

# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE OF GEORGIA

## INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

October 31, 2014

**RFQ #:** 484-090314  
**RFQ Title:** Environmental Services Contracts, Districts 1 & 2, Districts 3, 4 & 5 and Districts 6 & 7  
**FROM:** Darlene Parker, Transportation Services Procurement Manager  
**TO:** Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator  
**SUBJECT: 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
- 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
- Prequalification Certificate for Intended Awardee

There were three contracts awarded for this solicitation. This approval is for Contract 2 for Districts 3, 4 and 5. The five (5) highest firms in order of ranking are as follows:


1. **Mulkey Engineers & Consultants**
2. **HNTB Corporation**
3. **GT Hill Planners Corporation**
4. **Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.**
5. **AECOM Technical Services, Inc.**

The Selection Committee recommends the selection of the top ranked firm, Mulkey Engineers & Consultants was selected for Contract 2, Districts 3, 4 and 5.

Concurrence with Award from Responsible Division Director:

Certification Procurement Requirements Met:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Glenn Bowman, Director of Engineering**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator**

DJP:kcm

Attachments



# **Georgia Department of Transportation**

## **Request for Qualifications**

**To Provide**

**Environmental Services Contracts,  
Districts 1&2, Districts 3,4&5, Districts 6&7.**

**RFQ-484-090314**

**Qualifications Due: September 3, 2014**

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

# REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

484-090314

Environmental Services Contracts, Districts 1&2, Districts 3,4&5, Districts 6&7

## I. General Project Information

### A. Overview

The Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) is soliciting Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) from qualified firm(s) or organization(s) to provide Consultant Services for Environmental Services

This Request for Qualifications (RFQ) seeks to identify potential providers for the Scope of Services for each project/contract listed in Exhibit I. Firms that respond to this RFQ, and are determined by GDOT to be sufficiently qualified, may be deemed eligible, and invited to offer proposals 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 Consultant Plan Proposals, 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 15% 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, 7<sup>th</sup> 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 Environmental Services, for the GDOT Project identified. The anticipated scope of work for the project/contract is included in **Exhibit I**.

### E. Contract Term and Type

GDOT anticipates three (3) On-Call Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity contract(s) to be awarded to (3) firms, for each project/contract identified. GDOT anticipates that the Contract Type will be paid via Firm Fixed Price and/or Cost Plus Fixed Fee methodology. As an On-Call Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity contract(s), it is the Department's intention that the Agreements will remain in effect for up to a maximum of five (5) years.

The Department will only consider an extension beyond five (5) years in the event that a specific task order will not be completed within the original term of the Agreement, if determined to be in the Department's best interests. The Department will monitor task orders closely and will seek to only assign task orders which can be completed within the term of the Agreement.

**F. Contract Amount**

The On-Call, Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity contract(s) will have a minimum of \$25,000.00 and a maximum of \$5,000,000.00. The Department will only consider increasing the maximum amount in the event that services are needed while the successor contract is being procured, however; the Department will seek to ensure that the successor contract is in place to prevent such need.

**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-484-090314. 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 - Suitability** response.

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

GDOT will request a written proposal of the three (3) to five (5) finalist firms for each 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 proposal due date. Any additional detailed proposal 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 written proposal (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 <b>RFQ -484- 090314</b>	8/4/2014	-----
b. Deadline for submission of written questions and requests for clarification	8/18/2014	2:00 PM
c. Deadline for submission of Statements of Qualifications	9/3/2014	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.B.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:**

- Project Manager education, registration, relevant engineering experience, relevant project management experience, experience in utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance.
- Key Team Leaders’ education, registration, relevant technical experience, and relevant experience in utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance.
- Prime Consultant’s experience for the previous five (5) years 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:**

- Project Manager Workload.
- Workload capacity of Key Team Leader(s).
- Resources dedicated to delivering project.
- 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**):

- Technical approach to delivering various environmental studies on projects per the GDOT Plan Development Process.
- Provide any specific qualifications, skills, or knowledge which your firm has which could benefit projects, 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 submittal must have a separate cover page for each copy of each submittal 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, Count(ies), and Description.

**A. 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.**

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**.

**B. 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 (no more than five (5) projects).
  - 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 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, 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 (on no more than three (3) 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 resource area.

**This information is limited to one page maximum for each Key Team Leader identified in Section 7 of each Exhibit I. Respondents submitting more than one page for each Key Team Leader identified will be subject to disqualification.**

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 for the previous five (5) years. Describe no more than five (5) projects, in order of most relevant to least relevant, 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 and telephone numbers.
- f. Involvement of Key Team Leaders on the projects.

**This information is limited to two 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 subconsultants, who are considered team members. Prime Consultants and their subconsultant team members must meet the Area Class requirements listed in Exhibit I 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 subconsultants 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.**

**C. 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.
  - 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.
  - c. Narrative on Additional Resource Areas and Ability – Respondents are also allowed one page 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** (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 additional page allowed, 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**, 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, one page of text (for the Primary Office and Narrative on Ability discussion), 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 the 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, Count(ies), and Description.

**A. Technical Approach**

Provide any unique technical approaches your firm offers relative to addressing anticipated environmental services or related issues, laws & regulations, environmental procedures, use of any alternative methods of

delivery, and management of projects per the Plan Development Process in order to meet baseline schedules. Identify any unique challenges of the environmental process and how your firm intends to mitigate these challenges, including quality control and quality assurance procedures. Provide any specific qualifications, skills, knowledge of the environmental process which may uniquely benefit the firm and projects.

**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 are two (2) submittals required. Submittal #1 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**. Respondents must submit one original and five identical copies. Submittal #2 is an electronic version of Submittal #1 which allows for GDOT to maintain the files electronically. The original and each copy of Submittal #1 should be stapled separately. The original and each copy of Submittal #1 should be bound together using a binder clip or other similar fashion which allows the individual copies to be separated and distributed easily to Selection Committee Members. 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 and should be double-sided 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. For example, a piece of paper which has print on both sides, shall be considered two pages while a piece of paper with print on only one side would be considered a single page. Each Statement of Qualifications shall be prepared simply and economically as indicated above. Fancy bindings, 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 must be sealed in an opaque envelope or box, and reference **RFQ 484- 090314 and the words "STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS"** must be clearly indicated on the outside of all of the envelopes or boxes. Statements of Qualifications **must be physically received by GDOT** prior to the deadline indicated in the Schedule of Events (*Section III of RFQ*) at the exact address below:

Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT)  
Attention: Karen Mims  
Transportation Services Procurement  
One Georgia Center, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
600 West Peachtree Street, NW  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

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

Statements of Qualifications 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.

**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: **Karen Mims, e-mail: [kmims@dot.ga.gov](mailto:kmims@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.**

- A. There are two (2) submittals required. Submittal #1 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**. Respondents must submit one original and five identical copies. Submittal #2 is an electronic version of Submittal #1 which allows for GDOT to maintain the files electronically. The original and each copy of Submittal #1 should be stapled separately. The original and each copy of Submittal #1 should be bound together using a binder clip or other similar fashion which allows the individual copies to be separated and distributed easily to Selection Committee Members.
- 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 and should be double-sided 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. For example, a piece of paper which has print on both sides, shall be considered two pages while a piece of paper with print on only one side would be considered a single page. Each Statement of Qualifications shall be prepared simply and economically as indicated above. Fancy bindings, 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.**

- C. Submittals must be sealed in an opaque envelope or box, and reference **RFQ 484- 090314 and the words "PHASE II RESPONSE"** must be clearly indicated on the outside of all of the envelopes or boxes. Statements of Qualifications **must be physically received by GDOT** prior to the deadline indicated in the Notice to Finalists at the exact address below:

Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT)  
Attention: Karen Mims  
Transportation Services Procurement  
One Georgia Center, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
600 West Peachtree Street, NW  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

**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: **Karen Mims, e-mail: [kmims@dot.ga.gov](mailto:kmims@dot.ga.gov), or as directed in the Notice to Finalists, if different.** The deadlines for submission of questions relating to the Phase II Response will be identified in the Notice to 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.

**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 15% 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, 7<sup>th</sup> 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 subconsultant **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 1<sup>st</sup> 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**

**Project/Contracts**

- 1. **Project Number(s):** N/A
  - 2. **PI Number(s):** N/A
  - 3. **County(ies):** **Statewide – Districts 1&2, Districts 3, 4 & 5, Districts 6 & 7**
  - 4. **Description:** Under the terms of the resulting Agreement the selected Consultant will provide environmental services in support of the preparation of environmental studies, reports and documents for the Department under limited supervision. The selected consultant will also perform work that includes, but is not limited to, compiling the results of environmental studies into documents that are compliant the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or the Georgia Environmental Policy Act (GEPA).
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
1.06(a)	NEPA

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 Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
3.08	Landscape Architecture Design
3.14	Historic Rehabilitation

6. **Scope:**

The Consultant shall provide:

Environmental Services in support of the preparation of environmental studies, reports and documents for the Department under limited supervision and on an "On Call" basis. The Scope of Services for the various Task Orders

that would be issued under this Master Contract may include, but are not limited to the following items:

- A. Provide environmental studies (to include mitigation, if applicable) that shall include, but are not limited to conducting studies and preparing reports in compliance with:
1. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.
  2. The Archaeological Resources Protection Act.
  3. The Native American Graves Protection & Repatriation Act.
  4. The Georgia Abandoned Cemetery & Burial Grounds Act.
  5. Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.
  6. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act.
  7. The Clean Water Act.
  8. The Fish & Wildlife Coordination Act.
  9. The Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Act.
  10. Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice).
  11. Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain).
  12. Executive Order 13112 (Invasive Species).
  13. 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 772.
  14. The Clean Air Act Amendments.
  15. Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Act.
  16. Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act.
- B. Compile the results of environmental studies into a document compliant with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Georgia Department of Transportation Environmental Procedures Manual, the Georgia Department of Transportation Plan Development Process, 23 CFR 771, and/or the Georgia Environmental Policy Act (GEPA). The scope of services also encompasses research that is customarily performed by NEPA analysts—including but not limited to the evaluation of indirect and cumulative impacts, community and environmental justice impacts, floodplain encroachments, and, if necessary, Section 4(f) impacts and avoidance alternatives. The selected consultant may also conduct quality assurance reviews of NEPA or GEPA documents.
- C. Plan and conduct public outreach initiatives. Prepare written documents, such as outreach plans, comment response letters, and summary reports, in support of public outreach activities.
- D. Provide all personnel, equipment, materials, and transportation required to perform these studies.
- E. Document and submit findings in a manner that is approved by GDOT.
- F. Maintain a complete project file including, but not limited to, field notes, draft and approved reports and documents, transmittals, correspondence, e-mails, meeting notes, permits, and variances.
- G. Coordinate with appropriate GDOT offices, state and federal agencies.
- H. Maintain project schedule as directed by the GDOT Project Manager and/or by the OES.
- I. Maintain current project status in GDOT project management databases (i.e., TPRO, P6).
- J. Post approved reports and documents on GDOT server in the "OEL Work products" folder.
- K. Provide Quality Control/Quality Assurance (QC/QA) during contract and on individual documents.
- L. Provide other professional services as identified by GDOT related to the support of environmental services.

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

**7. Related Key Team Leaders:**

- A. NEPA Lead.
- B. Public Involvement Lead.
- C. Cultural Resources Lead.
- D. Ecology Lead.
- E. Air/Noise Lead.

