------------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Good
--	-----------------	--------	-------------

>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
>PM has scoped projects through PTIP.
>Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM is >50% available.

Firm Name:	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.
>Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

>PM is >50% available.

Firm Name:	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------------	--	--

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 1			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points			
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points			
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points			
Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points			
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.			
>Prime advanced plans for early advertisement 4 weeks after FFPR and generated a cost estimate within 5% of the bid, leading to an on-time bid.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
>PM is <25% available.			
Firm Name:	Thompson Engineering, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.			
>Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
>PM is >75% available.			
Firm Name:	TranSystems Corporation		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
>PM experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.			
>Prime experience does not highlight unique, project-specific management efforts.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
>PM is >50% available.			





Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications

Resources and Workload Capacity

Evaluator 2

	200	300	Phase One Evaluator 2 Individual	
Maximum Points allowed =	200	300		
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Engineers, Inc.	Good	Poor	150	26
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Adequate	Good	325	10
CDM Smith, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	10
Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.	Adequate	Good	325	10
Croy Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Poor	100	28
DRMP, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	21
EFK Moen, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	21
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	10
HNTB Corporation	Adequate	Adequate	250	21
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Good	Good	375	1
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	Good	Good	375	1
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Keck & Wood, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	19
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	Marginal	Adequate	200	24
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Long Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Marginal	175	25
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Good	375	1
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	10
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Practical Design Partners, LLC	Marginal	Marginal	125	27
RS&H, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	10
T.Y. Lin International, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	10
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	Adequate	Good	325	10
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Marginal	Good	275	20
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Good	325	10
Maximum Points allowed =	200	300	500	%

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	American Engineers, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>PM is a registered engineer and project management professional with 34 years of exp. PM listed numerous bridge projects yet presented limited details on relevant management experience for those projects. Noted detailed PM exp with a major widening project that required various levels of coordination. Roadway KTL has 17 yrs of exp and presented exp as lead engineer for 2 off-system bridge replacement projects. Noted exp as a design engineer assisting with developent of plans for a GDOT widening project that has been constructed. Prime presented relevant projects that demonstrates its ability in providing effectives services for GDOT. Most projects have been completed and included involmment of PM and Key Team Members.</i></p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Poor
<p><i>Prime has AJ Jubran listed as a resource on org chart under Geotechnical. AJ Jubran has passed and should not have been listed as a resource.</i></p>			
Firm Name:	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>PM presented exp with several interchange and widening projects that required bridges. Noted specific design tasks performed for eng related exp. PM management exp included projects that required coordination with Corp of Engineers to minimize impacts. Roadway KTL presented 3 GDOT projects of similar scope with details regarding project progression through plan development. Projects presented for prime's experience did not demonstrate their ability to deliver effective services for projects of similar complexity and scope.</i></p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>PRIME HAS ADEQUATE RESOURCES TO PERFORM SCOPE OF SERVICES. TWO OR MORE RESOURCES LISTED FOR EACH KEY TEAM MEMBER. PM AND KTL APPEAR TO HAVE CAPACITY FOR WORK.</i></p>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 2			
----------------	--	--	--

Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.

- Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
- Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
- Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
- Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points
- Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm Name:	CDM Smith, Inc.		
-------------------	-----------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

PM has 40 years of exp and noted experience delivering projects of similar scope and knowledgeable of GDOT processes. Relevant projects listed with similar scope included a bridge bundle with 3 bridges; however, role was not as PM. Roadway KTL presented exp with projects of similar scope. Currently serving as lead on an on-going FY 16 bridge bundle contract yet actual work completed is not defined. Would have been beneficial to list each bridge project from the contract and note the work that has been completed. Prime presented exp with projects of similar scope with PM and Roadway KTL involvement.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

PRIME HAS SUFFICIENT RESOURCES TO PERFORM SCOPE OF SERVICES; 2 OR MORE RESOURCES ARE LISTED FOR EACH AREA CLASS. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.

Firm Name:	Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.		
-------------------	---	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
--	-----------------	---	-----------------

PM has 37 yrs of exp and noted exp with GDOT processes. Listed projects of similar scope and complexity. Roadway has 9 years of exp and presented limited details on relevant engineering exp as a lead engineer. Prime presented exp with on-going projects of similar scope.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

Prime has sufficient resources listed on org chart to perform scope of services. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for scope of services. Narrative includes discussion on overall team and experience working together and exp. Delivering projects.



Firm Name:	Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.		
-------------------	----------------------------------	--	--





A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
--	-----------------	---	-----------------





PM presented limited details of relevant project management exp. Roadway KTL presented limited eng exp with projects of similar scope. Prime has completed projects of similar scope.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

PRIME has sufficient resources to perform scope of services. 2 or more resources are listed for each area class. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points			
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points			
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points			
Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points			
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Croy Engineering, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>PM has experience with GDOT processes and presented relevant exp. Roadway KTL has 8 years of exp and presented limited exp as lead engineer. Prime presented several on-going projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Poor
<i>Prime org chart appears to be incomplete. Several subconsultant firms are listed without an actual resource name. i.e. Brockington, R2T, Ecological Solution, United Consultants. Narrative does not provide any further details on these resources other than ICE resources. Without a listing of actual resource names, the reviewer cannot determine if sufficient resources are available to perform scope of services.</i>			
Firm Name:	DRMP, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>PM is a registered engineer with 37 years of exp. PM presented limited management exp with projects of similar scope utilizing GDOT processes. Most projects were off-system bridge replacements for Local Governments. Roadway KTL has 18 years of exp and presented limited details on relevant engineering experience as a lead; noted responsibilities as roadway improvements only with no details on plan elements or PDP progression. Prime has limited experience with projects of similar scope.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>Prime presented a detailed org chart with sufficient resources in each area class as well as quality reviewers for Key Areas except Environmental. Narrative includes discussion on PM, Roadway, and Bridge KT leads previous exp working together with no discussion on environmental lead. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.</i>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	EFK Moen, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>PM is a licensed structural and professional engineer with 28 years of exp. PM presented limited project management experience utilizing GDOT processes yet has exp with delivering projects for other state DOTs and has completed PDP training in 2018. Roadway KTL has 26 years of exp and presented limited as exp as a lead for projects of similar scope. Prime has completed several projects of similar scope with PM and Bridge Lead involmnet.</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>Prime presented sufficient resources to perform scope of services; however, roles for environmental resources were not defined for speciality areas like ecology, history, etc. QC resources listed for bridge and roadway KTLs. Narrative discussed quality assurance and responsibilities for sub-consultants with oversight by Prime. Discussed overall Team and plan to work together to deliver project. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.</p>			
Firm Name:	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>Roadway KTL is familiar with GDOT processes; presented limited details on relevant engineering exp as a lead; mainly listed duties as project manager. PM presented relevant eng exp with off-system bridges of similar scope. Relevant management exp was limited based on projects listed. Prime has limited exp as a firm delivering effective services for projects of similar complexity.</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p>Prime has sufficient resources to perform scope of services including an abundance of QA reviewers. The narrative does not provide any discussion on the actual QA process. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.</p>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	HNTB Corporation		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>PM is a registered engineer with 24 years of exp. Noted relevant management exp for a batch of GDOT projects that required delivery of 8 projects. Provided additional details on managemenet exp for several of the projects that were of similar scope. Roadway KTL has 21 years of exp and has served as lead on several projects, has exp utilizing GDOT processes. Prime demonstrated to ability to deliver effective services for GDOT; has completed one project of similar scope that included PM involmnet.</i></p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>Prime has adequate resources listed on org chart to perform scope of services, two or more resources are listed for each area class. Numerous QA reviewers and SME resources are listed for several areas with no added details in narrative on resources exp and qualifications as SMEs or quality reviewers. Noted discussion on office quality manager with no details on relevant exp. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work. Prime demonstrated to ability to deliver effective services for GDOT.</i></p>			
Firm Name:	Holt Consulting Company, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>PM presented relevant eng and management exp with projects of similar scope and complexity. Roadway KTL has exp with GDOT processes and presented relevant engineering exp to perform scope of services. Prime has delivered projects of similar scope with PM and KTL involmnet.</i></p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>Prime has sufficient resources listed in org chart. 2 or more resources are listed for each area class. Narrative discusses QA resources and processes. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.</i></p>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 2			
----------------	--	--	--

Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.

- Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
- Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
- Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
- Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points
- Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm Name:	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		
-------------------	---	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

PM presented detailed engineering and management exp for several projects of similar scope. Details noted coordination efforts and plan progression utilizing PDP. Roadway KTL presented exp as lead for a 2016 bridge bundle as well as several design build projects of similar scope. Prime has completed projects of similar complexity and scope with KTL involment.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

Prime has sufficient resources to perform scope of work, 2 or more resources listed for each ara class with QA reviewers for each KTL. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.

Firm Name:	KCI Technologies, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

PM presented relevant eng and management exp with projects of similar scope and complexity. Roadway KTL has exp with GDOT processes and presented relevant engineering exp to perform scope of services. Prime has delivered projects of similar scope with PM

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

PRIME ORG CHART HAS DEPTH OF RESOURCES TO PERFORM SCOPE OF SERVICES. 2 OR MORE RESOURCES ARE LISTED AS SUPPORT FOR KTLS. PM AND KTLS APPEAR TO HAVE CAPACITY TO PERFORM WORK. NARRATIVE NOTED THAT PRIME HAS 15 YEARS OF CEI EXP WITH DISTRICT 1 WHICH WILL BENEFIT MOT AND CONSTRUCTABILITY; WOULD HAVE LIKED TO SEE EXAMPLES OF SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGE OBTAINED THAT WOULD BE BENEFICIAL TO THIS SCOPE. NARRATIVE ALSO BRIEFLY DISCUSSED QA PROCESSES AND EXECUTION PLANS FOR MANAGING PROJECTS ON THIS CONTRACT.

Firm Name:	Keck & Wood, Inc.		
-------------------	-------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

PM is familiar with GDOT processes and presented relevant eng. Experience. Presented limited managment experience yet noted experience as design phase leader responsible for coordination efforts, quality assurance checks for several projects. Roadway KTL has relevant eng experience and presented details for project progression through PDP. Prime has completed several projects of similar scope with Roadway KTL involment.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
--	-----------------	---	-----------------

Prime has adequate resources to perform scope of services. Narrative expounded on exp of PM and Roadway KTL. Narrative discussed prime's scheduling software and briefly noted their existing in-house quality control processes. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 2			
----------------	--	--	--

Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
 Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
 Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
 Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points
 Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm Name:	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC		
-------------------	--	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Marginal
--	-----------------	---	-----------------

PM presented relevant engineering exp with projects of similar scope yet presented limited project management experience. Roadway KTL presented limited details on relevant engineering exp. Prime has limited exp delivering projects of similar scope.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
--	-----------------	---	-----------------

Prime has minimum resources to perform scope of services based on org chart. Two environmental resources have to cover multiple area classes. PM and KTLs appear to have capacity to perform scope of services. Narrative describes existing project conditions and possible constraints yet did not connect how resources listed will navigate or add value base on those existing conditions.

Firm Name:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
-------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

PM has 18 years of experience and is familiar with GDOT processes. PM presented management and engineering exp with project of similar scopes, provided details on both manangement tasks as well as plan deliverables. Roadway KTL presented exp with projects of similar scope and noted required deliverables. Prime presented exp with several on-going bridge bundle contracts and has completed one project of similar scope with bridge and env lead involment.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

Prime org chart displays sufficient resources to perform scope of services. Two or more resources are listed for each key team lead. Narrative discusses how PM and KTLs have worked together in past and provided examples of problem solving on similar projects.


