DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

June 3, 2015

RFQ #: 484-031315
RFQ Title: Engineering Design Services (B1 – 2015), Contract #5, P.I. #721290 & 721295 (Clayton, Fayette County)

FROM: Darlene Parker, Transportation Services Procurement Manager

TO: Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator

SUBJECT: **Ranking Approval - (Revised due to Administrative Error)**

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

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

1. **Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.**
2. **Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated**
3. **CDM Smith, Inc.**
4. **KCI Technologies, Inc.**
5. **Michael Baker Jr., Inc.**

The Selection Committee recommends the selection of the top ranked firm, Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc..

Concurrence with Award from Responsible Division Director:

Joe Carpenter, Division Director of P3/Program Delivery

Certification Procurement Requirements Met:

Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator

DJP:reb

Attachments

Contract #5

SR 85 FM SR 279/Fayette to CR 820Roberts Dr/Clayton

& SR 85 @ Camp Creek @ Clayton/Fayette County Line

STP00-0074-02(021) – P.I. # 721290 Clayton County

BHF00-0074-02(022) – P.I. #721295 Fayette County

Date Posted 2/13/2015

Georgia Department of Transportation

Request for Qualifications

To Provide

Engineering Design Services (B1-2015)

RFQ-484-031315
Qualifications Due: March 13, 2015

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

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS
484-031315

Engineering Design Services (B1-2015)

I. General Project Information

A. Overview

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

Contract	County	PI/Project #	Project Description
1	HENRY	0007856 CSSTP-0007-00(856)	SR 155 FROM I-75 TO SR 42/US 23
2	PAULDING	621720 & 632921 STP00-0186-01(025) & BRST0-0186-01(041)	SR 92 FROM NEBO ROAD TO SR 120 – INCLUDING POWDER SPRINGS CREEK BRIDGE (P. I. # 621720) & SR 92 @ CR 511-SOUTHERN RAILROAD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT IN HIRAM (P. I. #632921)
3	PAULDING	621570 NH000-0018-01(059)	SR 61 FM S OF CR 467 / DALLAS NEBO RD TO SR 6 / DALLAS BYPASS
4	CHEROKEE	630975- / 630977- BRSST-1375-00(006) & STP00-1375-00(005)	CR 770 / BELLS FERRY RD FM NO VICTORIA TO .2 MI N/LITTLE RIVER & CR770 / BELLS FERRY FM S FORK WAY TO N OF NORTH VICTORIA RD
5	CLAYTON, FAYETTE	721290 & 721295 STP00-0074-02(021) & BHF00-0074-02(022)	SR 85 FROM SR 279/FAYETTE TO CR 820/ROBERTS DR/CLAYTON & SR 85 @ CAMP CREEK @ CLAYTON/FAYETTE COUNTY LINE

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 Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) to be sufficiently qualified, may be deemed eligible, and invited to offer written plan 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, 7th Floor
600 West Peachtree Street, NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30308
Phone: (404) 631-1972

D. Scope of Services

Under the terms of the resulting Agreements, the selected consultants will provide full engineering design services, as well as all associated engineering related services for the GDOT Projects identified. The anticipated scope of work for each project/contract is included in **Exhibit I**.

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

E. Contract Term and Type

GDOT anticipates five (5) Multi-Phase, Project Specific contract to be awarded to five (5) 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 Project Specific contracts, it is the Department's intention that the Agreements will remain in effect until successful completion of the preliminary engineering phase of the projects, and may choose to utilize the selected consultant for use on construction revisions as necessary.

F. Contract Amount

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

II. Selection Method

A. Method of Communication

All general communication of relevant information regarding this solicitation will be made via the Georgia Procurement Registry (GPR) under RFQ-484-031315. All firms are responsible for checking the GPR on a regular basis for updates, clarifications, and announcements. GDOT reserves the right to communicate via electronic-mail with the primary contact listed in the Statements of Qualifications. Other specific communications will be made as indicated in the remainder of this RFQ.

B. Phase I - Selection of Finalists

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

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

C. Finalist Notification for Phase II

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

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 **RFQ 484-031315**	2/13/2015	----------
b. Deadline for submission of written questions and requests for clarification	2/26/2015	2:00 PM
c. Deadline for submission of Statements of Qualifications	3/13/2015	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 the project (including design concepts and use of alternative methods).
- Provide any specific qualifications, skills, or knowledge which your firm has which could benefit the project, and your ability and willingness to meet time requirements.

B. Past Performance – 10%

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

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

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

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

A. Administrative Requirements

It is required to submit the information below for each copy of each submittal for each project. 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 -Ident ify 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). Please note that each project/contract will follow an individual schedule which meets the availability of each Selection Committee. For this reason, the Notice to Finalists and resulting Phase II responses may be on different schedules for each project/contract. If a firm is a Finalist on multiple projects/contracts, the Phase II responses should be considered as separate responses which shall be prepared and submitted separately.