**“REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK”**

**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 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

GEORGIA SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION COMPLIANCE ACT AFFIDAVIT

Contracting Entity/Respondent: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Solicitation No./Contract No. : **RFQ-484-090314**

Solicitation/Contract Name: **Environmental Services Contracts, Districts 1&2, Districts 3,4&5, Districts 6&7**

By executing this affidavit, the undersigned person or entity verifies its compliance with O.C.G.A. § 13-10-91, stating affirmatively that the individual, firm, or entity which is contracting with the Georgia Department of Transportation has registered with, is authorized to participate in, and is participating in 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.

The undersigned person or entity further agrees that it will continue to use the federal work authorization program throughout the contract period, and it will contract for the physical performance of services in satisfaction of such contract only with subcontractors who present an affidavit to the undersigned with the information required by O.C.G.A. § 13-10-91(b).

The undersigned person or entity further agrees to maintain records of such compliance and provide a copy of each such verification to the Georgia Department of Transportation within five (5) business days after any subcontractor is retained to perform such service.

\_\_\_\_\_  
E-Verify/Company Identification Number

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Authorization

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Authorized Officer or Agent  
(Contractor Name)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title of Authorized Officer or Agent of Consultant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Authorized Officer or Agent

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN  
BEFORE ME ON THIS THE

\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 201\_\_

[NOTARY SEAL]

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

My Commission Expires: \_\_\_\_\_



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	Aerial Photography								
5.05	Photogrammetry								
5.06	Topographic Remote Sensing								
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 Engineering Projects

	# of Pages Allowed
Cover Page	-> 1
<b>A. Administrative Requirements</b>	
1. Basic Company Information	
a. Company name	
b. Company Headquarter Address	
c. Contact Information	Excluded
d. Company Website	
e. Georgia Addresses	
f. Staff	
g. Ownership	
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)
<b>B. Experience and Qualifications</b>	
1. Project Manager	
a. Education	
b. Registration	
c. Relevant engineering experience	2
d. Relevant project management experience	
e. Relevant experience using GDOT specific processes, etc.	
2. Key Team Leader Experience	
a. Education	
b. Registration	
c. Relevant experience in applicable resource area	1 (each)
d. Relevant experience using GDOT specific processes, etc.	
3. Prime's Experience	
a. Client name, project location, and dates	
b. Description of overall project and services performed	2
c. Duration of project services provided	
d. Experience using GDOT specific processes, etc.	
e. Clients current contact information	
f. Involvement of Key Team Leaders	
4. Area Class Table and Notice of Professional Consultant Qualifications for Prime and Sub-Consultants	-> Excluded
<b>C. Resources/Workload Capacity</b>	
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

**ADDENDUM NO. 1**

**ISSUE DATE: August 15, 2014, 2014**

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

**RFQ-484-090314: Environmental Services, Contracts; Districts 1 & 2, Districts 3, 4 & 5, Districts 6 & 7**

**NOTE PLEASE REVIEW CAREFULLY! THERE ARE CHANGES TO THE INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED. FAILURE TO ADHERE TO THE 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: Changes are being made to Exhibit I in the RFQ, as altered in this Addendum, signed acknowledgment of this addendum (this page) MUST be attached to your PROPOSAL.**

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  
 19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 Atlanta, Georgia 30308

This Addendum, including all articles and corrections listed below, shall become and form a part of the original RFQ package and shall be taken into account in preparing your proposal.

**I. Written Questions and Answers:**

	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Answers</b>
1.	Please confirm that consultants are to submit one statement of qualifications that encompasses qualifications to perform environmental services for any of the three district contracts listed in the RFQ, rather than three separate statement of qualifications.	There will be a separate submittal of the statement of qualifications for <b>each group of Districts</b> . There will be three different contracts issued: Districts 1 & 2; Districts 3, 4 & 5; and Districts 6 & 7. Please note on the cover of each submittal the Districts in which you would like to be considered. Please see the attached modified Exhibits 1-1, 1-2 and 1-3.

**II. RFQ Exhibits I is DELETED and REPLACED by the attached Exhibits I-1 through I-3.**

**EXHIBIT I-I**

**Districts 1 & 2, Project/Contracts**

- 1. **Project Number(s):** N/A
- 2. **PI Number(s):** N/A
- 3. **Counties:** Districts 1 & 2 - Gainesville and Tennille:

**The Counties for the Districts can be found at the following link:**

[http://www.dot.ga.gov/informationcenter/maps/Documents/GDOTDistricts\\_CountyFI/PS/GDOTDistrictsMap-CountyFIPS.pdf](http://www.dot.ga.gov/informationcenter/maps/Documents/GDOTDistricts_CountyFI/PS/GDOTDistrictsMap-CountyFIPS.pdf)

- 4. **Description:** Under the terms of the resulting Agreement the selected Consultant will provide environmental services in support of the preparation of environmental studies, reports and documents for the Department under limited supervision. The selected consultant will also perform work that includes, but is not limited to, compiling the results of environmental studies into documents that are compliant the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or the Georgia Environmental Policy Act (GEPA).

**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
1.06(a)	NEPA

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 Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
3.08	Landscape Architecture Design
3.14	Historic Rehabilitation

## 6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide:

Environmental Services in support of the preparation of environmental studies, reports and documents for the Department under limited supervision and on an "On Call" basis. The Scope of Services for the various Task Orders that would be issued under this Master Contract may include, but are not limited to the following items:

- A. Provide environmental studies (to include mitigation, if applicable) that shall include, but are not limited to conducting studies and preparing reports in compliance with:
  1. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.
  2. The Archaeological Resources Protection Act.
  3. The Native American Graves Protection & Repatriation Act.
  4. The Georgia Abandoned Cemetery & Burial Grounds Act.
  5. Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.
  6. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act.
  7. The Clean Water Act.
  8. The Fish & Wildlife Coordination Act.
  9. The Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Act.
  10. Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice).
  11. Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain).
  12. Executive Order 13112 (Invasive Species).
  13. 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 772.
  14. The Clean Air Act Amendments.
  15. Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Act.
  16. Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act.
- B. Compile the results of environmental studies into a document compliant with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Georgia Department of Transportation Environmental Procedures Manual, the Georgia Department of Transportation Plan Development Process, 23 CFR 771, and/or the Georgia Environmental Policy Act (GEPA). The scope of services also encompasses research that is customarily performed by NEPA analysts—including but not limited to the evaluation of indirect and cumulative impacts, community and environmental justice impacts, floodplain encroachments, and, if necessary, Section 4(f) impacts and avoidance alternatives. The selected consultant may also conduct quality assurance reviews of NEPA or GEPA documents.
- C. Plan and conduct public outreach initiatives. Prepare written documents, such as outreach plans, comment response letters, and summary reports, in support of public outreach activities.
- D. Provide all personnel, equipment, materials, and transportation required to perform these studies.
- E. Document and submit findings in a manner that is approved by GDOT.
- F. Maintain a complete project file including, but not limited to, field notes, draft and approved reports and documents, transmittals, correspondence, e-mails, meeting notes, permits, and variances.
- G. Coordinate with appropriate GDOT offices, state and federal agencies.
- H. Maintain project schedule as directed by the GDOT Project Manager and/or by the OES.
- I. Maintain current project status in GDOT project management databases (i.e., TPRO, P6).
- J. Post approved reports and documents on GDOT server in the "OEL Work products" folder.
- K. Provide Quality Control/Quality Assurance (QC/QA) during contract and on individual documents.
- L. Provide other professional services as identified by GDOT related to the support of environmental services.

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

**7. Related Key Team Leaders:**

- A. NEPA Lead.
- B. Public Involvement Lead.
- C. Cultural Resources Lead.
- D. Ecology Lead.
- E. Air/Noise Lead.

**EXHIBIT I-2**

**Districts 3, 4 & 5, Project/Contracts**

- 1. **Project Number(s):** N/A
- 2. **PI Number(s):** N/A
- 3. **Counties:** Districts 3, 4 & 5 - Thomaston, Tifton, and Jesup:

The Counties for the Districts can be found at the following link:

[http://www.dot.ga.gov/informationcenter/maps/Documents/GDOTDistricts\\_CountyFI/PS/GDOTDistrictsMap-CountyFIPS.pdf](http://www.dot.ga.gov/informationcenter/maps/Documents/GDOTDistricts_CountyFI/PS/GDOTDistrictsMap-CountyFIPS.pdf)

- 4. **Description:** Under the terms of the resulting Agreement the selected Consultant will provide environmental services in support of the preparation of environmental studies, reports and documents for the Department under limited supervision. The selected consultant will also perform work that includes, but is not limited to, compiling the results of environmental studies into documents that are compliant the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or the Georgia Environmental Policy Act (GEPA).

**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
1.06(a)	NEPA

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 Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
3.08	Landscape Architecture Design
3.14	Historic Rehabilitation

**6. Scope:**

The Consultant shall provide:

Environmental Services in support of the preparation of environmental studies, reports and documents for the Department under limited supervision and on an "On Call" basis. The Scope of Services for the various Task Orders that would be issued under this Master Contract may include, but are not limited to the following items:

- A. Provide environmental studies (to include mitigation, if applicable) that shall include, but are not limited to conducting studies and preparing reports in compliance with:
1. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.
  2. The Archaeological Resources Protection Act.
  3. The Native American Graves Protection & Repatriation Act.
  4. The Georgia Abandoned Cemetery & Burial Grounds Act.
  5. Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.
  6. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act.
  7. The Clean Water Act.
  8. The Fish & Wildlife Coordination Act.
  9. The Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Act.
  10. Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice).
  11. Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain).
  12. Executive Order 13112 (Invasive Species).
  13. 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 772.
  14. The Clean Air Act Amendments.
  15. Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Act.
  16. Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act.
- B. Compile the results of environmental studies into a document compliant with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Georgia Department of Transportation Environmental Procedures Manual, the Georgia Department of Transportation Plan Development Process, 23 CFR 771, and/or the Georgia Environmental Policy Act (GEPA). The scope of services also encompasses research that is customarily performed by NEPA analysts—including but not limited to the evaluation of indirect and cumulative impacts, community and environmental justice impacts, floodplain encroachments, and, if necessary, Section 4(f) impacts and avoidance alternatives. The selected consultant may also conduct quality assurance reviews of NEPA or GEPA documents.
- C. Plan and conduct public outreach initiatives. Prepare written documents, such as outreach plans, comment response letters, and summary reports, in support of public outreach activities.

- D. Provide all personnel, equipment, materials, and transportation required to perform these studies.
- E. Document and submit findings in a manner that is approved by GDOT.
- F. Maintain a complete project file including, but not limited to, field notes, draft and approved reports and documents, transmittals, correspondence, e-mails, meeting notes, permits, and variances.
- G. Coordinate with appropriate GDOT offices, state and federal agencies.
- H. Maintain project schedule as directed by the GDOT Project Manager and/or by the OES.
- I. Maintain current project status in GDOT project management databases (i.e., TPRO, P6).
- J. Post approved reports and documents on GDOT server in the "OEL Work products" folder.
- K. Provide Quality Control/Quality Assurance (QC/QA) during contract and on individual documents.
- L. Provide other professional services as identified by GDOT related to the support of environmental services.

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

**7. Related Key Team Leaders:**

- A. NEPA Lead.
- B. Public Involvement Lead.
- C. Cultural Resources Lead.
- D. Ecology Lead.
- E. Air/Noise Lead.