Firm Name:	Long Engineering, LLC		
-------------------	-----------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
--	-----------------	---	-----------------

PM presented exp managing mainly local government projects. Roadway KTL presented limited exp with projects of similar scope. Prime did not present any relevant exp that is similar in scope and complexity.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Marginal
--	-----------------	---	-----------------

Prime org chart does not provide a comprehensive list of available resources for Environmental. The NEPA lead is the only resource listed. Need to provide names of each specialist instead of providing a numerical value. Reviewer cannot determine if sufficient resources are available based on org chart. Narrative did not provide any additional details on environmental resources. Narrative discussed having an independent firm, Atlas, review major milestone deliverables similar to process used for GDOT design-build quality assurance program; however, QA resources are only provided for bridge and roadway. PM and KTLs appear to have capacity to perform scope of services.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Lowe Engineers, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>PM presented management and eng exp for several projects of similar scope. Roadway KTL presented several projects of similar scope with project specifics but no details on actual engineering duties performed. Prime has completed projects of similar scope with bridge lead involvement.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Prime has sufficient resources to perform scope of services . PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.</i>			
Firm Name:	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>PM has 18 years of exp and presented management exp for a variety of projects. Presented limited exp with GDOT processes. Roadway KTL has 29 years of exp and presented relevant engineering exp.with Design-build projects. Prime has delivered projects that included KTLs.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Org chart lists sufficient resources to perform scope of services including QA resources for each KTL. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.</i>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 2			
----------------	--	--	--

Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm Name:	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.		
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

Project Manager presented relevant exp managing projects of similar scope. Roadway KTL presented exp as lead for several projects of similar scope that progressed from concept to letting. Prime currently has several on-going bridge bundle projects that include bridges of similar scope.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

Prime has sufficient resources listed on org chart. 2 or more resources are listed for each key team area. Org chart and narrative include QA resources for each KTL, narrative provides details on years of exp for Roadway SME only. Narrative provides general discussion of prime's commitment to on-time delivery without any examples of previous project successes. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.

Firm Name:	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

PM provided detailed exp on relevant management experience for several projects of similar scope. RKTL presented relevant eng exp with numerous bridge bundle contracts. Prime has completed projects of similar scope.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

Prime has sufficient resources listed to perform scope of services including QA reviewers for each KTL. Narrative provided limited detail on Quality processes or experience of proposed QA SMEs. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.

Firm Name:	Practical Design Partners, LLC		
-------------------	--------------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Marginal
--	-----------------	---	-----------------

PM presented exp with a variety of transportation projects. Roadway KTL has relevant eng exp. Prime is a new company and has not completed any projects as a company.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Marginal
--	-----------------	---	-----------------

Prime org chart has limited resources to perform scope of services.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 2			
----------------	--	--	--

Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm Name:	RS&H, Inc.		
-------------------	------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

PM is familiar with GDOT processes and noted exp managing multiple contracts. Roadway KTL presented relevant eng exp and is familiar with GDOT processes. Prime presented exp delivering projects of similar scope.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

Prime org chart has sufficient resources to perform scope of services. 2 or more resources are listed for each area class. Narrative discusses resources experience and project schedule. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.

Firm Name:	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.		
-------------------	--------------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
--	-----------------	---	-----------------

Roadway KTL presented several projects with limited details on relevant engineering tasks performed. Prime has not completed a project of similar scope, presented several on-going projects.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

Prime has sufficient resources listed on org chart to perform scope of services, Two or more resources are listed for each key team area. Narrative provided more details on resources and history working together. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work,

Firm Name:	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
--	-----------------	---	-----------------

PM listed numerous projects of similar scope yet provided limited details on actual management or relevant engineering project for each project. Details were limited to project descriptions. Roadway KTL listed relevant projects including a bridge bundle but provided no details on actual eng. tasks performed for those projects. Prime has several on-going projects of similar scope that involve PM or KTL.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

Prime org charts has sufficient resources to perform scope of services. 2 or more resources are listed for each area class. Narrative provided general discussion on QA process and commitment to schedule without any examples of past success. Narrative also included discussion on existing site constraints which should be geared to the phase 2 technical approach. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 2			
----------------	--	--	--

Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm Name:	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.		
-------------------	---------------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
--	-----------------	--	-----------------

Roadway KTL presented limited exp with projects of similar scope. Prime has not completed a project of similar scope, presented several on-going projects.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
--	-----------------	--	-------------

Prime org chart has sufficient resources to perform scope of services. 2 or more resources are listed for each area class. Narrative discusses resources experience and ability to deliver projects on schedule and provides examples of past successes. PM and KTL appear to have capacity for work.

Firm Name:	Thompson Engineering, Inc.		
-------------------	----------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
--	-----------------	--	-----------------

PM presented relevant engineering experience with projects of similar scope yet provided limited project management exp details. PM does not have any experience with GDOT processes yet has taken the PDP training. Roadway KTL presented several projects of similar scope with limited details on actual tasks performed and exp with GDOT processes.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
--	-----------------	--	-------------

PRIME ORG CHART HAS DEPTH OF RESOURCES TO PERFORM SCOPE OF SERVICES. PM AND KTL APPEAR TO HAVE CAPACITY FOR WORK.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 2			
----------------	--	--	--

Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm Name:	TranSystems Corporation		
-------------------	-------------------------	--	--

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
--	-----------------	---	-----------------

PM listed several projects of similar scope for engineering and project management exp. Provided relevant management experience details for 2 projects that included environmental coordination with resources agencies. All other experience details focused on project descriptions. Roadway KTL presented exp from concept to preliminary design of 3 GDOT projects over waterways. Prime presented exp that demonstrates their ability to deliver effective services for projects of similar scope specifically the SR 15A over Curry Creek which involved PM and Bridge KTL.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
--	-----------------	---	-------------

PRIME HAS ADEQUATE RESOURCES TO PERFORM SCOPE OF SERVICES. ONE RESOURCE IS LISTED FOR EACH SPECIALITY AREA FOR ENV. PM AND KTL APPEAR TO HAVE CAPACITY FOR WORK. NARRATIVE DISCUSSED EXP OF KTL





Evaluation Criteria





Experience and Qualifications





Resources and Workload Capacity





Evaluator 3





<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	Phase One Evaluator 3 Individual	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Engineers, Inc.	Good	Good	375	7
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Good	Good	375	7
CDM Smith, Inc.	Adequate	Marginal	175	26
Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	18
Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.	Adequate	Good	325	11
Croy Engineering, LLC	Marginal	Marginal	125	28
DRMP, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	11
EFK Moen, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	18
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	24
HNTB Corporation	Adequate	Adequate	250	18
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Excellent	Good	425	2
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	Excellent	Good	425	2
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Excellent	Good	425	2
Keck & Wood, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	15
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	Poor	Adequate	150	27
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Good	Good	375	7
Long Engineering, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	15
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Excellent	Good	425	2
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	11
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	Excellent	Good	425	2
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Excellent	Excellent	500	1
Practical Design Partners, LLC	Good	Marginal	225	23
RS&H, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	15
Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	18
T.Y. Lin International, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	18
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	Marginal	Adequate	200	24
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	11
TranSystems Corporation	Good	Good	375	7
<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	500	%