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 project/contract submittal must have a separate cover page for each copy of each Phase II submittal for each project/contract 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 design concepts, use of any alternative methods for delivery (if applicable), and/or management of the project. Identify any unique challenges of the project and how your firm intends to mitigate these challenges, including quality control, quality assurance procedures. Provide any specific qualifications, skills, knowledge of the project and project area which may uniquely benefit the firm and project.

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. For each project/contract which is being sought by the firm, 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 for all projects being sought. Submittal #2 is an electronic version of Submittal #1 which allows for GDOT to maintain the files electronically. The original and each copy of each Submittal #1 should be stapled separately. For each project/contract response, 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. If a firm is responding to multiple

projects/contracts, each separately bound project/contract may be submitted in a single package (boxed, enveloped, or other). 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 484-031315 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: Rhonda Badgett
Transportation Services Procurement
One Georgia Center, 19th 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: **Rhonda Badgett, e-mail: rbadgett@dot.ga.gov.** The deadlines for submission of questions relating to the RFQ are the times and dates shown in the (**Schedule of Events -Sect ion III**). From the issue date of this solicitation until a successful proposer is selected and the award is made official and announced, respondents are subject to the Restriction of Communication in **Section I.B.**

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

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

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

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 for the project for which they have been identified as a Finalist. Submittal #2 is an electronic version of Submittal #1 which

allows for GDOT to maintain the files electronically. The original and each copy of each Submittal #1 should be stapled separately. For each project/contract response, 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. In the event that the firm has been identified as a Finalist on more than one project/contract, and the due date and time for the Phase II response is the same and a firm is responding to multiple projects/contracts, each separately bound project/contract may be submitted in a single package (boxed, enveloped, or other.)

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 dis qualification.**

C. Submittals must be sealed in an opaque envelope or box, and reference **RFQ 484-031315.**

D. **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: Rhonda Badgett
Transportation Services Procurement
One Georgia Center, 19th 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.

E. 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: **Rhonda Badgett, e-mail: rbadgett@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, 7th Floor
600 West Peachtree Street, NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30308
Phone: (404) 631-1972

D. Audit and Accounting System Requirements

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

1. Firm(s) should have an accounting system in place to meet requirements of 48 CFR Part 31 and, in the case of non-profit organizations, OMB Circular A-122.
2. Any firm that currently has an aggregate contract amount exceeding $250,000 should have submitted their yearly CPA overhead audit **no later than June 30 of each year**.
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 1st of each year, any consultant firm that is under contract with the Department as a prime or sub consultant shall provide to the Department's Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) a current list of all former Department employees employed by the firm and a document that certifies the responsibilities of those employees as it relates to the current contracts with the Department. This certification document shall attest to the fact that over the last year no former Department employee that is employed by their firm has worked on a contract between the Department and their firm where that employee, when employed by the Department, had direct involvement with the selection, award and/or administration of the consultant contract. Any consultant firm entering into a contract with the Department for the first time as a prime or sub consultant shall provide the initial required list of former Department employees and certification prior to the contract effective date. If the Department's CPO determines at any point during a contract that an actual conflict exists as it relates to the above paragraph, then the CPO shall have the authority to issue a stop work order on that contract.

EXHIBIT I-1

Project/Contract 1

1. Project Numbers: CSSTP-0007-00(856)
2. PI Numbers: 0007856
3. County:He nry
4. Description: SR 155 FROM I-75 TO SR 42 / US 23

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Urban Roadway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA
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)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.09	Traffic Control Systems Analysis, Design and Implementation
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrologic Studies (Roadway)
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

This project includes the widening of SR 155 from I-75 to SR 42 in Henry County. According to GDOT's Geo Counts 2013 traffic data, the current Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) on SR 155 ranges between 16,530 and 17,810. The corresponding Level of Service (LOS), as calculated in Highway Capacity Soft (HCS) 2010, is LOS "E". The Consultant shall provide concept development and development of the environmental document including all required special studies to carry the project to an approved concept report. All required engineering studies are considered part of the scope of services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process, Electronic Data Guidelines, Plan Presentation Guide, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual. The scope of the project shall include an analysis of the project area and corridor and any required field work in order to facilitate development of the project through an approved concept report and determination of logical termini. Scoping of the project and determining logical termini is a critical task of this scope and must be accomplished while considering other potential projects in the area which include: PI 0008336, which proposes to widen SR 155 from SR 42 to Racetrack Rd; and PI 0009156/0009157, which proposes managed lanes on 1-75 from SR 155 to SR 138. Henry County is preparing (with local funding) a feasibility study of a proposed new 1-75 interchange between exits 218 & 212, intended to improve access to 1-75 for freight traffic. The proposed interchange project is not programmed. Additionally, in order to properly scope the final project, traffic data will potentially need to be gathered from Bill Gardner Parkway on the south end all the way to SR 81 on the north end which have both been identified as potential project termini either for this project or other potential projects in the future in the case where a single environmental document is developed and the construction is phased over multiple projects.