**EXHIBIT I-3**

**Districts 6 & 7, Project/Contracts**

- 1. **Project Number(s):** N/A
- 2. **PI Number(s):** N/A
- 3. **Counties:** Districts 6 & 7 - Cartersville and Chamblee:

**The Counties for the Districts can be found at the following link:**

[http://www.dot.ga.gov/informationcenter/maps/Documents/GDOTDistricts\\_CountyFI/PS/GDOTDistrictsMap-CountyFIPS.pdf](http://www.dot.ga.gov/informationcenter/maps/Documents/GDOTDistricts_CountyFI/PS/GDOTDistrictsMap-CountyFIPS.pdf)

- 4. **Description:** Under the terms of the resulting Agreement the selected Consultant will provide environmental services in support of the preparation of environmental studies, reports and documents for the Department under limited supervision. The selected consultant will also perform work that includes, but is not limited to, compiling the results of environmental studies into documents that are compliant the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or the Georgia Environmental Policy Act (GEPA).

**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
1.06(a)	NEPA

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 Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
3.08	Landscape Architecture Design
3.14	Historic Rehabilitation

**6. Scope:**

The Consultant shall provide:

Environmental Services in support of the preparation of environmental studies, reports and documents for the Department under limited supervision and on an "On Call" basis. The Scope of Services for the various Task Orders that would be issued under this Master Contract may include, but are not limited to the following items:

- A. Provide environmental studies (to include mitigation, if applicable) that shall include, but are not limited to conducting studies and preparing reports in compliance with:
1. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.
  2. The Archaeological Resources Protection Act.
  3. The Native American Graves Protection & Repatriation Act.
  4. The Georgia Abandoned Cemetery & Burial Grounds Act.
  5. Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.
  6. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act.
  7. The Clean Water Act.
  8. The Fish & Wildlife Coordination Act.

9. The Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Act.
  10. Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice).
  11. Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain).
  12. Executive Order 13112 (Invasive Species).
  13. 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 772.
  14. The Clean Air Act Amendments.
  15. Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Act.
  16. Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act.
- B. Compile the results of environmental studies into a document compliant with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Georgia Department of Transportation Environmental Procedures Manual, the Georgia Department of Transportation Plan Development Process, 23 CFR 771, and/or the Georgia Environmental Policy Act (GEPA). The scope of services also encompasses research that is customarily performed by NEPA analysts—including but not limited to the evaluation of indirect and cumulative impacts, community and environmental justice impacts, floodplain encroachments, and, if necessary, Section 4(f) impacts and avoidance alternatives. The selected consultant may also conduct quality assurance reviews of NEPA or GEPA documents.
- C. Plan and conduct public outreach initiatives. Prepare written documents, such as outreach plans, comment response letters, and summary reports, in support of public outreach activities.
- D. Provide all personnel, equipment, materials, and transportation required to perform these studies.
- E. Document and submit findings in a manner that is approved by GDOT.
- F. Maintain a complete project file including, but not limited to, field notes, draft and approved reports and documents, transmittals, correspondence, e-mails, meeting notes, permits, and variances.
- G. Coordinate with appropriate GDOT offices, state and federal agencies.
- H. Maintain project schedule as directed by the GDOT Project Manager and/or by the OES.
- I. Maintain current project status in GDOT project management databases (i.e., TPRO, P6).
- J. Post approved reports and documents on GDOT server in the "OEL Work products" folder.
- K. Provide Quality Control/Quality Assurance (QC/QA) during contract and on individual documents.
- L. Provide other professional services as identified by GDOT related to the support of environmental services.

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

**7. Related Key Team Leaders:**

- A. NEPA Lead.
- B. Public Involvement Lead.
- C. Cultural Resources Lead.
- D. Ecology Lead.
- E. Air/Noise Lead.

## SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST



SOLICITATION #:		RFQ 484-090314								
SOLICITATION TITLE:		Environmental Services Contract 2, Districts 3, 4 & 5								
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:		September 3, 2014								
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	Meets Required Area Classes	Comments
1	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	9/3/2014	1:35 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
2	AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.	9/3/2014	12:22 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
3	CDM Smith Inc	9/3/2014	1:07 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
4	CROY Engineering, LLC	9/3/2014	11:42 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
5	Ecological Solutions	9/3/2014	11:43 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
6	Gresham, Smith and Partners	9/2/2014	2:23 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
7	GT Hill Planners Corporation	8/29/2014	2:57 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
8	HNTB Corporation	9/3/2014	11:33 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
9	HDR Engineering, Inc.	9/3/2014	1:16 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
10	ICA Engineering, Inc.	9/3/2014	1:41 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
11	Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	9/3/2014	1:21 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
12	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	9/3/2014	1:43 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
13	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	9/3/2014	10:19 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
14	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	9/3/2014	11:45 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
15	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	9/3/2014	12:09 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
16	TTL, Inc.	9/3/2014	1:26 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
17	URS Corporation	9/3/2014	11:14 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	

**SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST**

Solicitation #: RFQ 484-090314, Contract 2

Solicitation Title: Environmental Services Contracts, District 3, 4 & 5

Primes and Subconsultants	1.06							1.07	3.08	3.14	Certificate Expires	Comments
	1.06(a)	1.06(b)	1.06(c)	1.06(d)	1.06(e)	1.06(f)	1.06(g)					
<b>1</b> AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	X		X	X	X			X	X		1/31/2015	
Adkins North America, Inc.			X	X	X			X	X		6/30/2017	
Adrian Collaborative, LLC	X										8/31/2017	DBE
GT Hill Planners Corporation	X		X	X	X			X			11/30/2015	DBE
Hecht, Burdeshaw, Johnson, Kidd and Clark, Inc. Architects											7/31/2015	
Ecological Solutions	X				X						2/29/2016	
<b>2</b> AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.	X		X	X	X			X	X		10/31/2015	
Edwards-Pieman Environmental, Inc.	X		X	X	X			X	X		5/31/2017	DBE
Ecological Solutions	X				X						12/31/2015	DBE
<b>3</b> CDM Smith Inc	X		X	X	X			X			2/28/2015	
Edwards-Pieman Environmental, Inc.	X		X	X	X			X			5/31/2017	DBE
New South Associates, Inc.			X								5/31/2017	DBE
Adrian Collaborative, LLC	X							X			8/31/2017	DBE
AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.	X		X	X	X			X	X		10/31/2015	
Ecological Solutions	X				X						2/29/2016	
Sycamore Consulting, Inc.											8/31/2017	DBE
<b>4</b> CROY Engineering, LLC	X							X			7/31/2017	
New South Associates, Inc.			X					X			5/31/2017	DBE
River to Tap - R21, Inc.			X								7/31/2016	DBE
Ecological Solutions	X				X			X			2/29/2016	
Sycamore Consulting, Inc.											8/31/2017	DBE
Tumelt-Spangler-Walsh & Associates, Inc.								X	X		6/30/2015	
<b>5</b> Ecological Solutions	X				X			X			2/29/2016	
Adrian Collaborative, LLC	X		X		X			X			8/31/2017	DBE
GT Hill Planners Corporation	X		X	X	X			X			11/30/2015	DBE
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	X		X		X			X			7/31/2015	DBE
River to Tap - R21, Inc.			X		X						7/30/2016	DBe
Southeastern Ecological and Environmental Services, LLC					X			X			10/31/2015	
AEC, Inc.								X			4/30/2016	
New South Associates, Inc.			X					X			5/31/2017	DBE
Morland Allobell Associates, Inc.	X		X	X	X			X	X		5/31/2015	
CROY Engineering, LLC	X							X			7/31/2017	
URS Corporation	X		X	X	X			X	X		6/30/2015	
<b>6</b> Gresham, Smith and Partners	X				X			X			8/31/2017	
American Consulting Professionals LLC	X		X	X	X						3/31/2017	
GT Hill Planners Corporation	X		X	X	X			X			11/30/2015	DBE
CCR Environmental, Inc.					X						7/31/2017	
Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc.			X					X			3/31/2017	
Morland Allobell Associates, Inc.	X		X	X	X			X	X		5/31/2015	
ECO-Tech Consultants, Inc.					X						8/31/2017	
<b>7</b> GT Hill Planners Corporation	X		X	X	X			X			11/30/2015	DBE
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	X		X	X	X			X	X		5/31/2016	
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	X		X	X	X			X	X		9/30/2015	
Gresham, Smith and Partners	X				X			X	X		8/31/2017	
URS Corporation	X		X	X	X			X	X		6/30/2015	
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	X		X		X			X			3/31/2017	
Brookington and Associates	X		X		X			X			7/31/2015	DBE
Ecological Solutions	X				X						2/29/2016	
CCR Environmental, Inc.					X			X			7/31/2017	
Sycamore Consulting, Inc.								X			8/31/2017	DBE
Morland Allobell Associates, Inc.	X		X	X	X			X	X		5/31/2015	
Pond & Company								X	X		12/31/2014	
W. K. Dickson & Company, Inc.	X							X			11/30/2014	

**SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST**

Solicitation #: RFQ 484-090314, Contract 2												
Solicitation Title: Environmental Services Contracts, District 3, 4 & 5												
<b>8 HNTB Corporation</b>												
Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/31/2015
STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	6/30/2016
AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10/31/2015
Copperhead Consulting												DBE
<b>9 HDR Engineering, Inc.</b>												
HDR Engineering, Inc.	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7/31/2017
Adrian Collaborative, LLC												8/31/2017 DBE
Corbu Ecology Group, LLC												2/28/2017
ECC-Tech Consultants, Inc.												8/31/2017
Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/31/2015
ForeSite Group, Inc.												11/30/2015 DBE
GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/31/2017 DBE
New South Associates, Inc.												12/31/2014
Pond & Company												10/31/2015
Southeastern Ecological and Environmental Services, LLC												12/31/2015
Southern Research Historic Preservation Consultant, Inc.												12/31/2015
<b>10 IGA Engineering, Inc.</b>												
Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	11/30/2014
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/31/2017 DBE
UW Robinson & Associates, Inc.												7/31/2015 DBE
Roots Design Studio, LLC												3/31/2015
<b>11 Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.</b>												
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/31/2016
Anna Morris and Associates, LLC												12/31/2016 DBE
CCR Environmental, Inc.												7/31/2017
Corbu (formerly Welland & Ecological Consultants												2/28/2015
ECC-Tech Consultants, Inc.												8/31/2017
GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	11/30/2015 DBE
Hecht, Burdeshaw, Johnson, Kidd and Clark, Inc. Architects												7/31/2015
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	3/31/2017
New South Associates, Inc.												9/31/2017 DBE
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (P/KB/PA Americas, Inc.)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	12/31/2014
Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	12/31/2015 DBE
Southern Research Historic Preservation Consultant, Inc.												12/31/2015
<b>12 Kennedy Engineering &amp; Associates Group LLC</b>												
AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7/31/2015 DBE
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10/31/2015
Brookington and Associates												3/31/2017 DBE
Ecological Solutions	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7/31/2015 DBE
Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	2/28/2016
Michael Baker Jr. Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/31/2017 DBE
New South Associates, Inc.												1/31/2015
Roots Design Studio, LLC												5/31/2015
Southeastern Ecological and Environmental Services, LLC												4/30/2015
Southern Research Historic Preservation Consultant, Inc.												10/31/2015
Volkert, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	12/31/2015
<b>13 Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (P/KB/PA Americas, Inc.)</b>												
GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	3/31/2017
Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	11/30/2015 DBE
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/31/2017 DBE
CCR Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/31/2016
Lord, Aeck & Sargent, Inc.												7/31/2017
New South Associates, Inc.												3/31/2017
ECC-Tech Consultants, Inc.												5/31/2017 DBE
												8/31/2017
<b>14 Mulkey Engineers &amp; Consultants</b>												
CCR Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	12/31/2014
Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7/31/2017 DBE
GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/31/2017 DBE
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	11/30/2015 DBE
Lord, Aeck & Sargent, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/31/2016
Sycamore Consulting, Inc.												3/31/2017
Third Rock Consultants, LLC												8/31/2017 DBE



# GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

## RFQ 484-090314, Contract 2

### Environmental Services Contracts, Districts 3, 4 & 5

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

#### **Coordination and Communication**

Karen Mims 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, 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**

- **PM, Key Team Leader(s), and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – (20% or 200 Points)**
- **PM, 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 Monday, September 15, 2014. 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. The Selection Committee will also be allowed to bring any information for consideration they have available regarding the Firm's performance on any project/contract.