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points			
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points			
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points			
Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points			
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	American Engineers, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>PM has extensive experience working with GDOT on similar projects. Roadway team lead has fair experience serving as a lead on similar projects and more experience working as a designer on similar projects for GDOT. Bridge team lead has an extensive amount of experience working on similar bridges using a variety of span arrangements with GDOT as the lead bridge engineer. Environmental team lead also appears to have extensive experience working on similar projects for GDOT. The prime also lists working on similar projects and having the team leads work together.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows excellent redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC also is broken up cleanly with different personel in charge of the different disciplines quality control.</i>			
Firm Name:	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>PM has extensive experience working with GDOT on similar projects both as a PM and as an engineer. Roadway team lead lists extensive experience serving as a lead on similar projects and more experience working as a designer on similar projects for GDOT. Bridge team lead has an extensive amount of experience working on similar bridges using a variety of span arrangements with GDOT as the lead bridge engineer, and is intimately familiar with GDOT Bridge processes. Environmental team lead also appears to have a good amount of experience working on similar projects for GDOT. The prime also lists working on similar projects however does not show the team leads work together.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC also is broken up cleanly with different personel in charge of the different disciplines quality control.</i>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points			
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points			
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points			
Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points			
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	CDM Smith, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>Comments:PM has good experience working with GDOT on similar projects, although most experience is not as PM. Roadway team lead has fair experience serving as a lead on similar projects. Bridge team lead has an extensive amount of experience working on similar bridges using a variety of span arrangements with GDOT as the lead bridge engineer. Environmental team lead does not list any experience on bridge replacement projects. The prime also lists working on similar projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<i>Comments:The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC is not listed at all.</i>			
Firm Name:	Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>Comments:PM has extensive experience working with GDOT on similar projects, either as PM or principle in charge. Roadway team lead has fair experience working on similar projects but limited amount of Lead Engineer experience. Bridge team lead has a strong amount of experience working on similar bridges using a variety of span arrangements with GDOT as the lead bridge engineer. Environmental team lead has a good amount of experience on bridge replacement projects for GDOT. The prime also lists working on similar projects. The team does not appear to have any experience working together</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>Comments:The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC consists of one engineer.</i>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>PM has limited experience with GDOT on similar projects as a PM (lists only a culvert replacement as PM). Roadway team lead has fair experience working on similar projects. Bridge team lead has a strong amount of experience working on similar bridges using a variety of span arrangements (and special Culvert design) with GDOT as the lead bridge engineer. Environmental team lead does not list any experience on bridge replacement projects. The prime also lists working on similar projects. PM and Roadway Lead have experience working together.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC consists of multiple engineers to cover each discipline.</i>			
Firm Name:	Croy Engineering, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
Comments: <i>PM has limited experience with GDOT on similar projects as a PM, but more experience as a Roadway engineer on similar projects. Roadway team lead does not list any experience working on similar projects. Bridge team lead has a good amount of experience working on similar projects however all are Design Build. Environmental team lead does not list any experience on bridge replacement projects. The prime also lists working on similar projects. PM and Roadway Lead have experience working together.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart does not show any redundancy or additional PE's available. The QA/QC consists of two engineers and access to other staff .</i>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	DRMP, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>PM has extensive experience working with GDOT on similar projects. Roadway team lead has good experience serving as a lead on similar projects in Georgia. Bridge team lead has an extensive amount of experience working on similar bridges and special design culverts with FDOT as the lead bridge engineer. Environmental team lead also appears to have extensive experience working on similar projects for GDOT. The prime also lists working on many similar projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows excellent redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available and additional engineers familiar with GDOT policies. The QA/QC also is broken up cleanly with different personel in charge of the different disciplines quality control.</i>			
Firm Name:	EFK Moen, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>PM has good experience working on similar projects with both GDOT and other states. He appears to be very structural oriented. Roadway team lead has experience serving as a lead on a similar project for GDOT. Bridge team lead has an extensive amount of experience working on similar bridges and special design culverts with other states as a bridge engineer, but limited experience as a Lead Bridge engineer, and limited experience working with GDOT Bridge policies. Environmental team lead has extensive experience working on similar projects for GDOT. The prime also lists working on many similar projects although not in Georgia. Several of the team leadership group have experience working together</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows excellent redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC also is broken up between 2 engineers for Roadway and Structures. No mention of QA/QC for environmental.</i>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
Comments: <i>PM has experience working in Georgia on similar projects. Roadway team lead has good experience as a PM on similar projects in Georgia, but no listed experience as a designer. Bridge team lead has an extensive amount of experience working on similar bridges and special design culverts in Georgia as the lead bridge engineer. Environmental team lead also appears to have extensive experience working on similar projects for GDOT. The prime has limited experience on similar projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows some redundancy in each of the disciplines with at least one additional PE available. The QA/QC is extensive.</i>			
Firm Name:	HNTB Corporation		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>PM has extensive experience working with GDOT on similar projects as both a PM and designer. Roadway team lead has some experience on similar projects in Georgia. Bridge team lead has an extensive amount of experience working on large brige projects, but lists very little as a team Lead for this type of project. Environmental team lead has a good amount of experience working on similar projects for GDOT. The prime has a large amount of experience on similar projects working with GDOT.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available. There is additional experience in the Bridge group that has additional experience with this type project. The QA/QC is not well defined, listed under one person.</i>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Holt Consulting Company, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
Comments: <i>PM has extensive experience working with GDOT on similar projects as both a PM and designer. Roadway team lead has good experience on similar projects in Georgia. Bridge team lead also has a good level of experience working on this type project with GDOT and additional experience with other states. Environmental team lead has a good amount of experience working on similar projects for GDOT. The prime has a large amount of experience on similar projects working with GDOT and the majority of the team leaders all have worked together on similar projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available. The prime shows good experiences working with the GDOT Bridge Office. The QA/QC has engineers to check Structural and Roadway work, however no mention of Enviornental.</i>			
Firm Name:	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
Comments: <i>PM has extensive experience working with GDOT on similar projects as both a PM and designer. Roadway team lead has good experience on similar projects with GDOT however most were design build. Bridge team lead also has a good level of experience working on this type project with GDOT although again many were design build. Environmental team lead has a good amount of experience working on similar projects for GDOT. The prime has a large amount of experience on similar projects working with GDOT and the majority of the team leaders all have worked together on similar projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available. In house Geotech engineers should help (under current circumstances. Good QA/QC organization with individuals responsibility for each of the disiplines.</i>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	KCI Technologies, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
Comments: <i>PM has extensive experience working with GDOT on similar projects as both a PM and designer. Roadway team lead has good experience on similar projects with GDOT. Bridge team lead also has a good level of experience working on this type project with GDOT. Environmental team lead has a good amount of experience working on similar projects for GDOT. The prime has a large amount of experience on similar projects working with GDOT and the majority of the team leaders all have worked together on similar projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows excellent redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available. Good QA/QC organization with individuals responsibility for each of the disiplines.</i>			
Firm Name:	Keck & Wood, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>PM has extensive experience working with GDOT on similar projects as a designer but very little as a PM. Roadway team lead has good experience on similar projects with GDOT and equal experience as a PM to offer some redundancy. Bridge team lead also has a good level of experience working on this type project with GDOT. Environmental team lead has a good amount of experience working on similar projects for GDOT. The prime has a good amount of experience on similar projects working with GDOT.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows adequate redundancy in each of the disiplines with an additional PE available. QA/QC listed under one individual.</i>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points			
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points			
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points			
Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points			
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Poor
Comments: <i>PM has an acceptalbe level of experience working with GDOT on similar projects as both designer and PM. Roadway team lead no listed experience on similar projects. Bridge team lead also has minimal experence working on similar projects. Environmental team lead has a good amount of experience working on similar projects for GDOT. The prime also lists no experence on similar projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available. QA/QC organization lists 2 engineers one for Structural and one for Roadway. Environmental QA/QC not mentioned</i>			
Firm Name:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>PM has an acceptalbe level of experience working with GDOT on similar projects as both designer and PM. Roadway team lead has a good level of experience on similar projects, and some experience as a PM. Bridge team lead also has a good level of experience working on similar projects. Environmental team lead has a good amount of experience working on similar projects for GDOT. The prime also has a good level experence on similar projects and shows all team leaders working together.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows excellent redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC also is broken up cleanly with different personel in charge of the different disiplines quality control.</i>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
<p>Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.</p>			
<p>Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points</p>			
<p>Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points</p>			
<p>Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points</p>			
<p>Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points</p>			
<p>Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points</p>			
Firm Name:	Long Engineering, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p>Comments: All key team leads have a large amount of experience working together (exception environmental and just not with the rest of the team) on similar projects throughout Georgia and Alabama with the Prime.</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>Comments:The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC is broken between two PE's.</p>			
Firm Name:	Lowe Engineers, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
<p>Comments:PM has extensive experience working with GDOT on similar projects as both a PM and designer. Roadway team lead has good experience on similar projects with GDOT. Bridge team lead also has a good level of experience working on this type project with GDOT. Environmental team lead has a good amount of experience working on similar projects for GDOT. The prime has a large amount of experience on similar projects working with GDOT and the all of the team leaders all have a history of working together on similar projects.</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p>Comments:The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available who also have experience working with KTL. The QA/QC is broken between two PE's.</p>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points			
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points			
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points			
Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points			
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>Comments: PM has limited experience on similar projects, but a good deal of other PM experience and other design experience. While the Roadway lead lacks experience on similar projects in the Lead role, she has experience as a designer and Lead experience on other roadway projects. Bridge Lead has extensive experience with similar projects although mostly through design build. Environmental Lead has a good level of experience on simlar projects for GDOT. Most of the prime's work on similar projects comes through the design build process.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Comments:The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's providing redundancy within each field. The QA/QC is well defined with PE's assigned to each field.</i>			
Firm Name:	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
<i>Comments: PM has extensive design and project management experience working on similar projects with GDOT. Roadway Lead has a good deal of experience working on similar projects in this role and intimate knowledge of GDOT policies. Bridge and Environmental Leads also have an extensive amount of experience working with GDOT on similar projects. The prime has worked on many similar projects with all of the key team leaders gaining experience working together.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Comments:The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC also is broken up cleanly with different personel in charge of the different disiplines quality control.</i>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
<i>Comments: All key team leads have extensive experience working together (exception environmental and just not with the rest of the team) on similar projects with GDOT under the Prime.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
<i>Comments:The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows excellent redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available (some with listed experience working in similar roles with the team leads). Also a Structural PE is dedicated to Culvert and walls. The QA/QC also is broken up cleanly with different personel in charge of the different disiplines quality control.</i>			
Firm Name:	Practical Design Partners, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Comments: PM has extensive design and project management experience working on similar projects with GDOT. Roadway Lead has a good deal of experience working on similar projects in this role. Bridge and Environmental Leads also have a good amount of experience working with GDOT on similar projects. The prime has worked on a similar project.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<i>Comments:The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart does not shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines. There is no mention of QA/QC.</i>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	RS&H, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM has extensive design related experience involving similar projects and a limited amout of project management experience on similar projects. Roadway lead has extensive experience working on similar projects and an intimate knowledge of GDOT roadway policies. Bridge and Environmental Leads both have a good level of experience working on similar projects for GDOT. The prime also lists several similar projects they have worked with GDOT on.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments:The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows redundancy in each of the disiplines with additional PE's available. The QA/QC also is broken up cleanly with different personel in charge of the Roadway, Structures, and Construction quality control.			
Firm Name:	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: PM served as Subconsultant PM (?) on several similar projects working with GDOT. Roadway team Lead has similar experience. The Bridge Lead has good experience working on similar projects with GDOT in this role. The environmental Lead good experiece in similar roles on similar projects. The prime has worked on similar projects in Georgia.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments:The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC is broken between two PE's. No mention of environmental QA/QC			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>PM has a good deal of experience as a PM on similar projects with GDOT, also has a good amount of structural design experience. Bridge lead while vastly experienced with grade seperation bridges lists limited experience with bridges over waterways. Roadway team lead has extensive experience with similar projects working with GDOT and an intimate knowledge of GDOT Roadway policies. Environmental team lead does not list any experience with bridge replacement projects. The prime has a good level of experience with similar projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC is not clearly defined.</i>			
Firm Name:	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
Comments: <i>PM, Roadway team lead and Bridge team lead all have adequate experience working on similar projects using GDOT policies. Bridge also has a good deal of experience working on similar bridges around the SouthEast. Environmental team lead lists no experience working on bridge replacement projects. The prime does have some experience working on similar projects</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC is broken between two PE's. No mention of environmental QA/QC</i>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Thompson Engineering, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>PM has extensive experience serving as a PM for various DOT's around the South on similar projects, and additional experience as a structural engineer. Roadway Lead has good experience on similar projects for other DOT's and has also worked with GDOT as a team lead on other type projects. Both the bridge lead and environmental lead have extensive experience in their roles on similar projects employing GDOT policies. The prime has experience with this type of project while working in adjacent states, and also experience working with GDOT on other projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC also is broken up cleanly with different personel in charge of the different disiplines quality control.</i>			
Firm Name:	TranSystems Corporation		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>PM has extensive experience in the role working with GDOT policies on similar projects. The roadway lead has extensive experience working on the beginning stages of similar projects. The bridge lead has a high level of experience working with GDOT policies on similar bridges and has additional experience with hydraulic engineering. The environmental lead also has a good amount of experience working on similar projects. As does the prime.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>The Leads all appear to have adequate availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows good redundancy in each of the disiplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC also is broken up cleanly with different personel in charge of the different disiplines quality control.</i>			





Evaluation Criteria





Experience and Qualifications





Resources and Workload Capacity





Evaluator 4





SUBMITTING FIRMS	Maximum Points allowed =	200	300	Phase One Evaluator 4 Individual	
		▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Engineers, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	10	
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	10	
CDM Smith, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	10	
Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	23	
Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.	Adequate	Excellent	400	7	
Croy Engineering, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	10	
DRMP, Inc.	Good	Good	375	9	
EFK Moen, LLC	Good	Marginal	225	26	
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	23	
HNTB Corporation	Good	Excellent	450	1	
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	10	
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	Good	Adequate	300	10	
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Excellent	400	7	
Keck & Wood, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	23	
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	Adequate	Marginal	175	28	
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Good	Excellent	450	1	
Long Engineering, LLC	Good	Marginal	225	26	
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	10	
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	10	
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	Good	Excellent	450	1	
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Good	Excellent	450	1	
Practical Design Partners, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	10	
RS&H, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	10	
Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	10	
T.Y. Lin International, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	10	
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	Good	Adequate	300	10	
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Good	Excellent	450	1	
TranSystems Corporation	Good	Excellent	450	1	
Maximum Points allowed =	200	300	500	%	