Task Order #1 is expected to be Traffic Analysis, Public Involvement Plan and Engagement, Approval of Logical Termini, Value Engineering (VE) Study, Initial Environmental Studies, Concept Approval (pending negotiation discussions).

A. Concept Report:

1. Traffic Studies.
2. Cost estimates.
3. Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
4. Approved Concept Report.
5. Concept Design Data Book.

B. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies surveys reports and assessment of effects (i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology,inc luding I-bat if required, Archaeology.
2. Determine potential logical termini and submit form for approval.
3. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document:

    a. Environmental Assessment (EA).
    b. One (1) NEPA document reevaluation for Construction.

4. Preparation of a NW23 Section 404 permit application.
5. Aquatic Survey.
6. Stream Buffer Variance.
7. Wetland Mitigation, if required.
8. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
9. Public Involvement (one [1]po ssible detour/Public Information Open House [PIOH]).
10. Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
11. Certification for Right-of-Way.
12. Certification for Let.
13. Prepare for and attend the PFPRs and FFPRs.

C. Preliminary Design:

1. Pavement Evaluation/Underground Storage Tanks /Soil Survey.
2. Field Surveys (using the guidance provided in the GDOT Survey Manual).
3. Constructability Meeting participation.
4. Cost Estimation (CES) with annual updates.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
6. Location and Design Report.
7. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

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

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way (ROW) plans and staking.
2. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.

E. Final Design:

1. Final Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) Package.
2. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR)p articipation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
3. Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Report.
4. Erosion Control Plans.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
6. Cost Estimate (CES) Final cost estimate.
7. Amendments & Revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.

F. Construction:

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

G. Attendance in and writing minutes of monthly meetings to discuss progress and/or issues (additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).
H. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Package, address/respond to comments, and make plan changes.
I. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute preliminary and final roadway plans and all supporting disciplines (signing and marking, erosion control, ROW, Utilities, etc.) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.

7. Related Key Team Leader(s):

A. Roadway Design Lead.
B. NEPA Lead.

8. The proposed schedule for milestone dates is as follows:

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – July 31, 2015.
B. Approved Concept Report – May 5, 2016.
C. Preliminary Field Plan Review – January 28, 2018.
D. Environmental Approval – September 2018.
E. Right of Way Plans Approved – November 2018.
F. Right of Way Authorization – January 2018.
G. Final Field Plan Review – August 2019.
H. Final Plans Submitted for Letting - October 2020.
I. Let Contract to Construction – December 2020.

EXHIBIT I-2

Project/Contract 2

1. Project Numbers: STP00-0186-01(025) & BRST0-0186-01(041)
2. PI Numbers: 621720 & 632921
3. County: Paulding
4. Description: SR 92 from Nebo Road to SR 120 including Powder Springs Creek Bridge (PI # 621720)
   &
   SR 92 @ CR 511-Southern Railroad Bridge Replacement in Hiram (PI # 632921)

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Urban Roadway Design
3.03	Multi-Lane Urban Roadway Widening and Reconstruction

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA
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)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
4.01	Minor Bridge Design
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
5.04	Aerial Photography
5.05	Photogrammetry
5.07	Cartography
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)
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide Architectural and Engineering Design Services for approximately 5.7 miles along the two projects (PI#'s 621720 & 632921).

The proposed construction per the approved concept report dated February 9, 2005 will provide two, 12' lanes in each direction separated by a 20' raised median, curb and gutter, the proposed 5' sidewalks, will now be proposed as a multi-use trail and turn lanes at major intersections. The existing bridges over the Southern Railroad (PI # 632921) and the Silver Comet Trail will be replaced. The original design load capacities are H-15 and the sufficiency ratings on the structures are 48 and 47.9 respectively. Traffic will be maintained during construction.

Task Order #1 is expected to be for the completion of preliminary and Right-of-Way (ROW) plans including MS4 and Environmental Assessment (EA) approval.

A. Revise Concept Report:

1. Approval of Concept Report to include the multi-use trail and the narrowed lanes in the roadway typical section.

B. Database Preparation:

1. Validation of existing survey database, submit 621720/632921 survey for GDOT Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) approval, and revise if required.
2. Stake centerline/bridges for Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), Stake ROW and easements.
3. Conversion of CAICE database to IN-Roads.

C. Environmental Documents:

1. Conduct one (1) potential Public Information Open House (PIOH).
2. Conducton e (1) Public Hearing Open House (PHOH), Roadway Section & Bridge Replacement.
3. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) approved Draft EAs to complete the final Environmental Assessments with an Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impact (EA/FONSI) (621720 & 632921). Share one (1) document.
4. Update special studies and EA as required at project milestones.
5. Section 4(f) evaluation, as required.
6. Storm Water Management for Ecology.
7. Attend Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).