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 Thursday, October 09, 2014.** 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:	<i>Environmental Services Contract 2, Districts 3, 4 &amp; 5</i>	1	HNTB Corporation		
Solicitation #:	<i>RFQ 484-090314</i>	2	GT Hill Planners Corporation		
PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Preliminary Scoring based on Published Criteria		3	Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.		
<b>(This Page For GDOT Use)</b>		4	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants		
		5	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.		
		6	Gresham, Smith and Partners		
		7	HDR Engineering, Inc.		
		8	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)		
SUBMITTING FIRMS	<b>(RANKING)</b>		9	CDM Smith Inc	
	Sum of	Group	10	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	
	Individual	Rankings	Ranking	11	Ecological Solutions
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	14	5	11	12	AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.
AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.	30	12	12	12	CROY Engineering, LLC
CDM Smith Inc	23	9	12	12	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.
CROY Engineering, LLC	30	12	12	12	URS Corporation
Ecological Solutions	25	11	12	16	TTL, Inc.
Gresham, Smith and Partners	18	6	16	17	ICA Engineering, Inc.
GT Hill Planners Corporation	6	2	17		
HNTB Corporation	3	1			
HDR Engineering, Inc.	21	7			
ICA Engineering, Inc.	44	17			
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	6	3			
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	23	10			
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	22	8			
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	8	4			
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	30	12			
TTL, Inc.	41	16			
URS Corporation	30	12			

Evaluation Criteria →

Experience and Qualifications

Resources availability and Workload Capacity

# Evaluator 1

<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>Phase One Evaluator 1 Individual</b>	
<b>SUBMITTING FIRMS</b>	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
CDM Smith Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
CROY Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Ecological Solutions	Adequate	Marginal	175	16
Gresham, Smith and Partners	Adequate	Good	325	6
GT Hill Planners Corporation	Good	Good	375	1
HNTB Corporation	Good	Good	375	1
HDR Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
ICA Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Marginal	175	16
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Good	Good	375	1
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
TTL, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
URS Corporation	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>%</b>



GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-090314- Environmental Services Contracts, Contract 2, Districts 3, 4 & 5	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 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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>AECOM Technical Services, Inc.</b>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Good</b>
<i>Comments: Firm has extensive experience; the PM has experience managing similar projects as the subject project. Cultural Resources lead has experience managing both History and Archaeology. All other leads have extensive experience with GDOT policies and procedures.</i>			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Good</b>
<i>Comments: Firm and all technical leads have availability and capacity to complete the subject project.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>AMEC Environment &amp; Infrastructure, Inc.</b>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: Firm and team has limited variability; PM has no experience managing environmental projects; Firm's examples of projects not a good fit to the subject project. Little to no archaeological discussion.</i>			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: Cultural Resource and Ecology leads have limited capacity. Flow Chart was not detailed with respect to firm's resources.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>CDM Smith Inc</b>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: Cultural Resource lead has primary focus on archaeology. PM experience in project managing was not clearly conveyed on duties and responsibilities.</i>			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: Cultural Resource lead has limited availability/capacity in regards to implementing subject project.</i>			

<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>CROY Engineering, LLC</b>	Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating 	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: PM has no experience in managing environmental contracts. Cultural Resource lead has a primary focus on archaeology. Overall team has little variability.</i>				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%		Assigned Rating 	<b>Adequate</b>	
<i>Comments: Flow Chart is not very detailed in regards to the team's resources needed to complete the job. Ecology lead has limited availability/capacity.</i>				
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Ecological Solutions</b>	Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating 	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: Firm's experience in managing full turn key environmental projects is not extensive. Cultural Resource lead has primary archaeology focus.</i>				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%		Assigned Rating 	<b>Marginal</b>	
<i>Comments: PM, NEPA, PI, Ecology, and Cultural Resource leads all have high outside commitments to other projects. Flow Chart makes no mention of team's ability to complete work in Area Classes 3.08 and 3.14.</i>				
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Gresham, Smith and Partners</b>	Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating 	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: PM doesn't have extensive experience managing environmental only contracts similar to the subject project. Project examples provided by the firm aren't a good match to the subject project.</i>				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%		Assigned Rating 	<b>Good</b>	
<i>Comments: Firm and all technical leads have availability and capacity to complete the subject project.</i>				
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>GT Hill Planners Corporation</b>	Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating 	<b>Good</b>
<i>Comments: Firm has extensive experience; the PM has experience managing similar projects as the subject project. Cultural Resources lead has experience managing both History and Archaeology. All other leads have extensive experience with GDOT policies and procedures.</i>				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%		Assigned Rating 	<b>Good</b>	
<i>Comments: Firm and all technical leads have availability and capacity to complete the subject project.</i>				

**Firm Name:** HDR Engineering, Inc.

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

*Comments: Firm and PM have little to no experience managing full turn key environmental contracts. PM and NEPA lead have limited experience working in Georgia and with GDOT policies and procedures.*


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

*Comments: PM and NEPA lead have extensive outside commitments and limited availability/capacity.*

**Firm Name:** HNTB Corporation

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

*Comments: Firm has extensive experience; the PM has experience managing similar projects as the subject project. Cultural Resources lead has experience managing both History and Archaeology. All other leads have extensive experience with GDOT policies and procedures.*

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

*Comments: Firm and all technical leads have availability and capacity to complete the subject project.*

**Firm Name:** ICA Engineering, Inc.

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

*Comments: PM has limited experience managing full turn key environmental contracts. Ecology and Air/Noise leads have limited experience working in Georgia and with GDOT policies and procedures. It wasn't clearly conveyed what the NEPA lead's overall responsibilities were on project examples provided.*

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

*Comments: Team leads all have high outside commitments to other projects. Flow Chart makes no mention of team's ability to complete work in Area Classes 3.08 and 3.14.*

**Firm Name:** Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.

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

*Comments: Firm has extensive experience; the PM has experience managing similar projects as the subject project. Cultural Resources lead has experience managing both History and Archaeology. All other leads have extensive experience with GDOT policies and procedures.*

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

*Comments: Firm and all technical leads have availability and capacity to complete the subject project, although the Air/Noise lead was high.*

<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Kennedy Engineering &amp; Associates Group LLC</b>	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating 	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: It was not clearly conveyed what the exact responsibilities were on project examples presented for the PI lead. The Cultural Resource lead has primary focus on archaeology.</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating 	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: The PM has high outside commitments, while the Cultural Resource lead has limited availability/capacity.</i>		
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Mulkey Engineers &amp; Consultants</b>	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating 	<b>Good</b>
<i>Comments: Firm has extensive experience; the PM has experience managing similar projects as the subject project. Cultural Resources lead has experience managing just History. All other leads have extensive experience with GDOT policies and procedures.</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating 	<b>Good</b>
<i>Comments: Firm and all technical leads have availability and capacity to complete the subject project.</i>		
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)</b>	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating 	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: It was not clear as to exactly what role and responsibility, to include experience, the NEPA lead had based on the project examples given. Cultural Resources lead has primary focus only in History.</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating 	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: The Cultural Resources lead and the Air/Noise lead both have high outside commitments which could affect availability/capacity.</i>		
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Thomas &amp; Hutton Engineering Co.</b>	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating 	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: PM does not have experience managing environmental turn key contracts. Firm's project examples are not a good match to the subject project.</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating 	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: Flow Chart is not very detailed in regards to the team's resources needed to complete the job. PM has limited availability/capacity.</i>		

<b>Firm Name:</b>	TTL, Inc.		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: Not clear what PMs relevant experience is to environmental project management and PM has limited GDOT experience. Firm's project examples not ideal match to the subject project. PI lead experience not focused on lead responsibilities required for subject project.</i>			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: Ecology lead has limited availability/capacity needed for the subject project.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	URS Corporation		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: PI lead has very limited experience working in Georgia and has limited experience working with GDOT policies and procedures. Cultural Resources lead has primary focus on archaeology.</i>			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: Flow Chart is not very detailed in regards to the team's resources needed to complete the job. Cultural Resources and Ecology leads have limited availability/capacity.</i>			

Evaluation Criteria



Experience and Qualifications

Resources availability and Workload Capacity

# Evaluator 2

<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	Phase One	
			Evaluator 2 Individual	
<b>SUBMITTING FIRMS</b>	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	Good	Good	375	2
AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.	Adequate	Marginal	175	12
CDM Smith Inc	Good	Adequate	300	7
CROY Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Marginal	175	12
Ecological Solutions	Good	Good	375	2
Gresham, Smith and Partners	Adequate	Adequate	250	10
GT Hill Planners Corporation	Good	Good	375	2
HNTB Corporation	Excellent	Excellent	500	1
HDR Engineering, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	7
ICA Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Marginal	175	12
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	Good	Good	375	2
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	Good	Adequate	300	7
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	Adequate	Adequate	250	10
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Good	Good	375	2
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	Adequate	Marginal	175	12
TTL, Inc.	Marginal	Marginal	125	17
URS Corporation	Adequate	Marginal	175	12
<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>%</b>




GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-090314- Environmental Services Contracts, Contract 2, Districts 3, 4 & 5	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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>AECOM Technical Services, Inc.</b>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Good</b>
<p>Laura Dawood as PM: strong experience on several large and complex projects; not a huge number of GDOT projects overall, but she is experienced with GDOT EPM, P6, TPRO, etc. Wendy Dyson as NEPA Lead: strong experience on countless GDOT projects of all levels of complexity. Todd Barker as public involvement leader: MA in communications/PR in progress; experience on 25 GDOT projects in NEPA, scheduling, QA/QC, etc; conducted training for GDOT and its consultants; overall, an extremely strong lead. Erin Murphy as Cultural Resources team lead: 9 yrs experience with 106 and NEPA; worked in history and archeo; seems strong. Chris Covington as ecology lead: 9 plus years of experience; expertise in aquatics; not a large number of GDOT projects; Mandy Phillips as Air/Noise lead: 14 plus years experience; much of experience is with ecology and NEPA, but seems to have good A/N background.</p>			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Good</b>
<p>Team includes 5 subs, 3 of which can do ecology, 3 of which can do NEPA, 2 of which can do A/N, 2 of which can do CR. Available staff includes 12 NEPA, 10 public involvement, 6 CR, 14 Eco, 9 A/N. Prime has 36 Env Scientists in GA.</p>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>AMEC Environment &amp; Infrastructure, Inc.</b>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<p>Michael Thomas as PM: lots of GDOT experience but lacks environmental; Tim Nichols as NEPA lead lacks sig experience; 2 of 3 examples were minor projects/CE. Lee Walton as Public involvement lead: strong experience with planning 100s public meetings; however, experience with GDOT is limited; Mark Grindstaff as CR lead: strong and relevant experience; David Smith as ecology lead: strong and relevant experience; Josh Earhart as A/N lead: strong and relevant experience</p>			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Marginal</b>
<p>Team consists only of AMEC, EPEI, and Ecological Solutions. Available staff not listed. Not very deep team.</p>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>CDM Smith Inc</b>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Good</b>
<p>Terri Malone as PM: 27 yrs exp; sig exp with GDOT. Angie Malta as NEPA Team Lead: Exp with 2 previous district nepa contracts as proejct coordinator; good overall and gdot exp. Todd Barker as public involvement team lead: see above. Scot Keith as CR team lead: 18 yrs exp including a good amt for gdot. Brendan Brown as ecology team lead: little GDOT experience, good overall ecology background, but not practicing for very long (grad in '05). Rajit Ramkumar as A/N team lead: good background in a/n (11 years) and on gdot projects (a/n lead for 2 previous district contracts)</p>			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<p>CR team includes 15 specialists and 3 subs; NEPA team includes 12 specialists and 1 sub; Eco team includes 15 specialists and 2 subs; a/n team includes 4 specialists and 1 sub; public inv team includes 5 specialists and 1 sub. Six subs listed. Staff of 9 in atlanta considerably smaller than some other firms. 21 staff within 2 hours who could help on this,</p>			

<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>CROY Engineering, LLC</b>
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating  Adequate

Greg Teague as PM: good engineering experience but env PM experience not demonstrated; gdot experience is good; Melanie Orr as NEPA team lead: strong experience in nepa and with gdot; Leah Vaughn as public inv team lead: good public inv and gdot background but not great. Scot Keith as team lead for CR: see above. David Smith as team lead for eco: see above. Amanda Lester as team lead for a/n: exp with gdot and with a/n but not extensive

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

Five subs listed; very few personnel listed: 2 for CR, 1 for a/n, 2 for eco, 1 for pub inv.