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 4			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	American Engineers, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: Project manager 34 years experience, worked on approximately 30 GDOT projects (14 bridge replacements), experience supervising environmental disciplines, familiar with policy/procedures, example provided as a project manager from concept to construction. Roadway design lead 23 years experience, familiar with policy/procedure, worked on 2 bridge replacments projects. Bridge design 34 years experience, lead structural design on over 200 bridges, bridges over water. Env 36 years experience, completed over 250 projects for GDOT, experience with public involvement outreach in environmental justice areas, experience leading SME's and familiar with policies/procedures. Prime, worked on similar scoped projects.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: Organizational chart includes many members but does not call out QAQC nor public involvement.			
Firm Name:	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: Project manager 22 years experience, familiar with policy/procedure. Roadway design 24 years experience, highlighted bridge replacements projects. Bridge design 28 years experience, very familiar with policy/procedures, conducted over 1000 plan reviews, bridges over water highlighted. Env 6 years experience, familiar with P6 and Tpro updates, leads mainly Ecology efforts, has overseen 100 environmental surveys/reports, and familiar with policy/procedures. Prime worked on similar scoped projects.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: Organizational Chart shows leads and public involvement personnel, but does not disclose QA/QC leads.			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 4			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	CDM Smith, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments <i>Project manager 40 years experience, experience working on bridge replacments projects, has worked on 50+ GDOT projects, experience with environmental disciplines, familiar with policy/procedures. Roadway design lead 10 years experience, familiar with policy/procedure, worked on 3 bridge replacments projects. Bridge design 21 years experience, bridge design on 6 GDOT bridges, bridges over water. Env, 20 years experience, completed over 25 projects for GDOT, experience with public involvement outreach in environmental justice areas, experience leading SME's and familiar with policies/procedures. Prime, worked on similar scoped projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>Organizational chart complete with public involvement personnel, but does not disclose the QA/QC leads.</i>			
Firm Name:	Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>Project manager 37 years experience, worked on approximately GDOT projects, familiar with policy/procedures. Roadway design lead 9 years experience, worked on 2 bridge replacment projects for GDOT. Bridge design 15 years experience, lead structural design on bridges over water. Env, 20 years experience, completed over 25 projects for GDOT, experience with public involvement outreach in environmental justice areas, experience leading SME's and familiar with policies/procedures. Prime, worked on similar scoped projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>Organizational chart complete with public involvement personnel, but does not disclose the QA/QC leads.</i>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 4			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>Comments: 16 years experience with GDOT work, familiar with GDOT policy/procedures, provides one example of bridge replacement project. Roadway design lead 16 years experience, familiar with policy/procedure as is working on multiple roadway projects, mentions one bridge replacement project. Bridge design 13 years experience, familiar with GDOT policy/procedure. Env 20 years experience, completed GDOT projects, experience with public involvement outreach in environmental justice areas, experience leading SME's and familiar with policies/procedures. Prime, worked on similar scoped projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
<i>Comments: Organizational chart complete, includes public involvement and QA/QC personnel.</i>			
Firm Name:	Croy Engineering, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Comments: Project manager has worked on GDOT projects, mentions bridge replacement over water, experience with environmental disciplines, familiar with policy/procedures. Roadway design lead over 8 years experience, familiar with policy/procedure. Bridge design 15 years experience, lead structural design on many GDOT bridges, bridges over water. Env 25 years experience, 10 years with GDOT, experience with public involvement, familiar with policies/procedures. Prime, worked on similar scoped projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>Comments: Organizational chart does not depict exact names for SME's and does not show QA/QC.</i>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 4			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	DRMP, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: Project manager 37 years experience, worked on GDOT projects, bridge replacments over water, familiar with policy/procedures. Roadway design lead 18 years experience, familiar with policy/procedure, has worked on GDOT bridge replacments projects over water. Bridge design 28 years experience, mainly work in Florida but has completed GDOT PDP, experience with bridges over water. Env 25 years experience, completed over 50 GDOT projects, experience with public involvement outreach, experience leading SME's and familiar with policies/procedures. Prime, worked on similar scoped projects.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: Organizational chart complete, public involvement specialists provided, and QA/QC team identified.			
Firm Name:	EFK Moen, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: Project manager 28 years experience, has experience with structures over waters, whasn't worked on many GDOT projects, took GDOT PDP in 2018. Roadway design lead 26 years experience, familiar with policy/procedure, has worked on bridge replacments projects over water in Georgia. Bridge design 11 years experience, has completed bridge replacement projects over water but does not have much GDOT work experience, did take GDOT PDP. Env, 20 years experience, completed many projects for GDOT, experience with public involvement outreach, experience leading SME's and familiar with policies/procedures. Prime, worked on similar scoped projects			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
Comments: Organizational chart does not depict which individuals complete what for environmental, no public involvement identified and QA/QC not identified for environmental.			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 4			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>Comments: Project manager 25 years experience, worked on similar scope projects, highlighted the importance of ensuring team and contracts in place to ensure work starts, very familiar with policy/procedures, Roadway design over 30 years experience, all projects highlighted had him as PM not Roadway lead, familiar with policy/procedures. Bridge 30 years experience, familiar with policy/procedure worked on bridges replacement projects. Envir 20 years experience, has worked on many projects for GDOT, experience with public involvement outreach, experience leading SME's and familiar with policies/procedures. Prime, worked on similar scoped projects</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>Comments: Organizational chart does not show public involvemtn nor QAQC personnel.</i>			
Firm Name:	HNTB Corporation		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Comments: Project manager 24 years experience, worked on similar scoped projects (bridge replacements over water), familiar with policy/procedure. Roadway design 21 years experience, worked on similar scoped projects, familiar with policy/procedure. Bridge 20 years experience, bridge over water highlighted. Env 17 years experience, worked on more than 120 GDOT projects, familiar with PAR and ecology, A3M, familiar with policy/procedure. Prime worked on similar scoped projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
<i>Comments: Organizational chart was complete, deputy project manager provided, identified a quality control team for areas including scheduling, org chart detailed and provided depth.</i>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 4			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Holt Consulting Company, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Comments: Project manager 22 years experience, worked on similar scoped projects familiar with policy/procedures. Roadway 24 years experience, worked on similar scoped projects familiar with policy/procedures. Bridge 13 years experience, bridges over water highlighted, famialr with policy/procedures Env 20 years experience, specializes in community involvement and EJ, familiar with policy/procedure, no GEPA project highlighted, bridge replacement projects highlighted. Prime worked on similar scoped projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>Comments: Organizational chart provides public involvement, but does not note the QAQC for environmental.</i>			
Firm Name:	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Comments: Project manager more than 20 years experience, worked on similar scoped projects for GDOT, familiar with policy/procedures, example provided as a project manager from concept to construction. Roadway design lead 13 years experience, familiar with policy/procedure, has worked on bridge replacments projects over water for GDOT. Bridge design 16 years experience, understanding of environmental, bridges over water. Env, 20 years experience, completed many projects for GDOT, experience with public involvement outreach in environmental justice areas, experience leading SME's and familiar with policies/procedures. Prime, worked on similar scoped projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>Comments: Organizational chart is complete, does not call out QAQC personnel.</i>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 4			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	KCI Technologies, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: Project manager 22 years experience, worked on similar scoped projects, familiar with policy/procedures, highlights bridge replacement over water. Roadway, 23 years experience, worked on similar scoped projects in the area, familiar with policy/procedures. Bridge worked on similar scoped projects, familiar with policy/procedure. Env highlights bridge replacement projects. Prime worked on similar scoped projects.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
Comments: Organizational chart complete with public involvement, all environmental SME's depicted and QAQC personnel called out.			
Firm Name:	Keck & Wood, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: Project manager main experience is as design phase leader not project manager, familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. Roadway design 14 years experience with firm, highlights bridge replacement projects for GDOT, familiar with policies and procedures. Bridge design worked on bridges over water for GDOT. Envir 27 years of experience with bridges over water, public involvement, policies and procedures. Prime worked on similar scoped projects.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: Organizational chart complete with public involvement and depicts the different environmental SME's, does not note who the QAQC is for environmental but does for design.			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 4			
<p>Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.</p>			
<p>Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points</p>			
Firm Name:	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>Comments: Project manager has 24 years of experience, familiar with GDOT policy and procedures, highlights projects of the same scope, over water. Roadway design 8 years of experience, does not highlight bridge replacement projects. Bridge 27 years of experience, work with GDOT and their policy/procedures, does not highlight bridge replacements in Georgia. Envir 25 years of experience, public involvement, highlights bridge replacements.</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p>Comments: Organizational chart does not depict which environmental SME is doing which discipline, QAQC personnel not mentioned for environmental.</p>			
Firm Name:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p>Comments: Project manager 18 years experience, worked on similar scoped projects, familiar with policy/procedures. Roadway 16 years experience, worked on similar scoped projects, especially briges over water, familiar with policy/procedures. Bridge worked on bridges over water, familiar with policy/procedures. Envir 27 years experience worked on similar scoped projects, familiar with public involvement, GDOT polcies and procedures. Prime worked on similar scoped projects.</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
<p>Comments: Organizational chart offers QAQC in structures, chart is complete with two teams to complete bridge work and public involvement, discussed survey team experience.</p>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 4			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Long Engineering, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>Project manager 32 years experience, worked on six bridge reapiacement projects (over water), familiar with policy/procedures. Roadway 28 years experience, experience reviewing plans, highlights bridge replacement projects, familiar with policy/procedures. Bridge, 38 years experience, highlights bridges over water, familiar with policy/procedures. Envir 24 years experience, specializes in community involvement and EJ, familiar with policy/procedure. Prime worked on similar scoped projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
Comments: <i>Organizational chart does not detail out environmental specialists, and QAQC is not called out.</i>			
Firm Name:	Lowe Engineers, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: <i>Project manager has extensive experience with GDOT bridge replacement projects, 24 years of overall experience, familiar with policies/procedures. Roadway 23 years of experience, highlights bridges over water, and familiar with policies/procedures. Design 20 years of experience with 40 bridge replacements projects with GDOT, highlights bridges over water, and familiar with policies/procedures. Envir 22 years of experience with includes bridges over water, very familiar with policies/procedures. Prime worked on similar scoped projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: <i>Organizational chart includes all disciplines including public involvement, but does not state QAQC for environmental.</i>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 4			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: Project manager 17 years of experience, mentions bridge replacement projects of similar scope and is familiar with GDOT policies/procedures. Roadway 29 years experience, highlights many bridge replacement projects, especially over water. Bridge 15 years of experience, highlights bridges over water and is familiar with GDOT policies/procedures. Envir 20 years of NEPA experience, highlights many bridge replacments projects, public involvement. Prime worked on similar scoped projects.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: Organizational chart does not depict which environmental SME is doing which discipline, public involvement not mentioned.			
Firm Name:	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: Project manager 31 years experience, worked on similar scoped projects, familiar with policy/procedures. Roadway 13 years experience, worked on similar scoped projects, very familiar with policy/procedures GDOT. Bridge 31 years experience, bridges over water highlighted, familiar with policy/procedures. Env. 30 years experience, project examples provided are similar is scope. Prime worked on projects of similar scope.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
Comments: Organizational chart complete with QAQC for bridge, roadway, environmental provided and public involvement.			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 4			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Comments: Project manager 17 years experience worked on simiar scoped projects, familiar with policy/procedure. Roadway 22 years experience, worked on bridge replacement projects over water, familiar with policy/procedure. Bridge 11 years experience, bridges over water highlighted, familiar with policy/procedure. Env 24 years experience, public involvement, worked on similar scoped projects. Similar scoped projects worked on by the prime.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
<i>Comments: Organizational chart complete with QAQC for bridge, roadway, environmental provided and public involvement.</i>			
Firm Name:	Practical Design Partners, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Comments: Project manager 16 years of experience with similar scoped projects, highlights bridges over water, and is familiar with policies/procedures of GDOT. Roadway 17 years of experience, notes experiences with permitting but does not highlight any bridge replacement projects over water. Bridge 21 years of experience with similar scoped projects highlighted. Envir GDOT experience with bridge bundles, and familiar with GDOT policies/procedures. Prime worked on similar scoped projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>Comments: Organizational chart shows leads and public involvement personnel, but does not disclose QA/QC for all leads.</i>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 4			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	RS&H, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: Project manager 27 years of experience, familiar with GDOT procedures, highlights bridge replacements projects. Roadway 18 years of experience, highlights bridge replacments over water. Bridge 13 years of experience, bridge replacements highlighted and familiar with GDOT policies/procedures. Envir 24 years experience, worked on several bridge replacements projects over water, public involvement. Prime worked on similar scoped projects.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: QAQC not mentioned for environmental.			
Firm Name:	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: Project manager 22 years of experience, hightlights bridge replacement projects over water, familiar with GDOT policy/procedures. Roadway curretly leading 2 GDOT bridge replacement projects, recently PDP, worked closely with locals. Bridge 30 years of experience, bridge replacements projects over waters highlighted and familiar with GDOT policies/procedures. Envir 10 years of experience, bridge experience, public involvement. Prime worked on similar scoped projects.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: QAQC not mentioned for environmental.			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 4			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: Project manager 19 years experience, project examples provided show bridge replacement projects and familiarity with GDOT policy/procedures. Roadway, 23 years experience, stakeholder involvement, familiar with policy/procedures. Bridge 23 years experience, bridge over water highlighted, familiar with policy/procedure. Env 20 years experience, very familiar with policy/procedure including public involvement. Prime worked on similar scoped projects.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: Organizational chart did not call out QAQC for environmental.			
Firm Name:	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: Project manger 35 years of experience, mentions one project similar in scope in highlights, familiar with policy/procedures. Roadway 19 years experience, highlights bridges over water, familiar with GDOT policy/procedures. Bridge 10 years experience, highlights one project with bridge over water. Env, 20 years experience, completed many projects for GDOT, experience with public involvement outreach in environmental justice areas, experience leading SME's and familiar with policies/procedures. Prime, worked on similar scoped projects.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: QAQC not mentioned for environmental.			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 4			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Thompson Engineering, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Comments: Project manager 30 years experience, mostly engineer for projects rather than project manager, does highlight projects over water. Roadway currently managing 4 bridge replacement projects for another DOT, has completed GDOT PDP. Bridge 35 years, 17 years close work with GDOT, highlights numerous bridges over water projects in Georgia, familiar with policy/procedures. Envir 20 years of experience, highlights bridge replacement projects over waters with GDOT, public involvement, familiar with policy/procedure. Prime has worked on similar scoped projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
<i>Comments: Organizational chart shows all the key leads with public involvement and QA/QC for all.</i>			
Firm Name:	TranSystems Corporation		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Comments: Project manager 27 years experience, worked on projects of similar scope with PI and over water, familiar with policy/procedures. Roadway 26 years experience, worked on projects of similar scope requiring extensive PI coordination, familiar with policy/procedures. Bridge, 27 years experience, worked on similar scoped projects including bridges over water, familiar with policy/procedures. Envir 20 years experience, leads P6 and Tpro updates and PI, has worked on projects of similar scope with extensive PI needs highlighted, familiar with policy/procedures. Prime worked on projects of similar scope.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Excellent
<i>Comments: Organizational chart includes all disciplines including public involvement, notes QAQC for all leads and notes years experience for leads and principal.</i>			