D. Preliminary Design and Plans:

1. Finalize Preliminary Roadway Design Plans, for 631720 and 632921 to achieve Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR). Plans are currently at approx. 80 - 90%.
2. Transportation Enhancements (TE) Study for Signal Documentation.
3. Review erosion control requirements that will impact Right-of-Way (ROW) (MS4).
4. Retaining Wall Locations and Envelopes.
5. Roundabout with Feasibility Studies.
6. Prepare for, attend and respond to the PFPR.
7. Preliminary Utility Plans.
8. Correction/Revisions of Preliminary Utility Plans.

E. Right of Way Plans:

1. Prepare Right-of-Way plans and revisions,as necessary (assume one [1] revision per parcel).

F. Final Design and Plans

1. Provide final roadway plans, retaining wall plans, approved pavement design, final bridge plans, special provisions as necessary, etc. for the Plans, Specification and Estimates (PS&E) deliverable.
2. Bridge design using Load Resistance Factor Design (LRFD).
3. Prepare lighting plans,if necessary.
4. Prepare for, attend and respond to the Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
5. Address Request for Information (RFI) during bid and construction process.
6. Prepare "Use on Construction" plan revisions and/or Amendments.
7. Railroad Coordination.
8. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans Revisions.
9. Roundabout – SR 92 @ East Paulding Middle School.
10. Final Signal, Signing and Marking Plans – SR 92 @ Main Street.
11. Final Utilities Plans.
12. Corrected/Revisions of Final Utilities Plans.

G. Construction Phase:

1. Review Shop Drawings.
2. Prepare Site Condition Reviews.
3. Site Condition Revisions.

H. Deliverables, to include but not limited to:

1. GDOT Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) approved survey for 621720 & 632921.
2. Conversion of database from CAICE to IN-Roads.
3. Approved Design Exceptions/Variances:

   a. Narrow Lanes & Median Width, and others that may be required.

4. One (1) Approved Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impact (EA/FONSI).
5. One (1) re-evaluations of each EA/FONSI (Construction) and ROW reevaluation.
6. Approved Bridge Layout Plans.
7. Approved Revised Concept Report:

   a. Narrow Lanes & Median Width.
   b. Multi-use Trails.

8. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Deliverables.
9. Approved Right-of-Way plans.
10. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Deliverables.
11. Final Plans Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) package for projects.
12. Revised "Use-on Construction" plans and/or quantities.
13. MS4 design and analysis.

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

H. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Package, address/respond to comments, and make plan changes.

I. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute preliminary and final roadway plans and all supporting disciplines (signing and marking, erosion control, ROW, Utilities, etc.) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.

7. Related Key Team Leader(s)

   A. Roadway Design Lead.
   B. NEPA Lead.

8. Available Information:

   1. Final Feasibility Report.
   2. Draft Environmental Assessment Report.

   *Project specific information can be accessed at the following website:
   http://mydocs.dot.ga.gov/info/publicdownloads/Downloads/Forms/AllItems.aspx,

   This link will take you directly to the GDOT Public Downloads page, and follow the steps below:

   A. Expand the "Transportation Services Procurement" folder.
   B. Highlight the appropriate **RFQ-484-031315 (B1-2015) Available Project Files** folder (all files in this folder will appear at the bottom of the dialogue box).
   C. Select and open the desired file(s).

   The below listed documents have already been completed in-house and are available upon request:

   1. Preliminary Plans – CAICE and MicroStation V7.
   2. Environmental Sensitive Areas Delineations – MicroStation and DGN files.
   3. Approved Concept Report, dated February 9, 2005.
   4. Signal Warrant Studies – SR 92 @ Main Street.
   5. Roundabout Feasibility Study – SR 92 @ East Paulding Middle School.

9. An expected schedule includes the following milestone dates:

   A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – July 31, 2015.
   B. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – October 24, 2016.
   C. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans Approved – August 3, 2017.
   D. Environmental Documental Approval – September 30, 2018.
   E. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – May 5, 2017.
   F. Final Plans for Letting – June 10, 2020.
   G. Let Contract – August 21, 2020.

EXHIBIT I-3

Project/Contract 3

1. Project Numbers: NH000-0018-01(059)
2. PI Numbers: 621570
3. County:Pa ulding
4. Description: SR 61 FM S OF CR 467/DALLAS NEBO RD TO SR 6/DALLAS BYPASS

5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members.

The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in **Exhibit IV**) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint-venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications.