<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Ecological Solutions</b>
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating  Good

Erik Alford as PM: experience mostly as a principal and not in project management; extensive experience with gdot. Todd Barker as NEPA team lead: strong and extensive exp with gdot. Lenor Bromberg as public inv team lead: strong and extensive gdot exp. Scot Keith as CR team lead: see above. David Smith as eco team lead: see above. Pat Smeeton as a/n team lead: managed a/n group at JJG; strong exp with a/n and with medium level of exp with gdot

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

10 subs: 8 nepa, 5 history, 4 archeo, 4 a/n, 5 eco, 6 public inv. Support staff include 24 for nepa, 20 for pub inv, 21 for eco, 9 for a/n, 32 for CR

<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Gresham, Smith and Partners</b>
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating  Adequate

Jeremy Busby as PM: excellent gdot exp but lacks env; Aaron Caldwell as nepa lead: 10 yrs overall exp, good exp with nepa and ecology, good exp with gdot, examples listed were CE - exp with more complex nepa docs not demonstrated. Jamie Cochran as Pub inv lead: substantial exp in pub inv, not sure how much with gdot projects. Erin Murphy as CR team lead: see above. Todd Hill as ecology lead: broad gdot and environmental experience, but not strictly an ecologist or lead SME. Anna Peterfreund as a/n lead: depth of exp in gdot but not strictly an a/n sme.

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

6 subs with 3 nepa, 3 a/n, 5 eco, 2 cr, 2 public inv; in-house employees available include 8 nepa/env, 3 public inv. Team has 12 nepa, 10 pub inv, 12 cr, 8 eco, 8 a/n.

<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>GT Hill Planners Corporation</b>
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating  Good

Todd Hill as PM: substantial and relevant exp in env project managing with gdot. JC as nepa team lead: substantial and relevant exp. Leah Vaughn as pub inv team lead: see above; Erin Murphy as cr team lead: see above; Aaron Caldwell as ecology team lead: good amt of exp and gdot exp but much as nepa. Eric Nicoletti as a/n team lead: 6 yrs of exp with a/n - not as extensive as some others but strong background

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

12 firms listed as subs, with 9 nepa, 6 hist, 3 nepa, 5 a/n, 9 eco, 8 pub inv. Staff listed include 7 nepa, 6 public inv, 6 hist, 4 archeo, 12 eco, 6 a/n.

**Firm Name:** HDR Engineering, Inc.


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

Shannon Meder as PM: good exp (15 yrs) and has worked with transp projects, but very limited exp with gdot (mostly SC). Vickie Miller as NEPA lead: exp in transportation but very limited in GA. Heather Perrin as pub inv team leader: strong and relevant exp. Mark Grindstaff as CR team lead :see above. Steven Busbee as ecology lead: strong background with DOT work in other states but none in GA or with GDOT. Josh Earhart as a/n lead: see above. Prime Experience: good exp in SC handling DOT projects both major and minor.

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

4 subs. 3 firms can do nepa, 1 history, 3 air, 2 noise, 5 eco, 2 archeo, 2 public inv. Staff listed include 12 eco, 7 cr, 5 a/n, 7 nepa, 4 pub inv.EPEI listed as major partner with Susan Thomas as deputy PM.

**Firm Name:** HNTB Corporation

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

Melvin Brown as PM: strong and relevant exp with task order idiq management and all env specialties, exp with gdot. Tim Hatton as NEPA team lead: strong and relevant exp. Charlotte Weber as CR team lead: Joe Joseph as CR team lead: strong and relevant experience. Austin Meadows as ecology lead: strong and relevant experience. Josh Earhart as a/n team lead: see above. Prime's Exp and Qual: strong

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

10 subs. Team includes 5 nepa firms, 5 hist, 4 a/n, 7 eco, 5 archeo, 5 public inv. Staff listed includes 16 nepa, 42 eco, 56 cr, 14 a/n, 11 public inv

**Firm Name:** ICA Engineering, Inc.

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

Descriptions of team leads lack a summary of each person's background and experience, instead providing only project exp and exp with gdot processes. Stan King as PM: 23 yrs exp but most in engineering project management - less so in env services; still, good exp with road projects. Wayne Hall as NEPA lead: extensive experience in transportation but mostly in SC and more in ecology. Lenor Bromberg as public inv team lead: see above. Mark Grindstaff as CR lead: see above. Barrett Stone as eco team lead: 10 years exp, but project involvement highlights nepa not ecology; has ecology exp including b.s. and exp with aquatic surveys, limited exp in ga and none listed with gdot. Mark Reep as a/n lead: 15 yrs exp but all in nc; most exp seems to be in engineering. Prime Exp: several recent projects including some large and some small - not extensive but good level of prime exp.

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

4 subs. 3 firms can do nepa, 1 history, 1 air, 1 noise, 2 eco, 1 archeo, 1 public inv. Staff listed includes 3nepa, 1 hist, 3 eco, 2 public, 3 a/n.

**Firm Name:** Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.

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

Emily Ritzler as PM: strong and relevant exp. JC as NEPA lead: strong and relevant exp. Claudio Bilotto as pub inv lead: strong and relevant exp. Erin Murphy as CR lead: see above. Stacy Stewart as ecology lead: relevant exp but may not have enough to be lead. Byron Pirkle as a/n lead: strong and relevant exp. Prime's exp: firm has a good amount of exp managing env contracts

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

11 subs. 5 firms can do nepa, 5 hist, 3 a/n, 8 eco, 3 arch, 5 public inv. Staff listed includes 15 nepa, 7 public, 20 eco, 5 a/n, 5 arch, 10 hist.

<b>Firm Name:</b> Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Good</b>
<p>Lenor Bromberg as PM: strong and relevant exp. Mary Best as NEPA team lead: strong and relevant exp. Lori Kennedy as public inv lead: unclear what her role in the listed projects entailed - did she schedule and lead the public outreach? Scot Keith as CR lead: see above. Paul Condit as ecology lead: decent exp but may not be lead-level. Anna Peterfreund as a/n lead: see above. Prime experience: strong and relevant exp.</p>			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<p>11 subs. 7 firms can do nepa, 5 hist, 5 a/n, 8 eco, 4 archeo, 4 public inv. Staff listed includes 6 nepa, 11 eco, 5 a/n, 4 public inv, 7 archeo, 6 hist.</p>			
<b>Firm Name:</b> Mulkey Engineers & Consultants			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Good</b>
<p>Britt Hennessey as PM: strong and relevant experience. Meredith Tredeau as NEPA lead: good nepa and gdot exp. Tish Stultz as public inv lead: strong and relevant exp. Matthew McDaniel as CR lead: strong and relevant exp. Todd Hill as Eco lead: see above. Josh Earhart as a/n lead: see above. Prime Exp. good.</p>			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Good</b>
<p>7 subs. 4 firms can do nepa, 5 hist, 3 a/n, 6 eco, 3 archeo, 4 public inv. Staff includes 10 nepa, 6 public inv, 7 hist, 4 archeo, 16 eco, 5 a/n.</p>			
<b>Firm Name:</b> Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<p>Claudia Bilotto as PM: 16yrs exp overall, good but not great level of exp with GDOT. Alison Nichols as NEPA lead: good but not great level of exp with gdot. Leah Vaughn as public inv lead: see above. Mark Grindstaff as CR lead: see above. Jon Sell as ecology lead: strong and relevant background. Byron Pirkle as a/n lead: see above. Prime Exp: good</p>			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<p>7 subs. 4 firms can do nepa, 4 hist, 3 air, 4 noise, 5 eco, 2 archeo, 4 public inv. Staff listed include 12 nepa, 4 public inv, 17 eco, 3 archeo, 6 hist, 5 a/n.</p>			
<b>Firm Name:</b> Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<p>Doyle Kelley as PM: good exp but mostly on engr side, some with gdot projects including env doc. Jeff Ingam as NEPA lead: projects mentioned do not state doc type; no overall summary of experience; seems to be more engineering. Heather Perrin as public inv lead: see above. Michael Reynolds as CR lead: little exp in GA and with complex road projects. Dave Pearce as eco lead: strong relevant exp. William Anderson as a/n lead: good. Prime experience: good</p>			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Marginal</b>
<p>4 subs. 3 firms can do nepa, 2 a/n, 2 eco, 2 archeo, 3 hist, 1 public inv. Staff listed include 2 nepa, 1 a/n, 1 eco, 1 cr, 1 public inv</p>			

<b>Firm Name:</b> TTL, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Marginal</b>
<p>Sheryle Reeves as PM and NEPA lead: minimal exp with GA road projects; overall yrs of exp omitted. Erin Murphy as CR lead: see above. LN Manchi as public involvement lead: good overall transportation exp and with gdot, but doesn't demonstrate public outreach expertise. David Smith as eco lead: see above. Eric Nicoletti as a/n lead: see above. Prime Exp: good but not in ga</p>			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Marginal</b>
<p>4 subs. 4 firms can do nepa, 3 hist, 2 a/n, 4 eco, 3 archeo, 2 pub inv. Staff listed includes 1 nepa, 4 cr, 2 public inv, 3 eco, 4 a/n. Albany, GA office</p>			
<b>Firm Name:</b> URS Corporation			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Adequate</b>
<p>Patrick Smith as PM and NEPA lead: good experience and background. Brandy Sweitzer as pub inv lead: 16 yrs exp on transportation projects but only one recent in GA. Scot Keith as CR lead: see above. David Smith as eco lead: see above. Jeff Wood as a/n lead: limited experience listed - projects dont demonstrate expertise enough to be a lead. Prime exp: good.</p>			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	<b>Marginal</b>
<p>4 subs. 3 firms can do nepa, 3 hist, 2 a/n, 3 eco, 3 archeo, 2 public inv. Staff listed includes 3 nepa, 7 cr, 5 eco, 2 a/n, 2 public inv. Can draw on other urs offices - employ 112 eco, 32 hist, 197 archeo, 1280 env sci, 144 public inv specialists. Still, team in Atlanta is fairly weak.</p>			