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF TOP SUBMITTALS FOR PHASE I

Solicitation Title:	Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services	1	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	2	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.
PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria FOR TOP 15 SUBMITTALS		2	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
(This Page For GDOT Use)		2	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC
		2	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC
		6	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.
		6	TranSystems Corporation

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING)			Firm Name
	Score	Ranking		
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	450	1	12	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	375	2	12	HNTB Corporation
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	375	2	12	DRMP, Inc.
KCI Technologies, Inc.	300	8		
Lowe Engineers, LLC	300	8		
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	375	2		
RS&H, Inc.	300	8		
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	300	8		
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	375	2		
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	325	6		
TranSystems Corporation	325	6		
CDM Smith, Inc.	250	12		
Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	250	12		
HNTB Corporation	250	12		
DRMP, Inc.	250	12		

SUBMITTING FIRMS	Evaluation Criteria		Phase One Scores and Group Ranking	
	200	300	Total Score	Ranking
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Good	Excellent	450	1
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	Good	Good	375	2
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Good	Good	375	2
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	8
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	8
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Good	Good	375	2
RS&H, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	8
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	8
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	Good	Good	375	2
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	6
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Good	325	6
CDM Smith, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
HNTB Corporation	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
DRMP, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
Maximum Points allowed =	200	300	500	%

Experience and Qualifications

Resources and Workload Capacity

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Parson's Project manager (PM) has 17 years of experience managing transportation engineering and planning projects. The PM has worked on similar scoped projects, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. Additionally, the PM has successfully managed relevant project management obstacles on past projects, examples include overcoming a 9-month delay, which the PM accelerated PFPR and ROW plans; submitted a limited scope concept 4 weeks after NTP; and used GIS surface data to prepare A3M plans 3 months after NTP. The Roadway Key Team Lead (KTL) has 22 years of various roadway design experience, has worked on bridge replacement projects over water, has been a lead on 4 recent GDOT bridge bundles, which involved the replacement of 15 bridges over waterways and railroads, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Bridge KTL has 11 years of structural design experience on transportation projects, completed relevant projects including bridges over water, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The NEPA KTL has 24 years of providing management experience of environmental documentation, which most are relevant to this project. Also, the NEPA KTL has previous public involvement experience which will serve as a plus. The Prime has completed many projects for GDOT with similar scope as this project. All KTL's have extensive experience working together, except for environmental, on similar projects with GDOT under the Prime.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Excellent	
<p>Parson's PM has over 50% availability. Additionally, the KTL's all appear to have ample availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available, and listed deputy PM's having previous experience working in similar roles with the team leads. Parson's will add a Structural PE, who is dedicated to culverts and wall designs for this project. The QA/QC roles are clearly defined and detailed to outline different personnel in charge of the project disciplines for quality control.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>NV5's PM has 31 years of experience in project management and roadway design, worked as a PM on similar scoped projects which includes 8 bridge replacements from 2 GDOT bridge bundles, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. In addition, the PM will use a structured Project Management Plan (PMP) to establish project expectations, objectives, deliverables, and roles. The Roadway KTL has 13 years of experience in roadway and project management design, worked on similar scoped projects, was a previous GDOT group manager, and is very familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Bridge KTL has 31 years experience and has served as a project engineer on over 130 highway bridge and structure projects, served as a KTL on 2 previous GDOT bridge bundle projects, highlighted bridges over water, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The NEPA KTL has 30 years experience, and listed project examples that are similar in scope to this project. The Prime has worked on projects of similar scope and with involvement of all KTL's.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>All of NV5's KTL's have ample availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC process is clearly defined with different personnel in charge of the various disciplines within quality control.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Kimley-Horn's PM has 18 years of experience, previously worked on similar scoped projects, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. Also, the PM provides various examples of project coordination, including task order development. The Roadway KTL has 16 years experience; previously used technical design experience with GDOT bridge replacement projects, which enabled better understanding of deliverables and processes, especially with bridges over water; and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Bridge KTL has 12 years of experience, worked on bridges over water, has current up to date knowledge of complex staging and LRFD standards, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The NEPA KTL has 27 years experience, worked on similar scoped projects, and familiar with public involvement and GDOT policies and procedures. The Prime worked on similar scoped projects and all the KTL's have previously worked together. Additionally, the Prime successfully met bridge bundle concept dates, coordinated several stakeholder meetings which resulted incorporating special lighting and landscaping; and has provided numerous examples of coordinating with various stakeholders.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Kimley-Horn's organizational chart offers QA/QC in structures and is clearly defined with different personnel in charge of the disciplines in quality control. Additionally, the organizational chart is complete with multiple team members to complete bridge work and public involvement, discussed survey team experience, and shows high redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available. All KTL's appear to have ample availability to work on this project. Lastly, their narrative provided examples of problem solving capabilities on past projects with PM and KTL's.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	KCI Technologies, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>KCI's PM has 22 years of experience, worked on similar scoped projects, is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures, and highlights managing projects that include bridge replacements over water. Additionally, the PM will develop a very specific procurement plan detailing the scope of all task orders. The Roadway KTL has 23 years of experience, previously worked on similar scoped projects in the area, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Bridge KTL has 19 years of experience, worked on similar scoped projects, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedure. The NEPA lead highlights performance on past bridge replacement projects. The Prime and KTL's have worked together, except for the NEPA KTL. Additionally, the Prime has worked on similar scoped projects, and their previous experience notes recovering a 5-month delay by expediting PFPR and ROW plans.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>KCI's organizational chart is complete with public involvement, all environmental SME's depicted, and described QA/QC in detail. All KTL's appear to have availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC is organized with individuals responsibility for each of the disciplines. However, the NEPA KTL availability concerns the team due to current work with GDOT's MMIP advanced improvement projects.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Lowe Engineers, LLC		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Lowe's PM has extensive experience with GDOT bridge replacement projects, has over 24 years of experience, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. In addition, the PM notes using 3D laser scanner to collect data and save time and money. The Roadway KTL has 23 years of experience, highlights bridges over water, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Bridge KTL has 20 years of experience, designed 40 bridge replacements projects with GDOT, highlights bridge projects over water, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The NEPA KTL has 22 years of experience that includes bridge projects over water, and is very familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Prime worked on similar scoped projects and all KTL's worked on past projects together.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Lowe's organizational chart contains all disciplines including public involvement, but does not state QA/QC for environmental. All KTL's appear to have availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available, who have previous experience working with KTL's . The QA/QC is reviewed between two PE's.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Atlas' PM has 22 years of experience, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Roadway KTL has 24 years of roadway design experience and highlighted bridge replacement projects. The Bridge KTL has 28 years of bridge design experience, is very familiar with GDOT policies and procedures, conducted over 1000 plan reviews, and listed projects with bridge over water. The NEPA lead has 6 years of experience, familiar with P6 and TPro updates, primarily leads Ecology efforts, and has overseen 100 environmental surveys/reports. The Prime worked on similar scoped projects, but is not shown if KTL's worked together on past projects.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Atlas' organizational chart outlines KTL's and public involvement personnel. The Prime will include a deputy PM, and assign someone to track schedule and critical path. The KTL's appear to have availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available. Lastly, the QA/QC is clearly defined with different personnel in charge of the various disciplines in quality control.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	RS&H, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>RS&H's PM has 27 years of experience, is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures, and has extensive management of bridge replacement projects. In addition, the PM has completed a host of activities within 4 weeks of NTP, including Project Execution Plans and Procurement Plans. The Roadway KTL has 18 years of experience, highlights bridge replacements over water. The Bridge KTL has 13 years of experience, noted previous bridge replacements projects, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The NEPA lead has 24 years experience, completed reports for several bridge replacements projects over water, and is highly active with public involvement. The Prime worked on similar scoped projects; however, did not state if KTL's previously worked together. Recently, the Prime let a project where their cost estimate was only 2% over the average bid.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>All RS&H's KTL's appear to have availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows redundancy in each of the disciplines with additional PE's available. The QA/QC also is clearly defined with different personnel in charge of the Roadway, Structures, and Construction quality control. However, QA/QC was not mentioned for environmental.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Holt Consulting Company, LLC		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Holt's PM has 22 years of experience, has worked on similar scoped projects, previously served as a project manager, lead roadway engineer, or roadway designer on approximately 50 roadway projects in Georgia, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Roadway KTL has 24 years of experience, worked on similar scoped projects, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Bridge KTL has 13 years of experience, previously worked on bridges over water, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The NEPA KTL has 20 years of experience, specializes in community involvement and NEPA approvals for CEs and PCEs, is very familiar with GDOT policies and procedures, and has previously worked on NEPA for bridge replacement projects. The Prime has delivered on similar scoped projects with PM and KTL involvement.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Holt's organizational chart provides QA/QC for public involvement, but none for environmental. In addition, the organizational chart shows redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available, except for environmental. All KTL's appear to have availability to work on this project.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>ICE's PM has more than 20 years experience, worked on similar scoped projects for GDOT, is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures, and referenced past projects as a project manager from concept to construction. The Roadway KTL has 13 years of experience, is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures, and previously worked on bridge replacements projects over water for GDOT. The Bridge KTL has 16 years of design experience, a high understanding of environmental from past projects, and completed bridge projects over water. The NEPA lead has 20 years of experience, completed many projects for GDOT, has experience with public involvement outreach in environmental justice areas, experience leading SME's, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Prime has worked on similar scoped projects. The PM and KTL's previously worked together, except for the NEPA KTL.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>ICE's KTL's appear to have availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available. ICE will include in-house Geotech engineers to assist under current circumstances. Additionally, their QA/QC is organized with individuals responsibility for each of the disciplines.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Neel-Schaffer's PM has 17 years of experience, but mostly as a design-build PM, and did mention bridge replacement projects. However, the PM is limited with understanding of GDOT policies and procedures since the projects listed are not similar to this project. The Roadway KTL has 29 years of experience, but lacks experience in a lead role for a project of this scale. The Roadway KTL did list many bridge replacement projects over water. The Bridge KTL has 15 years of experience and completed bridge projects over water. The NEPA KTL has 20 years of experience, and highlights many bridge replacement projects including public involvement. The Prime and KTL's previously worked together on projects listed.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Neel-Schaffer KTL's appear to have availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's providing redundancy within each field. The QA/QC is well defined with PE's assigned to each field. Also, the Prime will include a deputy PM.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	TranSystems Corporation		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>TranSystems PM has 27 years of experience, worked on projects of similar scope with public involvement and bridges over water, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Roadway KTL has 26 years of experience, worked on projects of similar scope requiring extensive public involvement coordination, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Bridge KTL has 27 years of experience, worked on similar scoped projects including bridges over water, has experience with hydraulic engineering, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The NEPA lead has 20 years of experience, leads P6, TPro updates and public involvement, has worked on projects of similar scope with extensive public involvement needs highlighted, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Prime worked on projects of similar scope, but no mention of KTL's working together. The PM and Bridge KTL worked on 1 project together.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>All TranSystems KTL's appear to have availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC is structured, and is defined with different personnel in charge of the various disciplines under quality control.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	CDM Smith, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>CDM's PM has 40 years experience, has worked on 50+ GDOT projects, including bridge replacements, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. scope included a bridge bundle with 3 bridges. The Roadway KTL has experience with projects of similar scope, but is currently serving as lead on an on-going FY16 bridge bundle contract, which actual work completed is not provided. The evaluation team believes it would have been beneficial to list each bridge project from the contract and note the work that has been completed. The Bridge KTL has an extensive amount of experience working on similar bridges using a variety of span arrangements with GDOT as the lead bridge engineer. The NEPA lead has 20 years of experience, completed over 25 projects for GDOT, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures, but NEPA KTL does not list any experience on bridge replacement projects. The Prime had prior experience with projects of similar scope as this project, and listed a project with involvement of the PM and Roadway KTL.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>CDM's KTL's all appear to have availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available. However, the QA/QC is not listed.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>SEI's PM has 22 years of experience, highlights bridge replacement projects over water, is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures, and scoped projects through PTIP. The Roadway KTL is currently leading 2 GDOT bridge replacement projects, but presented several projects with limited details on relevant engineering tasks performed. The Bridge KTL has 30 years of experience, completed bridge replacements projects over water, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The NEPA lead has 10 years of experience, and listed projects with experience in public involvement. The Prime has not completed a project of similar scope to this projects and presented several on-going projects. No project listed has prior KTL involvement.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>The leads listed by SEI all appear to have availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available. The QA/QC is broken between two PE's. No mention of environmental QA/QC.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	HNTB Corporation		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>HNTB's PM has 24 years of experience, worked on similar scoped projects including bridge replacements over water, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Roadway KTL has 21 years of experience, worked on similar scoped projects, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedure. The Bridge KTL lead has an extensive amount of experience working on large bridge projects, but lesser experience as a Lead for this type of project. The NEPA lead has 17 years of experience, and has worked on more than 120 GDOT projects, is familiar with PAR, Ecology, A3M, and GDOT policies and procedures. The Prime worked on similar scoped projects and has demonstrated ability to deliver effective services for GDOT. The Prime completed 1 project of similar scope that included PM and KTL involvement.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>HNTB KTL's all appear to have availability to work on this project. The organization chart shows redundancy in each of the disciplines with multiple PE's available. HNTB included numerous Q/A reviewers and listed SME resources for several areas, but no details in their narrative on their resources and qualifications as SMEs or quality reviewers. HNTB plans to add an office quality manager but did not detail their relevant experience to this project.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	DRMP, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>DRMP's PM has 37 years of experience, previously worked on GDOT projects, including bridge replacements over water, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. Although, the PM presented limited management experience with projects of similar scope to this project, and most projects listed were off-system bridge replacements for Local Governments. The Roadway KTL has 18 years of experience, but presented limited details on relevant engineering experience as a lead. Additionally, did describe responsibilities with roadway improvement projects but no details on plan elements or PDP progression. The Bridge KTL has 28 years of experience, has completed GDOT PDP and has experience with bridges over water. The Bridge KTL has an extensive amount of experience working on similar bridges and special design culverts with FDOT as the lead bridge engineer. The NEPA KTL has 25 years experience, completed over 50 GDOT projects, has experience with public involvement outreach and experience leading SME, and is familiar with GDOT policies and procedures. The Prime has limited experience with projects of similar scope, and there was no mention of KTL's previously working together on projects.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>DRMP has a detailed organizational chart with sufficient resources in each area class, in addition to, quality reviewers for key areas, except for Environmental. Their PM and KTL's appear to have the capacity to complete the project.</p>			

SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST																							
Solicitation #: RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9																							
Solicitation Title: Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services																							
Primes and Subconsultants		1.06(a)	1.06(b)	1.06(c)	1.06(d)	1.06(e)	1.06(f)	1.06(g)	1.07	1.10	3.01	3.12	4.01(a) or (b)	4.04	5.01	5.02	6.01(a)	6.01(b)	6.02	6.05	9.01	Certificate Expires	
2	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	3/12/2023	
	Accura Engineering and Consulting Services, Inc.														X	X	X	X	X	X	X	1/31/2022	
	Aulick Engineering, LLC										X	X		X							X	11/9/2023	
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X														4/14/2023	
	Long Engineering, Inc.										X	X	X	X	X	X					X	12/14/2023	
12	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	X				X			X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X		X	1/31/2022	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X													3/12/2023	
	Accura Engineering and Consulting Services, Inc.														X	X	X	X	X	X	X	1/31/2022	
16	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X							X	X	8/31/2024
	Ecological Solutions, Inc.	X				X		X														2/28/2022	
	MC Squared, Inc.																X	X	X	X	X	11/9/2023	
	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	X	X			X				X		X			X	X						12/31/2021	
	TerraXplorations, Inc.		X				X															5/31/2024	
20	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	3/7/2023	
	Aulick Engineering, LLC										X	X	X								X	11/9/2023	
	ECS Southeast, LLP																X	X	X	X		12/31/2021	
	Ecological Solutions, Inc.	X				X		X														2/28/2022	
	Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X			X		X		X	8/9/2024	
21	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X							X	12/14/2023	
	CHB Acquisition Services, LLC																					5/19/2022	
	Contour Engineering, LLC																X	X	X	X		3/12/2023	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X													3/12/2023	
	Kennedy Engineering & Association Group, LLC	X	X	X	X	X			X		X									X	X	7/17/2024	
	Settimio Consulting Services, Inc.														X	X						2/28/2022	



SELECTION OF FINALISTS

**RFQ-484-051121
Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services,
Contracts 1 – 12**

The Georgia Department of Transportation is pleased to announce the selection of the following firms as finalists regarding the above RFQ:

Contract 1 - PI #0013064, Meriwether/Pike Counties

CHA Consulting, Inc.
HNTB Corporation
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.
WSP USA, Inc.

Contract 2 - PI #0013591, Catoosa County

KCI Technologies, Inc.
Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.
Mott MacDonald, LLC
Qk4, Incorporated
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

Contract 3 – PI #0017729, Dawson County

Alfred Benesch & Company
KCI Technologies, Inc.
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
Practical Design Partners, LLC

Contract 4 – PI #0017732, Habersham County

KCI Technologies, Inc.
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
WSP USA, Inc.

Contract 5 – PI #0017733, Habersham County

Alfred Benesch & Company
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC
Lowe Engineers, LLC
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.
Southeastern Engineering, Inc.

Contract 6 – PI #0017734, Habersham/White Counties

Alfred Benesch & Company
Arcadis U.S., Inc.
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

Contract 7 – PI #0017735, Hall County

Alfred Benesch & Company
Holt Consulting Company
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

Contract 8 – PI #0017736, Hart County

Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC
KCI Technologies, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
RS&H, Inc.
Thompson Engineering, Inc.
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.

Contract 9 – PI #0017737, Towns County

Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

Contract 10 – PI #0017739, White County

Arcadis U.S., Inc.
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.
Holt Consulting Company, LLC
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
STV Incorporated
TranSystems Corporation

Contract 11 – PI #0017770 Cancelled

Contract 12 – PI #0017845, Fulton County

Barge Design Solutions, Inc.
KCI Technologies, Inc.
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.



Russell R. McMurry, P.E., Commissioner
 One Georgia Center
 600 West Peachtree Street, NW
 Atlanta, GA 30308
 (404) 631-1000 Main Office

August 17, 2021

NOTICE TO SELECTED FINALISTS

To: Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC; Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC; Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.; NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.; and Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

Please send an e-mail confirming receipt of this notice to Charnele Dobbins (cdobbins@dot.ga.gov).

Re: RFQ-484-051121 – Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services, Contract 9 - PI #0017737, Towns County

On behalf of the Selection Committee for the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) referenced above, we congratulate you and your firm on being selected as a finalist for further consideration. This notice shall serve as an official request for additional required information and action from finalists. **Please refer to the original solicitation (RFQ-484-051121), pages 8&9, VII. Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response – Phase II Response, A&B and pages 10&11, IX. Instructions for Submittal for Phase II – Technical Approach and Past Performance Response, A-D for instructions to submit your package.** As a finalist, your firm is required to comply with the written instructions and remaining schedule below:

A. Technical Approach - 40%

This information will be limited to a maximum of three (3) pages.

Furnish information that may serve to differentiate your firm from other firms and evidence of the firm’s fit to the project and/or needs of GDOT, including:

1. Provide any unique technical approaches your firm offers relative to addressing anticipated design concepts, use of any alternative methods for delivery (if applicable), and/or management of the project.
2. Identify any unique challenges of the project and how your firm intends to mitigate these challenges, including quality control, quality assurance procedures.
3. Provide any specific qualifications, skills, knowledge of the project and project area which may uniquely benefit the firm and project, and your ability and willingness to meet time requirements.

B. Past Performance - 10%

No additional information should be submitted to fulfill this requirement. Information from the relevant projects listed as well as information on file with the Department will be used to fulfill this requirement.

Remaining Schedule

d. GDOT completes evaluation and issues notification and other information to finalist firms.	08/17/2021	-----
e. Deadline for submission of written questions from finalists	08/24/2021	2:00 PM
f. Phase II Response of Finalist firms due	09/01/2021	2:00 PM

C. Finalist Selection

Final selection will be determined by carrying the scores from **Phase I** forward for each Finalist and by evaluating the **Technical Approach** and **Past Performance** criteria for **Phase II**. For each evaluator, the points assigned to each criterion will be totaled and a rank will be determined. The rankings of all evaluators will be totaled for each finalist in order to determine the sum of the individual rankings. The finalists will be ranked in descending order of recommendation using the sum of individual rankings from the Selection Committee members. Should a tie exist for the highest ranking firm on the contract/project, and qualifications appear to be equal, the Selection Committee shall defer to the sum of the individual points and the award shall be made to the finalist with the highest sum.