The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane urban Roadway Design
3.03	Multi-Lane Urban Roadway Widening and Reconstruction

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA
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)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.08	Landscape Architecture Design
3.09	Traffic Control Systems Analysis, Design and Implementation
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.15	Highway Lighting
4.01	Minor Bridge Design
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

6.01 (a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01 (b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide development of the environmental document including all required special studies (Air, Noise, Ecology, and National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA]), preliminary construction plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, preliminary and final roadway plans, staging plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance) and construction services. All required engineering studies are considered part of the scope of services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with but not limited to the Plan Development Process, Electronic Data Guidelines, Plan Presentation Guide, NEPA and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

Task Order #1 is expected to be for the completion of preliminary and Right-of-Way (ROW) plans including MS4 and Environmental Assessment (EA) approval.

A. Concept Report and Database Validation.

B. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies survey reports and assessment of effects for Ecology.
2. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents:

    a. Environmental Approval.
    b. One (1) NEPA document re-evaluation for Construction.

3. Preparation of Section 404 permit application.
4. Aquatic Survey and report.
5. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
6. Public Involvement (Public Information Open House/Public Hearing Open House [PIOH/PHOH/Noise Wall meetings]) and associated coordination with GDOT.
7. Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
8. Certification for Right-of-Way.
9. Certification for Let.
10. Terrestrial Protected Species Survey and Report (Georgia Aster).
11. TPro and P6 updates.
12. Bat surveys and associated reports.

C. Preliminary Design:

1. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:

    a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
    b. Preliminary Signal Plans.
    c. Preliminary Communication Plans.
    d. Preliminary Staging & Erosion Control Plans.
    e. MS4.

2. Underground Storage Tanks (UST).
3. Cost Estimation with annual updates.
4. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
5. Location and Design Report.
6. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
7. Traffic Studies.
8. Preliminary Construction plans.
9. Utilities Plans (24 series).

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

1. Prepare Right- of-Way plans.
2. Coordinate field review of Right- of-Way plans and staking.
3. Right- of-Way revisions during acquisitions.
4. Coordination with the GDOT Right- of-Way Office during acquisitions.

E. Final Design:

1. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
2. Erosion Control Plans.
3. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
4. Corrected FFPR Plans.
5. Cost Estimation (CES) Final cost estimate.
6. Final Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) Package.
7. Amendments & Revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.
9. Complete Final Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:

    a. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
    b. Final Signal Plans.
    c. Final Communication Plans.
    d. Final Staging & Erosion Plans.
    e. MS4.

10. Update all Environmental Special Studies Reports:

    a. History.
    b. Ecology.
    c. Archaeology.
    d. Air.
    e. Noise.
    f. Freshwater Aquatic.

11. Utilities Plans (24 series).

F. Construction:

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

G. Deliverables, to include but not limited to:

1. Approved Design Exceptions/Variances:

   a. Narrow Lanes & Median Width, and others that may be require.

2. One (1) Approved Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impact (EA/FONSI).
3. One (1) re-evaluation for the EA/FONSI (Construction).
4. Approved Bridge Layout Plans.
5. Approved Revised Concept Report:

   a. Narrow Lanes & Median Width.

6. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR).
7. Approved Right-of-Way plans.
8. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
9. Final Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) package for project.
10. Revised "Use-on Construction" plans and/or quantities.
11. MS4 design and analysis.
12. Approved Storm Water Report (MS4).
13. Provide approved Buffer Variance & 404 Permit.

H. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews for all deliverables.

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

J. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Package, address/respond to comments, and make plan changes.

K. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute preliminary and final plans and all supporting disciplines (signing and marking, erosion control, ROW, Utilities, etc.) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.

7. Related Key Team Leader(s):

   A. Roadway Design Engineer.
   B. NEPA Lead.

8. Available Information:

   A. Preliminary Plans –MicroStation V7.
   B. Environmental Sensitive Areas Delineations – MicroStation and DGN files.
   C. Approved Concept Report.
   D. Converted database from CAICE to IN-Roads.
   E. All Approved Environmental Documents.
   F. GDOT Accepted Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) database.

   *Project specific information can be accessed at the following website:
   http://mydocs.dot.ga.gov/info/publicdownloads/Downloads/Forms/AllItems.aspx
   This link will take you directly to the GDOT Public Downloads page, and follow the steps below:
   A. Expand the "Transportation Services Procurement" folder.
   B. Highlight the appropriate **RFQ-484-031315 (B1-2015) Available Project Files** folder (all files in this folder will appear at the bottom of the dialogue box).
   C. Select and open the desired file(s).

9. The following milestone dates are proposed (see draft schedule):

   A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – June 2015.
   B. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – June 2016.
   C. Environmental Certification – July 2017.
   D. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans approved – May 2017.
   E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Authorization – July 2017.
   F. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – January 2018.
   G. Let Contract – July 2020.