Evaluation Criteria



Experience and Qualifications

Resources availability and Workload Capacity

# Evaluator 3

SUBMITTING FIRMS	Maximum Points allowed =	200	300	Phase One Evaluator 3 Individual	
		▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11	
AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11	
CDM Smith Inc	Marginal	Good	275	9	
CROY Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	11	
Ecological Solutions	Good	Adequate	300	7	
Gresham, Smith and Partners	Good	Excellent	450	2	
GT Hill Planners Corporation	Excellent	Good	425	3	
HNTB Corporation	Excellent	Excellent	500	1	
HDR Engineering, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	7	
ICA Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Marginal	175	16	
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	Excellent	Good	425	3	
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	Marginal	Good	275	9	
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	Good	Good	375	5	
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Good	Good	375	5	
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11	
TTL, Inc.	Marginal	Marginal	125	17	
URS Corporation	Adequate	Adequate	250	11	
<b>Maximum Points allowed =</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>%</b>	



GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-090314- Environmental Services Contracts, Contract 2, Districts 3, 4 & 5	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 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			
<b>Firm Name:</b> AECOM Technical Services, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating $\longrightarrow$		Adequate
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Good info on + examples provided for PM, NEPA, public inv + Cultural Review lead.</p> <p>Not a lot of detailed minimum of project examples provided for Cultural Review or Air - noise lead (or what they are, method challenge for - noise other construction projects since local prime power project into dist. not go in to a lot of air 3 projects 2011/2012 + not clear what has been done in the case of exp? 1.</p>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating $\longrightarrow$		Adequate
<b>Comments</b>	<p>There appears to be Adequate time allocated by all these and but key personnel - not a lot of details provided a technical aspect to this contract</p>		
<b>Firm Name:</b> AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating $\longrightarrow$		Adequate
<b>Comments</b>	<p>NEPA lead appears to have very little NEPA experience</p> <p>History IPI lead give good examples of past experience</p> <p>Ecology lead examples - see some NEPA lead examples what about Study</p> <p>Ecology lead examples? prime lead examples for several to all the projects that were similar to each other - was there unique challenges for see what would happen it can need to look a <del>more</del> <del>cases</del> <del>from</del> <del>unique</del> <del>challenges</del> <del>for</del> <del>see</del> <del>what</del> <del>would</del> <del>happen</del> <del>it</del> <del>can</del></p>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating $\longrightarrow$		Adequate
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Not a lot of details about technical approach</p> <p>David Smith appears to have no time until Spring 2015</p>		
<b>Firm Name:</b> CDM Smith Inc			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating $\longrightarrow$		Marginal
<b>Comments</b>	<p>PM - <del>has</del> project experience provided variety of projects experience and has a lot of one experience (2)</p> <p>PM, <del>has</del> Cultural Review Ecology provide variety of project examples (think Cultural Review only provided technical lead exp and not History) from NEPA lead it is difficult to tell if they lead an Air-noise moving typical project from the base or not. Details unclear - work experience all related to air - Cultural Review - have not seen as technical experience</p>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating $\longrightarrow$		Good
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Appears to have many people to call upon, somewhat who would be in charge of CAC</p> <p>provide knowledge of areas to see the specs that could be a unique challenge</p> <p>SCOT kept apps to him a lot of his lead up</p>		

**Firm Name:** CROY Engineering, LLC  
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20% Assigned Rating  $\longrightarrow$  Adequate

**Comments**  
Project manager has worked on diff types of projects, covered various level and nature of projects for more than 20 yrs and type of projects as they feel a prime's examples are a variety of projects

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30% Assigned Rating  $\longrightarrow$  Adequate

**Comments**  
No branch or additional law makes in org chart. 6 or 7 a law - in some cases provided detailed public info appeal clients and some had until 2014

**Firm Name:** Ecological Solutions  
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20% Assigned Rating  $\longrightarrow$  Good

**Comments**  
All PM's provided good project examples Prime provided good examples of projects of high quality, covering outside fees (staff fees) (agency charges) etc. Not a lot of common sense of prime to ecology market

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30% Assigned Rating  $\longrightarrow$  Adequate

**Comments**  
Based on team decision, availability, and cost, discussed specialized needs identified and some level of work

**Firm Name:** Gresham, Smith and Partners  
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20% Assigned Rating  $\longrightarrow$  Good

**Comments**  
Team level provided good examples of similar projects they had worked on as well as provide a close list of examples with a lot of experience in type of project of similar scope

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30% Assigned Rating  $\longrightarrow$  Excellent

**Comments**  
Large staff available to work on 5 step CAMEC, provide a team, and other work to support project committee, specialized services available to the team

**Firm Name:** GT Hill Planners Corporation  
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20% Assigned Rating  $\longrightarrow$  Excellent

**Comments**  
Strong team led, all leads provide examples of projects they have led work on with a close list of fees + results, PMs have strong background in field of environmental planning, strong examples of projects in their files on a variety of sites to provide project.

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

**Comments**  
Have a lot of people with direct and experience available to work on project by was available to work

**Firm Name:** HDR Engineering, Inc.  
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20% Assigned Rating  $\longrightarrow$  Good

**Comments**  
Key leader had relative experience, however a knowledge had minimal experience in GAT  
Prime experience showed clarity of processes and reports needed

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30% Assigned Rating  $\longrightarrow$  Adequate

**Comments**  
Have many people identified in cases that are work in progress, identified other process & tricky situation  
No unique issues & hard to will be handled in discussed  
Key people flexible to work

**Firm Name:** HNTB Corporation  
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20% Assigned Rating  $\longrightarrow$  Excellent

**Comments**  
Key personnel provide good examples of projects & project similar scope worked on and of value to client project  
Prime has experience with this type of projects and provide good example of a chosen set of projects would be

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30% Assigned Rating  $\longrightarrow$  Excellent

**Comments**  
Identified key personnel as project staff  
Prime's ability to work with client will help project success  
Small projects critical events identified (5 steps)  
Clearly stated during project 2019 team is aware

**Firm Name:** ICA Engineering, Inc.  
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20% Assigned Rating  $\longrightarrow$  Adequate

**Comments**  
Key personnel show good project examples for  
Education field I was unclear of it by each other  
2019 3000 to 5000 projects AND more need to  
Prime example - non-computerized, ~~computerized~~

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30% Assigned Rating  $\longrightarrow$  Marginal

**Comments**  
There was not a large number of people available  
available for all tasks, any one person to do  
at more people available? my little project and  
where other resources to provide other work that does not appear to  
have a lot of availability with other projects

**Firm Name:** Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.  
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20% Assigned Rating  $\longrightarrow$  Excellent

**Comments**  
Team leads all provided excellent examples of project  
work & management experience in the respective areas - they all  
had extensive engineering experience & good example  
Prime example directly relates to GAT

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

**Comments**  
Has a large team to call upon  
A little firm review of local market - to eliminate new firms  
~~small firm not up to the task~~  
Key personnel appear to be in the field

<b>Firm Name:</b>	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<b>Comment</b>	<p>Contract review lead does not refer budget on history          only tech crew see if tech crew observe history work          security lead did not provide info about I + E spec except  <del>prime</del> pm has a lot of pocket expense I + E spec except          prime exp example 2 contracts say resp to ecology history etc</p>	

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	Good
<b>Comments</b>	<p>at this say they were completed by others? (see contract to verify) if          help staff independent O&amp;A/C review          for future</p>	

<b>Firm Name:</b>	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	Good
<b>Comments</b>	<p>contract review lead does not have exp or technology project?          key leads provided good relevant project experience relevant          tech work in contract          some provide a diverse set of projects relevant          relevant to the contract the spend on all they can</p>	

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	Good
<b>Comments</b>	<p>large list of <del>project</del> available project present  <del>has</del> special certs in a class will need          O&amp;A/C needs special certs for project also project related materials          in key certs and for project also project related materials          if need case) by present available &amp; power also for future</p>	

<b>Firm Name:</b>	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	Good
<b>Comments</b>	<p>key project provided good relevant experience of certs          in the field as it relates to this contract          review project relevant project on show a diverse          range of project manage experience by the firm</p>	

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	Good
<b>Comments</b>	<p>many increases, reduce multiple different than          available to work on project holds          valuation, specialty equipment like but's, dehydrator          support site <del>of the</del> of key project which to work a client</p>	

<b>Firm Name:</b>	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<b>Comment</b>	<p>Contract review lead - 1 as compared by team of          the review seems to be split off the firm name of          of the lead not see that lead people on this is          sufficient info provided - Am-nord lead did not see even          calculate expense with other moves files prime provide good project exp</p>	

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Did not list on org chart address project to client          with lower of project          Degree taken appears to be a long history consistent</p>	

<b>Firm Name:</b>	TTL, Inc.	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→ Marginal
<b>Comments</b>	<p>under how much experience PM has - not see it in PM's CV  <del>PM's CV</del> PM's CV has some experience with parts of schedule but          see a overall control it has.          Good hrs and other things prime experience should figure out          of skills but not seen to be in page of an overall control</p>	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→ Marginal
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Support staff in region is not large &amp; may have          on month end last which may be could be handled          David says not aware of 1 month 2015</p>	
<b>Firm Name:</b>	URS Corporation	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→ Adequate
<b>Comments</b>	<p>PM is also NEPT lead.          Colleen Ream's lead does not come to him a lot          of experience on way history but lots of tech experience          Paul says you only might have Patrick Smith's depend          not see it from his abstract with other leads?</p>	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→ Adequate
<b>Comments</b>	<p>org chart did not show a lot of NEPT or NEPT work          that could be provided if needed? but don't see the          down the history on power but if needed          PM discussed success such as history pro cold water,          +ref success, HSHL, Cellst/early success, Please See          David says had several success...</p>	

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

Solicitation Title:	<i>Environmental Services Contract 2, Districts 3, 4 &amp; 5</i>	1	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	
Solicitation #:	<i>RFQ 484-090314</i>	2	HNTB Corporation	
<b>PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria FOR TOP TEN SUBITTALS</b>		2	GT Hill Planners Corporation	
<b>(This Page For GDOT Use)</b>				
<b>SUBMITTING FIRMS</b>	<b>(RANKING)</b>		6	Gresham, Smith and Partners
		<b>Group</b>	8	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)
	<b>Score</b>	<b>Ranking</b>	8	HDR Engineering, Inc.
			8	CDM Smith Inc
			8	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC

HNTB Corporation	425	2
GT Hill Planners Corporation	425	2
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	375	4
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	450	1
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	375	4
Gresham, Smith and Partners	325	6
HDR Engineering, Inc.	250	8
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	325	6
CDM Smith Inc	250	8
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	250	8

Evaluation Criteria →

Experience and Qualifications

Resources availability and Workload Capacity

<b>SUBMITTING FIRMS</b>	<b>Maximum Points allowed =</b>		<b>Scores and Group Ranking</b>	
	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>Total Score</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
HNTB Corporation	Excellent	Good	425	2
GT Hill Planners Corporation	Excellent	Good	425	2
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	Good	Good	375	4
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Good	Excellent	450	1
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	Good	Good	375	4
Gresham, Smith and Partners	Adequate	Good	325	6
HDR Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	Adequate	Good	325	6
CDM Smith Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
<b>Maximum Points allowed =</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>500 %</b>	

RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS, DISTRICTS 3,4,5, CONTRACT 2	
Firm	HNTB Corporation	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Excellent
<p>The team leaders had excellent background experience with GDOT. The firm as a whole provided diverse examples of successfully managing complex projects. The firm provided evidence with complex projects in the past. The Prime provided excellent examples of projects of similar type and scope. The Project Manager has experience managing full turn key environmental projects.</p>			
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>The organization chart was very detailed and listed key personnel and supporting staff. The team provided strategies with dealing with unique project challenges. Also, showed their availability through the year 2019. The staff has excellent availability and capacity to complete the project on time. Noted that this team's availability will be impacted by winning the contract for District's 6 and 7 thereby impacting their availability and capacity.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS, DISTRICTS 3,4,5, CONTRACT 2	
Firm	GT Hill Planners Corporation	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Excellent
<p>The key team leaders were strong and they provided projects that they actually lead. The Project Manager (PM) had a strong diverse background. The firm provided a variety of studies of similar scope. The focus on Public Involvement was excellent.</p>			
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>The organization chart was very detailed and listed key personnel and supporting staff. The staff has availability and capacity to complete the project on time. They also had a separate Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) team. However, this teams selection on Contract 1 will reduce its availability and capacity.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS, DISTRICTS 3,4,5, CONTRACT 2	
Firm	Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>The team leads provided good examples of projects of similar scope. The team as a whole has extensive experience. The Project Manager (PM) has similar experience for projects of this nature. The Ecologist did not provide document experience at a Lead level.</p>			
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>The organization chart was very detailed and listed key personnel and supporting staff. The staff has availability and capacity to complete the project on time, although the Public Involvement Lead and the Air/Noise have a high level of commitment. The team has a separate firm to provide the QA/QC.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS, DISTRICTS 3,4,5, CONTRACT 2	
Firm	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>The team leads provided good examples of projects of similar scope. The team as a whole has extensive experience. The Project Manager has similar experience for projects of this nature.</p>			
Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Excellent	
<p>The organization chart was very detailed and listed key personnel and supporting staff. Also, showed their availability through the year 2019. The staff has availability and capacity to complete the project on time.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS, DISTRICTS 3,4,5, CONTRACT 2	
Firm	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>The team leads were very strong and have extensive experience with projects of similar scope. The PM is managing the Transportation Investment Act (TIA) environmental area and manages other significant projects of this matter which are very complex. There was not a lot of detail provided for the Air/Noise Lead.</p>			
Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>The organization chart was very detailed and listed key personnel and supporting staff. The staff has good availability and capacity to complete the project on time. Did not mention QA/QC.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS, DISTRICTS 3,4,5, CONTRACT 2	
Firm	Gresham, Smith and Partners	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>The Cultural Resources Lead has experience managing both history and archeology. The Project Manager did not demonstrate environmental experience in managing projects of similar scope. The project examples provided by the firm are not a good fit for the scope of services.</p>			
Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>They provided a five step QA/QC which is really good. Their availability was great and they can complete the job. The organization chart was detailed.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS, DISTRICTS 3,4,5, CONTRACT 2	
Firm	HDR Engineering, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>The PM has managed all aspects of environmental services. The examples provided by the firm were relevant to the contract and showed diversity. The Cultural Resource Lead has experience with history, but not archaeology. They have minimum experience with GA DOT's policies and procedures.</p>			
Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>The QA/QC would be conducted throughout the project. The Deputy PM has a lot of GADOT project experience. The NEPA Lead, Cultural Resources Lead and PM availability is limited according to the information shown on the commitment table.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS, DISTRICTS 3,4,5, CONTRACT 2	
Firm	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>The Prime showed a range of projects similar to the scope. The PM has extensive experience. The NEPA lead does not display a lot of demonstrated experience. The Cultural Resources Lead does not show archaeological experience.</p>			
Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>The team demonstrated that key personnel are able to handle specialty areas. The organization chart showed a large range of personnel to complete the scope of work. The availability of the Cultural Resources Lead showed high commitments.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS, DISTRICTS 3,4,5, CONTRACT 2	
Firm	CDM Smith Inc	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>NEPA team lead has extensive experience. Cultural Resources Leads' primary focus was on archeology. PM's experience in project managing was not specific enough and lacked details. The Air/Noise Lead was not concise regarding actual experience. The Ecology Lead did not demonstrate sufficient relevant experience.</p>			
Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>They identified the lead who will provide QA/QC as well as the backup personnel. Cultural Resource Lead has high commitments on other projects.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	<b>PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS, DISTRICTS 3,4,5, CONTRACT 2</b>	
Firm	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>The PM has extensive experience needed for the subject matter. The Prime's project examples gave contradictory descriptions of responsibilities. The NEPA Lead and the Public Involvement Leads' roles were unclear in the examples provided. The Cultural Resource Lead has primary focus on archaeology.</p>			
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>The team has good QA/QC with an outside firm. The organization chart was clear and concise. The Ecological Team did not identify enough available staff to handle the demands of the contract. The PM has high outside commitments. The Cultural Resource Lead's availability is limited.</p>			



# **SELECTION OF FINALISTS**

**RFQ-484-090314**

**Environmental Services Contracts; Districts 1 & 2, Districts 3,  
4 & 5, Districts 6 & 7**

**The Georgia Department of Transportation is pleased to announce the selections of the following firms as finalists regarding the above RFQ for, Contracts 1-3, Districts 1-7:**

## **Selected Finalists:**

### **Contract 1, Districts 1 & 2**

1. AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
2. GT Hill Planners Corporation
3. HNTB Corporation
4. Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.
5. Mulkey Engineers & Consultants

### **Contract 2, Districts 3, 4 & 5**

1. AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
2. GT Hill Planners Corporation
3. HNTB Corporation
4. Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.
5. Mulkey Engineers & Consultants

### **Contract 3, Districts 6 & 7**

1. AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
2. GT Hill Planners Corporation
3. HNTB Corporation
4. Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.
5. Mulkey Engineers & Consultants



September 19, 2014

**NOTICE TO SELECTED FINALISTS**

**To: AECOM Technical Services, Inc.; GT Hill Planners Corporation; HNTB Corporation; Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.; Mulkey Engineers & Consultants**

Please send an e-mail confirming receipt of this notice to Karen Mims @ (kmims@dot.ga.gov).

**Re: RFQ-484-090314 – Environmental Services Contracts, Contract 1-3, Districts 1 - 7**

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-484-09034), page 8, VII. Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response – Phase II Response, A&B and page 10, 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. Technical Approach to Managing the Project:
  - a. Provide any unique technical approaches your firm offers relative to fulfilling the environmental scope of services, and/or management of the project.
  - b. Unique challenges of the project and how your firm intends to mitigate these challenges, including details of the approach to achieving an approved Environmental Document and quality control, quality assurance procedures.
2. Provide any specific qualifications, skills, knowledge of the environmental process which may uniquely benefit the firm and project.

**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

1. GDOT completes evaluation and issues notification and other information to finalist firms.	09/19/2014	-----
2. Deadline for submission of written questions from finalists (e-mail preferred)	09/23/2014	2:00 PM
3. GDOT Receives Submittals I, and 2 for Phase II	09/26/2014	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 **Suitability** 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 Karen Mims, and congratulations, again, to each of you!

Karen Mims  
[kmims@dot.ga.gov](mailto:kmims@dot.ga.gov)  
404-631-1430

## SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ 484-090314
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Environmental Services Contract 2, Districts 3, 4 & 5
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Compliant with Page # Limitations
1	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	9/26/2014	11:29 AM	X
2	HNTB Corporation	9/26/2014	10:42 AM	X
3	GT Hill Planners Corporation	9/26/2014	12:29 PM	X
4	Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	9/26/2014	10:07 AM	X
5	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	9/26/2014	2:03 PM	X

\* Note to File: I attest that the delivery person from AECOM was in the door by 2:00 p.m.\* *Kem*


**GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF SUBMITTALS**

<b>Solicitation Title:</b>	<i>Environmental Services Contract 2, Districts 3, 4 &amp; 5</i>	1	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants
<b>Solicitation #:</b>	<i>RFQ 484-090314</i>	2	HNTB Corporation
<b>PHASE I AND PHASE II - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria</b>		2	GT Hill Planners Corporation

**(This Page For GDOT Use)**

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING)	
	Sum of	Group
	Score	Ranking
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	850	1
HNTB Corporation	825	2
GT Hill Planners Corporation	825	2
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	775	4
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	775	4

Evaluation Criteria →



SUBMITTING FIRMS	PHASE I		PHASE II		Group Scores and Ranking	
	200	300	400	100	Total Score	Ranking
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Good	Excellent	Good	Excellent	850	1
HNTB Corporation	Excellent	Good	Good	Excellent	825	2
GT Hill Planners Corporation	Excellent	Good	Good	Excellent	825	2
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	Good	Good	Good	Excellent	775	4
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	Good	Good	Good	Excellent	775	4
<b>Maximum Points allowed =</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>%</b>

RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	<b>PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS, CONTRACT 2</b>	
Firm	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good

The proposal covered all areas of the scope. The team gave project examples of what services they can provide. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) was clear, strong and indepth with five levels of review. The environmental experience was specific to the District areas. The firm has a P6 scheduler. The technical approach included Section 408 permitting supported by strong experience.

Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Excellent
------------------	--	-----------------	-----------

The firm's customer service and adherence to schedules are strong suits according to the committee. Also, the evaluators were in agreement with the ratings and comments conducted from the reference checks performed by Transportation Services Procurement (TSP).

RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	<b>PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS, CONTRACT 2</b>	
Firm	HNTB Corporation		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good

The firm has a strong dedicated team with very little turnover. Their multi-tier QA/QC was detailed. The decision makers had key team roles.

Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Excellent
------------------	--	-----------------	-----------

The PM was successful working on very difficult GDOT NEPA projects. Also, the evaluators were in agreement with the ratings and comments conducted from the reference checks performed by Transportation Services Procurement (TSP).

RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	<b>PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS, CONTRACT 2</b>	
Firm	GT Hill Planners Corporation		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>The firm has a special media group for public involvement. The usage of the client satisfaction survey was positive. Demonstrated some similar experience to subject project but some examples were not relevant. The delivery was not specific to this project. Did not see the relevance in working with their internal designers rather than the design lead. The QA/QC was very brief.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Excellent
<p>The evaluators were in agreement with the ratings and comments conducted from the reference checks performed by Transportation Services Procurement (TSP).</p>			
RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	<b>PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS, CONTRACT 2</b>	
Firm	Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>The firm mentioned in detail the P6, baseline schedules and TPRO. Also, the proposal covered Section 408 which shows they aware of the unique challenges for this project. The firm has a strong graphics department. Most of the key challenges were addressed. They addressed District specific needs. The QA/QC lacked detail; only a two step process. Air and noise was not mentioned at all.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Excellent
<p>The firm did an excellent job with public involvement on the "Old Alabama Road Improvement" project according to the committee. Also, the evaluators were in agreement with the ratings and comments conducted from the reference checks performed by Transportation Services Procurement (TSP).</p>			

RFQ	RFQ 484-090314	<b>PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS, CONTRACT 2</b>	
Firm	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>The Consultant has knowledge with similar contracts. The firm mentioned they could combine multiple projects in single field trips for efficiency. The proposal had various typos, as well as incomplete sentences. The proposal did not clearly address unique challenges. The proposal was not specific to the environmental areas.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Excellent
<p>The firm's previous report submissions required only minor revisions. Past experience with the PM has been positive. Also, the evaluators were in agreement with the ratings and comments conducted from the reference checks performed by Transportation Services Procurement (TSP).</p>			

**Reference Check Scores for  
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.**

**Reference A**

<b>Firm Name</b>	<b>Georgia Department of Transportation</b>		
<b>Project Name</b>	SR 1/US 27 at SR 166 Interchange, Carroll County		
<b>Project Manager</b>	Laura Dawood, Mandy Phillips	Title	Project Manager
<b>Contact Information</b>	Chandria Brown, P.E., 404-631-1580, Project Manager		
	<b>Reference Questions</b>	<b>Score</b>	
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.	9	
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.	9	
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.	9	
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.	9	
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.	9	
<b>Comments</b>	They are a technically sound firm. Also, they are very responsive.		