Negotiations will then be initiated with the top-ranked firm to finalize the terms and conditions of the contract, including the fees to be paid. In the event a satisfactory agreement cannot be reached with the highest-ranking firm, GDOT will formally terminate the negotiations in writing and possibly enter into negotiations with the second highest-ranking firm, and so on in turn until a mutual agreement is established and GDOT awards a contract. The final form of the contract shall be developed by GDOT.

Please address any questions you may have to Charnele Dobbins, and congratulations again to each of you!

Charnele Dobbins
cdobbins@dot.ga.gov
404-631-1425

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services	
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	September 1, 2021	
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm	

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Meets Required Area Classes	Compliant with Page # Limitations
1	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	9/1/2021	12:17 PM	X	X
2	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	9/1/2021	1:29 PM	X	X
3	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	9/1/2021	10:28 AM	X	X
4	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	9/1/2021	11:10 AM	X	X
5	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	9/1/2021	11:00 AM	X	X

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF SUBMITTALS

Solicitation Title:	Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services	1	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	2	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
PHASE I AND PHASE II - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria		3	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.
(This Page For GDOT Use)		3	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC
		5	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING)	
	Sum of	Group
	Total Score	Ranking
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	825	1
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	625	3
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	775	2
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	625	3
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	550	5

Evaluation Criteria →	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Experience and Qualifications</div> <div style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Resources and Workload Capacity</div> <div style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Technical Approach</div> <div style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Past Performance</div> </div>					
	PHASE I		PHASE II		Group Scores and Ranking	
<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	400	100	Total Score	Ranking
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	▼	▼		
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Good	Excellent	Good	Good	825	1
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	Good	Good	Adequate	Adequate	625	3
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Good	Good	Good	Excellent	775	2
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Good	Good	Adequate	Adequate	625	3
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	Good	Good	Marginal	Good	550	5
<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	400	100	1000 %	

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Parsons addressed environmental, the firm has extensive experience on identifying culverts and the firm has knowledge of mitigation techniques to complete lower-level NEPA documentation. For roadway, the firm identified restraints with intersections within close proximity to the culvert and recommended a 3-span to retain the profile, and alternatives to each. For project management, the firm provided a detailed approach to project deliverables and initiatives, including procurement plan, project execution plan, and communication plan. Also, the firm included a Gantt chart for project delivery. The procurement plan includes four anticipated task orders to get to construction. Lastly, the firm cited similar projects in the past where they overcame a 10-month delay by delivering concepts within 2 months of NTP. It appears the firm is equipped to address challenges that may arise through previous working knowledge.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Parsons received a 5.00 out of 5.00 score from five (5) past performance reviews all from one reviewer, citing "Parsons is extremely knowledgeable of the Departmental processes and procedures. The team was very responsive and managed the project well throughout the preliminary phase." In a review of numerous evaluations from GDOT Office of Program Delivery in 2020, the prime received all positive comments including "overcoming schedule delays that were caused by others". From GDOT Office of Bridge Design, the firm received a total of nine (9) scores, with an average overall of 81.2 out of 100%. As for their bridge final plans, from eleven (11) total scores, the firm received an average score of 67.6 out of 100% in hydraulic studies.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>NV5 addressed the proposed use of an abutment wall, due to the proximity of the SR intersection, their understanding how critical the Section 4(F) will be used for this project, and the firm will implement procurement plan which will include separate BFI and early bridge plans. However, the firm presented alternatives without consideration of the project budget. The firm also identified OMAT staffing and scheduling issues as an unforeseen challenge but did not provide any details on resolving delays. Lastly, the firm addressed critical areas within the project, such as utilities, public involvement, cultural resources, protected species, and permitting, but provided general information on their plan to meet those requirements, the evaluation team would have preferred a timeline on how the firm will accomplish those tasks.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>NV5 received an overall score of 3.20 out of 5.00 based on four (4) past performance reviews. Comments included "although these projects fell behind schedule, the consultant team worked together to resolve issues and submit per the recovery schedule" and "Consultant met deadlines and was responsive when needed". From GDOT Office of Program delivery 2020 reviews, the firm received both positive and negative reviews. Comments noted was a high turnover in the firm's Environmental section, scheduling issues, and projects falling behind schedule, but is currently making an effort to recover. From GDOT Office of Bridge Design, out of a small sample size of projects reviewed, the firm scored an average score of 49.5 out of 100%.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Kimley-Horn noted the constraints with the intersection and proposed abutment walls. For environmental, the firm appears very knowledgeable and experienced with the NEPA process, and cited past experience completing Section 4(f) for similar projects. Additionally, the firm will implement a Project Execution Plan similar to past successful plans on similar projects, and will utilize a contract tracking spreadsheet. The firm recognizes it is key in getting first task order executed quickly and intends to complete critical tasks early. Their proposed ABC delivery technique is inclusive of detours, public involvement and coordination. Lastly, their firm appears to be fully dedicated and staffed to completion of this project and achieving project deliverables.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Excellent
<p>Kimley-Horn received an overall score of 4.70 out of 5.00 from four (4) past performance reviews. Comments noted were "The PM and lead designer's communication with the GDOT far exceeded my expectations. This consultant stays on top of the schedule and informs GDOT PM quickly if issues arise" and "The consultant has produced quality deliverables that received high scores/rating. The consultant project leader has been a great resource for the GDOT PM to address project activities. Project has needed the schedule to be shifted due to scope changes and environmental impacts that were not a result of consultant performance." Based on GDOT Office of Program Delivery reviews, from a sample of twenty (20) evaluations from projects in 2020, the firm received mostly positive comments. From GDOT Office of Bridge Design reviews, from fourteen (14) total plans, the firm received an average score of 81.4 out of 100%, and their final plan score of 89.2 out of 100%. Overall, the firm received high reviews from both State and local governments for their performance on past projects.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Atlas' technical approach mentions they plan on using a single span structure, if the culvert is not a desirable option. For Environmental, the firm is knowledgeable and aware of survey seasons to plan their deliverables. To address OMAT concerns, the firm will utilize a task order for BFI. The firm will create a team designated for project controls, who will meet internally ahead of baseline dates to deliver project deliverables early. Their project manager will initiate preliminary plans scoping after receiving the environmental resource ID. For addressing unforeseen project challenges, the firm plans to work closely with GDOT's Office of Environmental Services to minimize impacts to the surrounding area. However, the firm did not present or address any design challenges and the firm provided a general summary of their overall approach, and the evaluation team would have preferred more details on how the firm plans to deliver the work.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Atlas received an overall score of 3.40 out of 5.00 from two (2) respondents on their past performance reviews. Comments stated "Provided good communication and coordination as part of the Design-Build Team with the contractor to keep a successful project on schedule" and "met expectations". However, from GDOT Office of Program Delivery, in a review of evaluations from 2020, the firm received both positive and negative comments, which several comments noted "late deliverables from the consultant". From GDOT Office of Bridge Design, from eleven (11) reviews, their final Bridge plans average score was 64.9 out of 100%. From GDOT Office of Environmental Services, the firm is knowledgeable but requires oversight from their department.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 9	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Marginal
<p>ICE's technical approach presented alternatives that did not consider project budget. The alternatives and relocations proposed (such as adding a wall) would add more time to scope and costs. The firm will implement a reasonable procurement plan. Most of the strategies outlined are routine. The firm cited a challenge, which was the nearby intersections; and their plan to mitigate this was to install roundabouts and realign the road, which will alleviate the need for an off-site detour. The firm provided a general summary of qualifications, skills, and knowledge. Overall, the evaluation team expected more details on how the use of their team will benefit the project.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>ICE received an overall score 4.40 out of 5.00 from 2 past performance reviews, which both scores are from the same reviewer. The scores were based on a projects from GDOT's Office of Innovative Delivery, the comment cited "project was delivered on time with limited challenges". From GDOT Office of Program Delivery, in a review of evaluations from 2020 projects, the prime received mostly positive comments.</p>			

Reference Check Summary for
RFQ 484-051121 Contract 9
Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services

Questions answered on a 1, 3, 5 scale.

1 = Below Expectations, 3 = Met Expectations, 5 = Exceeded Expectations

	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project.					
Reference 1	3	5	5	5	5
Reference 2	3	5	5	5	5
Reference 3			5	3	5
Reference 4			5	3	5
Reference 5					5
Reference 6					
Reference 7					
Section Average	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.					
Reference 1	3	5	5	3	5
Reference 2	3	3	5	3	5
Reference 3			5	3	5
Reference 4			5	3	5
Reference 5					5
Reference 6					
Reference 7					
Section Average	3.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.					
Reference 1	3	5	3	3	5
Reference 2	3	3	3	3	5
Reference 3			3	3	5
Reference 4			5	3	5
Reference 5					5
Reference 6					
Reference 7					
Section Average	3.00	4.00	3.50	3.00	5.00
4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management.					
Reference 1	5	5	5	3	5
Reference 2	3	3	5	3	5
Reference 3			5	3	5
Reference 4			5	3	5
Reference 5					5
Reference 6					
Reference 7					
Section Average	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.					
Reference 1	5	5	5	3	5
Reference 2	3	5	5	3	5
Reference 3			5	3	5
Reference 4			5	3	5
Reference 5					5
Reference 6					
Reference 7					
Section Average	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	5.00
Overall Average	3.40	4.40	4.70	3.20	5.00

Respondent

< >

06:24
Time to complete

1. Name *

2. Organization *

3. Address *

4. City, State Zip Code *

5. Email Address *

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

 Yes No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

 1 - Did not meet expectations 3 - Met expectations 5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Provided good communication and coordination as part of the Design-Build Team with the contractor to keep a successful project on schedule

Respondent

< >

02:46
Time to complete

1. Name *

Tim Matthews

2. Organization *

GDOT

3. Address *

600 W Peachtree St, NW

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, GA 30308

5. Email Address *

tmatthews@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Was a very challenging project and consultant met expected expectations.

Respondent

< >

01:54
Time to complete

1. Name *

2. Organization *

3. Address *

4. City, State Zip Code *

5. Email Address *

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

ICE exceeded all expectations for this award-winning Design-Build project. They accelerated the schedule and were innovative in their approach to design & erosion control.

Respondent

< >

01:14
Time to complete

1. Name *

2. Organization *

3. Address *

4. City, State Zip Code *

5. Email Address *

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Project was delivered on time with limited challenges.

Respondent

< >

03:00
Time to complete

1. Name *

2. Organization *

3. Address *

4. City, State Zip Code *

5. Email Address *

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

The PM and lead designer's communication with the GDOT far exceeded my expectations. This consultant stays on top of the schedule and informs GDOT PM quickly if issues arise.

Respondent

< >

02:14
Time to complete

1. Name *

Ashley Folmar

2. Organization *

AECOM/GDOT Consultant

3. Address *

1360 Peachtree St NE #500

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, GA 30309

5. Email Address *

afolmar@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

 Yes No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

 1 - Did not meet expectations 3 - Met expectations 5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

This consultant was managed very well by the PM and the design lead. The design lead would inform GDOT PM as soon as any issues arose and beat deadlines whenever possible. Would highly recommend this consultant for future work with GDOT.