EXHIBIT I-4

Project/Contract 4

1. Project Numbers: BRSST-1375-00(006) & STP00-1375-00(005)
2. PI Numbers: 630975-/630977-
3. County(ies): Cherokee
4. Description: CR 770/Bells Ferry Rd FM No Victoria to .2 MI N/Little River
   CR 770/Bells Ferry FM S Fork Way to N of North Victoria Rd
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane urban Roadway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA
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, & Community Value Studies
1.09	Location Studies
1.10	Traffic Analysis
1.11	Traffic and Toll Revenue Studies
1.12	Major Investment Studies
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
4.01	Minor Bridge Design
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
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)
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
8.01	Construction Engineering and Supervision
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide the development of the Environmental Assessment (EA) for 630977- including all required special studies & reevaluation, the Categorical Exclusion (CE) reevaluation for 630975-, preliminary construction plans, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing & marking plans, approved and final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans and final constructions plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services. All deliverables and phases of the project shall be in accordance with the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) Plan Development Process (PDP), the Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), the Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

Task Order #1 is expected to be Preliminary Plans, ROW Plans, and Preliminary Bridge Plans

A. Environmental Document:

1. Prepare National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)/Reevaluation for Construction Authorization for both projects.
2. Prepare Certifications for Construction Letting authorizations on both projects.
3. Prepare for and attend Final Field Plan Reviews (FFPRs) and Constructability Reviews.
4. Prepare all updated studies prior to construction for LET.

B. Preliminary Design:

1. Pavement Evaluation/Underground Storage Tanks/Soil Survey.
2. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:

    a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
    b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
    c. Preliminary Signal Plans, if required.
    d. Preliminary Staging Plans.
    e. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).

3. Prepare Bridge Hydraulic Study.
4. Prepare Bridge Foundation Inspection (BFI) Report.
5. Field Surveys.
6. Prepare for and attend Constructability Review.
7. Prepare Cost Estimation (CES) with annual updates.
8. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
9. Prepare Location and Design Report.
10. Attend Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), prepare report and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

C. Utility Plans:

1. Prepare existing utility plans.
2. Provide 1st submission plans to the District Utilities Office.
3. Coordinate with the District Utilities Office to provide prints, as needed, to include but not limited to Preliminary Plans, Final Plans, Use-on Construction, and others.
4. Utility or Design changes/revisions during utility construction.

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

1. Approved Right-of-Way plans.
2. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way plans and staking.
3. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way plans.
4. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.

E. Final Design:

1. Complete final plans, including but not limited to, roadway design, bridge design.
2. Attend Final Field Plan Review (FFPR);pr epare report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
3. Corrected/Revisions of Final Utilities.
4. Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Report.
5. Prepare Final Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) Package.
6. Prepare Approved Erosion Control Plans.
7. Complete Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews (FFPR & Final Design).
8. Prepare Cost Estimation (CES) Final cost estimate.
9. Prepare and submit Final Design Data Book.

F. Construction:

1. Review Shop Drawings.
2. Prepare Site Condition Reviews.

G. Attendance in meetings and writing of meeting minutes.

7. Related Key Team Leader(s):

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

8. Expected schedule includes the following milestone dates:

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – April 15, 2015.
B. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – August 15, 2018.
C. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans approved – April 2, 2019.
D. Right of Way Authorization – July 2, 2019.
E. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – February 20, 2020.
F. Final Plans for Letting – August 11, 2020.
G. Let Contract – October 27, 2020.

9. Available Information:

A. Approved Concept Report.
B. Approved Environmental Document.
C. Subsurface Utilities Engineering (SUE) Plans/Information.

*Project specific information can be accessed at the following website:
http://mydocs.dot.ga.gov/info/publicdownloads/Downloads/Forms/AllItems.aspx

This link will take you directly to the GDOT Public Downloads page, and follow the steps below:
A. Expand the "Transportation Services Procurement" folder.
B. Highlight the appropriate **RFQ-484-031315 (B1-2015) Available Project Files** folder (all files in this folder will appear at the bottom of the dialogue box).
C. Select and open the desired file(s).

EXHIBIT I-5

Project/Contract #5

1. Project Numbers: STP00-0074-02(021) & BHF00-0074-02(022)
2. PI Numbers: 721290 & 721295
3. County(ies): Clayton, Fayette
4. Description: SR 85 FROM SR 279/FAYETTE TO CR 820/ROBERTS DR/CLAYTON
   &
   SR 85 @ CAMP CREEK @ CLAYTON/FAYETTE COUNTY LINE
5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom Georgia Department of Transportation (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 the "Notice of Professional Consultant Qualifications" for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint-venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The Notice must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

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

Number	Area Class
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Urban Roadway Design
3.03	Multi-Lane Urban Roadway Widening and Reconstruction
4.01	Minor Bridge Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA
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, & Community Value Studies
1.09	Location Studies
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.08	Landscape Architecture Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.13	Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Design
3.15	Highway Lighting
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
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)

6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope of Work

Project P.I. 721295 will reconstruct both the northbound and southbound bridges on SR 85 over Camp Creek. The existing right of way is approximately 170 feet wide. The total project length is approximately 4.13 miles.