**Reference B**

<b>Firm Name</b>	<b>Georgia Department of Transportation</b>		
<b>Project Name</b>	GDOT TIA Program Management - Environmental Only		
<b>Project Manager</b>	Garrick Edward, P.E.	Title	Project Manager
<b>Contact Information</b>	Tim Matthews, 631-1568, GDOT Program Manager		
	<b>Reference Questions</b>	<b>Score</b>	
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.	8	
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.	8	
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.	8	
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.	8	
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.	8	
<b>Comments</b>	Satisfied with the job thus far for the environmental aspect of the project.		

**Reference Check Scores for  
GT Hills Planners Corporation**

**Reference A - Served as Subconsultant for Jacobs. Also, Jacobs is shortlisted, NEPA Lead listed in Jacob's SOQ gave rating.**

<b>Firm Name</b>	<b>Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.</b>		
<b>Project Name</b>	Statewide Environmental Services Contract		
<b>Project Manager</b>	Todd Hill, NEPA Task Lead, Erin Murphy, Cultural Resources Task Lead, Eric	Title	Environmental Task Leads
<b>Contact Information</b>	Jonathan Cox, 404--978-7516, NEPA Lead		
	<b>Reference Questions</b>	<b>Score</b>	
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.	9	
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.	9	
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.	9	
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.	9	
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.	9	
<b>Comments</b>	The Lead(Todd Hill) is a reliable resource. He is very knowledgeable in the necessary environmental areas. Also, he delivers within schedules and budget.		

**Reference B - Served as Subconsultant**

<b>Firm Name</b>	<b>GDOT Hired Consultant, Consultant for URS Corporation</b>		
<b>Project Name</b>	On-Call Professional Services for TIA Projects		
<b>Project Manager</b>	Erin Murphy, Cultural Resources Task Lead, Eric Nicolett, Air Studies, Todd Hill, QA/QC	Title	Project Managers
<b>Contact Information</b>	Shrujal Amin - Embedded URS Corporation Employee for TIA, 404-631-1697		
	<b>Reference Questions</b>	<b>Score</b>	
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.	9	
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.	10	
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.	10	
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.	8	
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.	10	
<b>Comments</b>	The work has been excellent and do not have to follow-up on their work. They always get it right the first time.		

Reference C - Served as Subconsultant -HNTB is also shortlisted.

<b>Firm Name</b>	<b>HNTB Corporation</b>		
<b>Project Name</b>	Statewide Environmental Services Statewide		
<b>Project Manager</b>	Todd Hill, Erin Murphy	Title	QA/QC/ Cultural Resources Task Leader
<b>Contact Information</b>	Brock Hoegh, P.M., 404-556-5806		
	<b>Reference Questions</b>		<b>Score</b>
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.		6
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.		8
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		8
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		7
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		7
<b>Comments</b>	Overall, the technical work was good. Work efforts on ecological was good. QA/QC before submission could have been improved.		

RFQ 484-090314  
Environmental Services Contracts, Contracts 1-3, Districts 1-7

**Reference Check Scores for  
HNTB Corporation**

**Reference A**

<b>Firm Name</b>	<b>Georgia Department of Transportation</b>		
<b>Project Name</b>	SR 32 Bridge Replacement Over the Flint River		
<b>Project Manager</b>	Ted Hatton	Title	NEPA Lead
<b>Contact Information</b>	Mr. Derrick Brown, Senior Project Manager, 404-631-1571		
	<b>Reference Questions</b>		<b>Score</b>
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.		9
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.		10
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		9
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		10
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		10
<b>Comments</b>	The Project Manager (Shane Swann) was very diligent and very responsive to the needs of the GDOT Project Manager; also proactive with any problems or concerns.		

**Reference B**

<b>Firm Name</b>	<b>Georgia Department of Transportation</b>		
<b>Project Name</b>	GA Multi-Modal Passenger Terminal (MMPT) EIS		
<b>Project Manager</b>	Melvin Brown, Tim Hatton	Title	QA/QC, NEPA Lead
<b>Contact Information</b>	Derrick Cameron, GDOT, Assistant State Project Review Engineer, 404-631-1223		
	<b>Reference Questions</b>		<b>Score</b>
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.		10
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.		10
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		9
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		10
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		10
<b>Comments</b>	They are a really responsive firm. Very knowledgeable of the work given to them.		

RFQ 484-090314  
Environmental Services Contracts, Contracts 1-3, Districts 1-7

**Reference Check Scores for  
Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.**

**Reference A**

<b>Firm Name</b>	<b>Georgia Department of Transportation</b>		
<b>Project Name</b>	US 27 Widening, Troup County		
<b>Project Manager</b>	Jonathan Cox, Stacy Stewart Erin Murphy	Title	NEPA, Ecology, Cultural Resources
<b>Contact Information</b>	Adam Smith, Assistant Project Manager, 706-621-9704		
	<b>Reference Questions</b>	<b>Score</b>	
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.	8	
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.	8	
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.	7	
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.	9	
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.	8	
<b>Comments</b>	They have a lot of knowledgeable staff and have done well progressing with a challenging project.		

**Reference B**

<b>Firm Name</b>	<b>Georgia Department of Transportation</b>		
<b>Project Name</b>	District 3 Task Order Contract - Limited Projects		
<b>Project Manager</b>	Jonathan Cox, Stacy Stewart, Erin Murphy	Title	NEPA Lead, Ecology, Cultural Resources
<b>Contact Information</b>	Bobby Dollar, Transportation Environmental Planner, 404-631-1920		
	<b>Reference Questions</b>	<b>Score</b>	
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.	8	
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.	8	
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.	7	
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.	7	
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.	8	
<b>Comments</b>	The staff that he work with were knowledgeable for their subject matter. They were easy to work with and overall the quality of the work was good.		

**Reference Check Scores for  
Mulkey Engineers and Consulting**

**Reference A**

<b>Firm Name</b>	<b>Georgia Department of Transportation</b>		
<b>Project Name</b>	Old Alabama Road Improvement		
<b>Project Manager</b>	Ken McDuff, P.E., Britt Hennessey, P.E.	Title	Project Managers
<b>Contact Information</b>	Kimberly Nesbitt, Project Manager, 404-631-1575		
	<b>Reference Questions</b>	<b>Score</b>	
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.	9	
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.	9	
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.	9	
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.	9	
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.	7	
<b>Comments</b>	They were able to get the logical termini reviewed and approved by FHWA in less than 4 months.		

**Reference B**

<b>Firm Name</b>	<b>Georgia Department of Transportation</b>		
<b>Project Name</b>	SR 360 Widening and Reconstruction		
<b>Project Manager</b>	Ken McDuff, P.E., Britt Hennessey, P.E., Meredith Tredeau, AICP	Title	Project Managers
<b>Contact Information</b>	Chandria Brown, Senior Project Manager, 404-631-1580		
	<b>Reference Questions</b>	<b>Score</b>	
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.	9	
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.	9	
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.	8	
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.	9	
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.	9	
<b>Comments</b>	The Consultant is a very technically sound firm. They are responsive and proactive in their project management.		

Reference Check Summary for  
RFQ 484-090314  
Environmental Services Contracts, Contracts 1-3, Districts 1-7

	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	GT Hills Planners Corporation	HINTB Corporation	Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.	Mulkey Engineers and Consulting
<b>Questions (to be answered on 1-10 scale, 10 indicates best)</b>					
1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.					
<b>Reference A</b>	9	9	9	8	9
<b>Reference B</b>	8	9	10	8	9
<b>Section Average</b>	8.50	9.00	9.50	8.00	9.00
2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.					
<b>Reference A</b>	9	9	10	8	9
<b>Reference B</b>	8	10	10	8	9
<b>Section Average</b>	8.50	9.50	10.00	8.00	9.00
3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.					
<b>Reference A</b>	9	9	9	7	9
<b>Reference B</b>	8	10	9	7	8
<b>Section Average</b>	8.50	9.50	9.00	7.00	8.50
4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.					
<b>Reference A</b>	9	9	10	9	9
<b>Reference B</b>	8	8	10	7	9
<b>Section Average</b>	8.50	8.50	10.00	8.00	9.00
5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.					
<b>Reference A</b>	9	9	10	8	7
<b>Reference B</b>	8	10	10	8	9
<b>Section Average</b>	8.50	9.50	10.00	8.00	8.00
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>8.50</b>	<b>9.20</b>	<b>9.70</b>	<b>7.80</b>	<b>8.70</b>

**SAM Search Results**  
**List of records matching your search for :**

**Search Term : mulkey\* consulting\***  
**Record Status: Active**

**No Search Results**


**SAM Search Results**  
**List of records matching your search for :**

**Search Term : "Mulkey Engineers & Consultants\*"**  
**Record Status: Active**

**No Search Results**

**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	ISSUE DATE	DATE OF EXPIRATION
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants 1255 Canton Street, Suite G  Roswell, GA 30075	4/10/14	3/31/17
<b>SIGNATURE</b>		
		
<b>1. Transportation Planning</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 1.01 State Wide Systems Planning Urban Area and Regional Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> 1.02 Planning <input type="checkbox"/> 1.03 Aviation Systems Planning <input type="checkbox"/> 1.04 Mass and Rapid Transportation Planning <input 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 type="checkbox"/> 1.06d Noise Studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06e Ecology <input type="checkbox"/> 1.06f Archaeology <input type="checkbox"/> 1.06g Freshwater Aquatic 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 type="checkbox"/> 1.10 Traffic Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 1.11 Traffic and Toll Revenue Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 1.12 Major Investment Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 1.13 Non-Motorized Transportation Planning	<b>3. Highway Design Roadway (Continued)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 3.09 Traffic Control Systems Analysis, Design and Implementation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.10 Utility Coordination <input 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 type="checkbox"/> 3.17 Design of Toll Facilities Infrastructure	
<b>2. Mass Transit Operations</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 2.01 Mass Transit Program (Systems) Management <input type="checkbox"/> 2.02 Mass Transit Feasibility and Technical Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 2.03 Mass Transit Vehicle and Propulsion System Mass Transit Controls, Communications and Information Systems <input type="checkbox"/> 2.04 <input type="checkbox"/> 2.05 Mass Transit Architectural Engineering <input type="checkbox"/> 2.06 Mass Transit Unique Structures <input type="checkbox"/> 2.07 Mass Transit Electrical and Mechanical Systems Mass Transit Operations Management and Support Services <input type="checkbox"/> 2.08 <input type="checkbox"/> 2.09 Aviation <input type="checkbox"/> 2.10 Mass Transit Program (Systems) Marketing	<b>4. Highway Structures</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.01 Minor Bridges Design <input type="checkbox"/> 4.02 Major Bridges Design <input 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	
<b>3. Highway Design Roadway</b> <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 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 type="checkbox"/> 3.06 Traffic Operations Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 3.07 Traffic Operations Design <input type="checkbox"/> 3.08 Landscape Architecture	<b>5. Topography</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.01 Land Surveying <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.02 Engineering Surveying <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.03 Geodetic Surveying <input type="checkbox"/> 5.04 Aerial Photography <input type="checkbox"/> 5.05 Aerial Photogrammetry <input type="checkbox"/> 5.06 Topographic Remote Sensing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.07 Cartography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.08 Subsurface Utility Engineering	
	<b>6. Soils, Foundation &amp; Materials Testing</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 6.01a Soil Surveys <input type="checkbox"/> 6.01b Geological and Geophysical Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 6.02 Bridge Foundation Studies Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Soils and Foundation) <input type="checkbox"/> 6.03 <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	
	<b>8. Construction</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8.01 Construction Supervision	
	<b>9. Erosion and Sedimentation Control</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9.01 Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control and Comprehensive Monitoring Program <input type="checkbox"/> 9.02 Rainfall and Runoff Reporting <input type="checkbox"/> 9.03 Field Inspections for Compliance of Erosion and Sedimentation Control Devices Installations	