Respondent

< Anonymous >

08:21
Time to complete

1. Name *

2. Organization *

3. Address *

4. City, State Zip Code *

5. Email Address *

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

 Yes No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

 1 - Did not meet expectations 3 - Met expectations 5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

The consultant has produced quality deliverables that received high scores/rating. The consultant project leader has been a great resource for the GDOT PM to address project activities. Project has needed the schedule to be shifted due to scope changes and environmental impacts that were not a result of consultant performance.

Respondent

< Anonymous >

07:05
Time to complete

1. Name *

Edgardo Aponte

2. Organization *

Gwinnett County Department of Transportation

3. Address *

446 West Crogan Street, Suite 410

4. City, State Zip Code *

Lawrenceville, GA 30046

5. Email Address *

edgardo.aponte@gwinnettcountry.com

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

 Yes No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

 1 - Did not meet expectations 3 - Met expectations 5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Kimley Horn's team provided great design services for the development of construction and right of way plans for this project, which consisted of the widening of Spalding Drive from Winters Chapel Road to SR 140/Holcomb Bridge Road from 2 to four lanes with a center lane from west of River Exchange Drive to SR 140/Holcomb Bridge Road. It also includes the replacement of the existing bridge over Crooked Creek with a new bridge and the replacement of the existing traffic signal located at Winters Chapel Road and River Exchange Drive with new traffic signals. Kevin Ergle, Kimley Horn's project manager, and his team were very responsive in the development of the construction plans for this project. We are very appreciative of all the efforts with the early coordination with our Department of Water Resources and ourselves to discuss alternatives for the staging for the replacement of the existing bridge. We are very pleased with Kimley Horn's work.

Respondent

< Anonymous >

02:31
Time to complete

1. Name *

Helen Hawkins

2. Organization *

AECOM embedded at GDOT OPD

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree St., 25th floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, GA 30308

5. Email Address *

hhawkins@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

although these projects fell behind schedule, the consultant team worked together to resolve issues and submit per the recovery schedule. Consultant PM was proactive and helpful to bridge these projects through various activities.

Respondent

< Anonymous >

05:02
Time to complete

1. Name *

Helen Hawkins

2. Organization *

AECOM embedded into GDOT OPD

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree St, 25th floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, GA 30308

5. Email Address *

hhawkins@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

 Yes No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

 1 - Did not meet expectations 3 - Met expectations 5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Although the projects fell behind schedule due to numerous issues, the consultant created recovery schedules and worked to provide good deliverables to the Department. The consultant PM has worked well with me.

Respondent

< Anonymous

01:32
Time to complete >

1. Name *

Victor Gill

2. Organization *

GDOT Office of Program Delivery

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree Street NW

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, Georgia 30308

5. Email Address *

vgill@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

 Yes No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

 1 - Did not meet expectations 3 - Met expectations 5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Respondent

< >

01:41
Time to complete

1. Name *

2. Organization *

3. Address *

4. City, State Zip Code *

5. Email Address *

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Consultant met deadlines and was responsive when needed.

Respondent

< Anonymous >

01:29
Time to complete

1. Name *

Derrick Cameron

2. Organization *

GDOT - Office of Program Delivery

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree Street, 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, Georgia 30308

5. Email Address *

dcameron@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

 Yes No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

 1 - Did not meet expectations 3 - Met expectations 5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Parsons is extremely knowledgeable of the Departmental processes and procedures. The team was very responsive and managed the project well throughout the preliminary phase.

Respondent

< Anonymous >

01:26
Time to complete

1. Name *

Derrick Cameron

2. Organization *

GDOT - Office of Program Delivery

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree Street, 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, Georgia 30308

5. Email Address *

dcameron@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

 Yes No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

 1 - Did not meet expectations 3 - Met expectations 5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Parsons is extremely knowledgeable of the Departmental processes and procedures. The team was very responsive and managed the project well throughout the preliminary phase.

Respondent

< >

01:11
Time to complete

1. Name *

Derrick Cameron

2. Organization *

GDOT - Office of Program Delivery

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree Street, 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, Georgia 30308

5. Email Address *

dcameron@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Parsons is extremely knowledgeable of the Departmental processes and procedures. The team was very responsive and managed the project well throughout the preliminary phase.

Respondent

< Anonymous >

01:03
Time to complete

1. Name *

Derrick Cameron

2. Organization *

GDOT - Office of Program Delivery

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree Street, 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, Georgia 30308

5. Email Address *

dcameron@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

 Yes No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

 1 - Did not meet expectations 3 - Met expectations 5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Parsons is extremely knowledgeable of the Departmental processes and procedures. The team was very responsive and managed the project well throughout the preliminary phase.

Respondent

< Anonymous >

42:03
Time to complete

1. Name *

Derrick Cameron

2. Organization *

GDOT - Office of Program Delivery

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree Street, 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, Georgia 30308

5. Email Address *

dcameron@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

 Yes No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

 1 - Did not meet expectations 3 - Met expectations 5 - Exceeded expectations

10. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

11. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Parsons is extremely knowledgeable of the Departmental processes and procedures. The team was very responsive and managed the project well throughout the preliminary phase.

An official website of the United States government
[Here's how you know](#)



Search

Parsons Transportation G



Search Results

Saved Searches

Select Domain
Entity Information



All Entity Information

Entity Registrations

Disaster Response Registry

Entity UEI (not registered)

Exclusions

Filter By



Keywords

Classification



Excluded Individual



Excluded Entity



Entity Name

- Parsons Transportation Group Inc. (007979396) ×
- CHB ACQUISITION SERVICES, LLC (037112201) ×
- CONTOUR ENGINEERING, LLC (050433932) ×
- Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc. (926622598) ×
- Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group, LLC (151287633) ×
- SETTIMIO CONSULTING SERVICES INCORPORATED (019784604) ×

DUNS Unique Entity ID

e.g. 123456789 ▼

SAM Unique Entity ID

e.g. HTYR9YJHK65L ▼

CAGE / NCAGE

▼

Federal Organizations ▼

Exclusion Type ▼

Exclusion Program ▼

Location ▼

Dates ▼

Reset



No matches found

We couldn't find a match for your search criteria.

Please try another search or go back to previous results.



[Go Back](#)



[Feedback](#)

[Our Website](#)

[Our Partners](#)

[Policies](#)


[Customer Service](#)



General Services Administration

This is a U.S. General Services Administration Federal Government computer system that is **"FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY."** This system is subject to monitoring. Individuals found performing unauthorized activities are subject to disciplinary action including criminal prosecution.

STATE OF GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
NOTICE OF PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANT QUALIFICATION
 You are qualified to provide Consulting Services to the Department of Transportation for the
 area-classes of work checked below. Notice of qualification is not a notice of selection.

NAME AND ADDRESS	DISPOSITION DATE	EXPIRATION DATE
PARSONS TRANSPORTATION GROUP 3577 Parkway Lane, Building 5, Suite 100, Norcross, GA 30092	January 14, 2021	December 14, 2023
SIGNATURE		
		
1. Transportation Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.01 State Wide Systems Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.02 Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning <input type="checkbox"/> 1.03 Aviation Systems Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.04 Mass and Rapid Transportation Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.05 Alternate System and Corridor Location Planning <input type="checkbox"/> 1.06 Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06a NEPA Documentation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06b History <input type="checkbox"/> 1.06c Air Studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06d Noise Studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06e Ecology <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06f Archaeology <input type="checkbox"/> 1.06g Freshwater Aquatic Surveys <input type="checkbox"/> 1.06h Bat Surveys <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.07 Attitude, Opinion and Community Value Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 1.08 Airport Master Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.09 Location Studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.10 Traffic Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 1.11 Traffic and Toll Revenue Studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.12 Major Investment Studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.13 Non-Motorized Transportation Planning	3 Highway Design Roadway (continued) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.09 Traffic Control System Analysis, Design and Implementation <input type="checkbox"/> 3.10 Utility Coordination <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.11 Architecture <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.12 Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.13 Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians <input type="checkbox"/> 3.14 Historic Rehabilitation <input type="checkbox"/> 3.15 Highway Lighting <input type="checkbox"/> 3.16 Value Engineering <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.17 Design of Toll Facilities Infrastructure	
2 Mass Transit Operations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.01 Mass Transit Program (Systems) Management <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.02 Mass Transit Feasibility and Technical Studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.03 Mass Transit Vehicle and Propulsion System <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.04 Mass Transit Controls, Communications and Information Systems <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.05 Mass Transit Architectural Engineering <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.06 Mass Transit Unique Structures <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.07 Mass Transit Electrical and Mechanical Systems <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.08 Mass Transit Operations Management and Support Services <input type="checkbox"/> 2.09 Aviation <input type="checkbox"/> 2.10 Mass Transit Program (Systems) Marketing	4 Highway Structures <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.01a Minor Bridges Design <input type="checkbox"/> 4.01b Minor Bridges Design CONDITIONAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.02 Major Bridges Design <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.03 Movable Span Bridges Design <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.04 Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges) <input type="checkbox"/> 4.05 Bridge Inspection	
3 Highway Design Roadway <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.01 Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Rural Generally Free Access Highway Design <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.02 Two-Lane or multi-Lane with Curb and Gutter Generally Free Access Highways Design Including Storm Sewers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.03 Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Widening and Reconstruction, with Curb and Gutter and Storm Sewers in Heavily Developed Commercial Industrial and Residential Urban Areas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.04 Multi-Lane, Limited Access Expressway Type Highway Design <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.05 Design of Urban Expressway and Interstate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.06 Traffic Operations Studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.07 Traffic Operations Design <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.08 Landscape Architecture	5. Topography <input type="checkbox"/> 5.01 Land Surveying <input type="checkbox"/> 5.02 Engineering Surveying <input type="checkbox"/> 5.03 Geodetic Surveying <input type="checkbox"/> 5.04 Aerial Photography <input type="checkbox"/> 5.04a Aerial Photography/Conventional Aircraft <input type="checkbox"/> 5.04b Aerial Photography Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Concept Grade <input type="checkbox"/> 5.04b Aerial Photography Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Design Grade <input type="checkbox"/> 5.05 Aerial Photogrammetry <input type="checkbox"/> 5.06 Topographic Remote Sensing <input type="checkbox"/> 5.06a Topographic Remote Sensing (LIDAR) (Conventional Aircraft, Terrestrial Sensors and Mobile Vehicle, Boat, or Rail Units) (Design Grade) <input type="checkbox"/> 5.06b Topographic Remote Sensing (Unmanned Aircraft Systems LIDAR) (Design Grade) <input type="checkbox"/> 5.06c Topographic Remote Sensing (Unmanned Aircraft Systems LIDAR) (Concept Grade) <input type="checkbox"/> 5.06d Topographic Remote Sensing (SONAR) <input type="checkbox"/> 5.06e Topographic Remote Sensing Thermal and Infrared <input type="checkbox"/> 5.07 Cartography <input type="checkbox"/> 5.08 Subsurface Utility Engineering	
	6. Soils, Foundation & Materials Testing <input type="checkbox"/> 6.01a Soil Surveys <input type="checkbox"/> 6.01b Geological and Geophysical Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 6.02 Bridge Foundation Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 6.03 Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Soils and Foundation) <input type="checkbox"/> 6.04a Laboratory Materials Testing <input type="checkbox"/> 6.04b Field Testing of Roadway Construction Materials <input type="checkbox"/> 6.05 Hazard Waste Site Assessment Studies	
	8. Construction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8.01 Construction Supervision	
	9. Erosion and Sedimentation Control <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9.01 Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control and Comprehensive Monitoring Program <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9.02 Rainfall and Runoff Reporting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9.03 Field Inspections for Compliance of Erosion and Sedimentation Control Devices Installations	