The scope of work for this project will include, field surveys and database enhancements, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, and final right-of-way plans. All phases of this project should proceed using the guidance established in the GDOT Plan Development Process (PDP). All required engineering studies are considered part of the scope of services.

Task Order No. 1 is expected to be for survey and database completion, traffic analysis and approval, and Public Involvement Plan creation.

A. Environmental Document:

1. Environmental Management and Coordination, as required per specialty. Necessary Environmental Special Studies surveys reports and assessment of effects including Bat (i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
2. Public Involvement Activities and Written Materials.
3. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents, Miscellaneous NEPA Research, Certifications.
4. Ecological Studies, Reports, Permits, Variances.
5. Historic Resource Studies and Reports.
6. Archaeological Resource Studies and Reports.
7. Air Studies and Reports.
8. Noise Studies and Reports (Including barrier analysis).
9. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Activities.

B. Preliminary Design:

1. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:

   a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
   b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
   c. Preliminary Signal Plans.
   d. Preliminary Staging Plans.
   e. Preliminary Utilities Plans.
   f. Corrected/Revisions of Preliminary Utilities Plans.

2. Bridge Foundation Inspection (BFI) Report.
3. Pavement Evaluation/Underground Storage Tanks/Soil Survey.
4. Constructability Meeting participation.
5. Cost Estimation with annual updates.
6. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
7. Location and Design Report.
8. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

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

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way plans and staking.
2. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way plans.

D. Environmental Surveys:

1. Complete all necessary Environmental Special Studies surveys reports and assessment of effects (i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, Archaeology).

E. Utility Plans:

1. Prepare existing utility plans utilizing Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) services:

   a. Consultant shall have a SUE Kick-off Meeting:

      1) Complete Quality Level B Subsurface Utility Engineering (QLB-SUE) provide subsurface utility engineering services within the project area:

         a) Use available equipment, techniques and pieces of information available to complete this effort.
         b) Perform records research with the utility companies and municipalities.
         c) Perform a survey to gather our designation marks and the utility above ground features in the field.
         d) Transfer this information into MicroStation and develop a GDOT compliant QLB SUE deliverable.
         e) Perform required Quality Level-D Subsurface Utility Engineering (QL-D SUE), including records research.
         f) Designate and mark existence of subsurface utilities known to be located within the project area.
         g) Survey to designate markings for existence of utilities known to be located within the project area.
         h) Prepare Pole Data Table.
         i) Survey sanitary sewer.
         j) Develop utility composite drawing.
         k) Discipline Management, Meetings and Coordination.
         l) Field Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Site Visit.
         m) QA/QC Electronic Drawing to ensure it is performed in accordance with latest GDOT Electronic Data Guidelines and GDOT Survey Manual.
         n) Contract Administration.

   b. Submit the Quality Level D for review to the SUE Department. Any changes shall be made based on comments from the department until accepted.

2. Coordinate with District Utilities Office to provide prints, as needed to include but not limited to, Preliminary Plans and others.

F. Deliverables, to include but not limited to:

1. GDOT QA/QC approved survey.
2. Conversion of survey & design databases from CAICE to INROADS.
3. Approved Design Exceptions/Variances.
4. Narrow Lanes & Median Width, and others that may be required.
5. One (1) Approved Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impact (EA/FONSI).
6. One (1) re-evaluation for the EA/FONSI (Construction).
7. Approved Bridge Layout Plans.
8. Approved Revised Concept Report.
9. Narrow Lanes & Median Width.

10. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Deliverables.
11. Approved Right-of-Way plans.
12. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Deliverables.
13. Final Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) package for project.
14. Revised "Use on Construction" plans and/or quantities.
15. MS4 design and analysis.
16. Approved Storm Water Report (MS4).
17. Provide approved Buffer Variance & 404 Permit.
18. SUE database with Utility Owners List and Utility Legend.

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

H. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Package, address/respond to comments, and make plan changes.

I. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute preliminary and final plans and all supporting disciplines (signing and marking, erosion control, ROW, Utilities, etc.) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.

J. Construction:

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

7. Related Key Team Leader(s):

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

8. The following milestone dates are proposed:

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – July 2015.
B. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – June 2016.
C. Environmental Certification – July 2017.
D. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans approved – May 2017.
E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Authorization – July 2017.
F. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – January 2018.
G. Let Contract – July 2020.

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

Contracting Entity/Respondent: _____

Address: _____

Solicitation No./Contract No. : **RFQ-484-031315**

Solicitation/Contract Name: **Engineering Design Services – (B1 - 2015)**

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.GA. § 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 Date
(Contractor Name)

_____

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: _____

EXHIBIT IV
Area Class Summary Example

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

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

3.10	Utility Coordination							
3.11	Architecture							
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)							
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians							
3.14	Historic Rehabilitation							
3.15	Highway and Outdoor Lighting							
3.16	Value Engineering (VE)							
3.17	Toll Facilities Infrastructure Design							
4.01	Minor Bridge Design							
4.02	Major Bridge Design							
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)							
4.05	Bridge Inspection							
5.01	Land Surveying							
5.02	Engineering Surveying							
5.03	Geodetic Surveying							
5.04	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
A.	Administrative Requirements	
1.	Basic Company Information	
	a. Company name b. Company Headquarter Address c. Contact Information d. Company Website e. Georgia Addresses f. Staff g. Ownership	Excluded
2.	Notarized Certification Form (Exhibit II) for Prime ->	1
3.	Notarized Georgia Security and Immigration Compliance Act Affidavit (Exhibit III) ->	1
4.	Signed Cover Page of any Addenda Issued ->	1 (each addenda)
B.	Experience and Qualifications	
1.	Project Manager	
	a. Education b. Registration c. Relevant engineering experience d. Relevant project management experience e. Relevant experience using GDOT specific processes, etc.	2
2.	Key Team Leader Experience	
	a. Education b. Registration c. Relevant experience in applicable resource area d. Relevant experience using GDOT specific processes, etc.	1 (each)
3.	Prime's Experience	
	a. Client name, project location, and dates b. Description of overall project and services performed c. Duration of project services provided d. Experience using GDOT specific processes, etc. e. Clients current contact information f. Involvement of Key Team Leaders	2
4.	Area Class Table and Notice of Professional Consultant Qualifications for Prime and Sub-Consultants ->	Excluded
C.	Resources/Workload Capacity	
1.	Overall Resources	
	a. Organization chart -> b. Primary office to handle project and staff description of office and benefits of office c. Narrative on Additional Resource Areas and Ability	Excluded 1
2.	Project Manager Commitment Table ->	Excluded
3.	Key Team Leaders Project commitment table ->	Excluded

ADDENDUM NO. 1

ISSUE DATE: February 27, 2015

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

RFQ 484-031315 Engineering Design Services (B1-2015)

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: A 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 W. Peachtree Street, NW
19th 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.

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

I. Written Questions and Answers:

	Question	Answer
1	Is there any available information for Contracts #1 and #5? All other contracts listed available information.	No, there is no available information for Contract #1 and Contract #5.

2	Contract #4 included Area Classes 1.11 – Traffic and Toll Revenue Studies, 1.12 – Major Investment Studies, and 8.01 – Construction Engineering and Supervision. Was it intentional to require these area classes?	No, these Area Class(es) 1.11, 1.12 and 8.01 are not necessary for Exhibit I-4, P. I. Numbers 630975- and 630977-. Please see Revised Exhibit I-4 below.
3	When will the "Available Project Information" for Contract # 2, 3 and 4 be placed on line?	**All available** project specific information has been placed online at: http://mydocs.dot.ga.gov/info/publicdownloads/Downloads/Forms/AllItems.aspx See Exhibit I-2, Exhibit I-3 and Exhibit I-4, Item #8 - Available Information for instructions to access available documents for these projects.
4	Regarding Exhibit I-1, Project #CSSTP-0007-00(856), PI #0007856, Henry County, SR 155 from I-75 to SR 42/ US 23 (pages 15-18), there is an existing bridge on SR 155 contained within the project area. Will bridge work be included for the proposed scope of work? Was it intentional to not require Area Classes 4.01, 5.01, 5.02, 5.03 for Contract #1? The scope for Exhibit I-1 states that Right-Of-Way staking is needed. Will survey prequalification be required?	Yes, it was intentional to not require Area Classes 4.01, 5.01, 5.02 and 5.03. The GDOT Bridge office will keep the bridge design in-house. The Survey will also be completed by GDOT. No, survey prequalification will not be required.

II.RFQ Exhibit I-4 is DELETED and REPLACED with the attached Exhibit I-4.

EXHIBIT I-4

Project/Contract 4

1. Project Numbers: BRSST-1375-00(006) & STP00-1375-00(005)
2. PI Numbers: 630975- / 630977-
3. County(ies): Cherokee
4. Description: CR 770/Bells Ferry Rd FM No Victoria to .2 MI N/Little River
   CR 770/Bells Ferry FM S Fork Way to N of North Victoria Rd
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane urban Roadway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA
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, & Community Value Studies
1.09	Location Studies
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
4.01	Minor Bridge Design
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
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)
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide the development of the Environmental Assessment (EA) for 630977- including all required special studies & reevaluation, the Categorical Exclusion (CE) reevaluation for 630975-, preliminary construction plans, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing & marking plans, approved and final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans and final constructions plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services. All deliverables and phases of the project shall be in accordance with the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) Plan Development Process (PDP), the Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), the Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

Task Order #1 is expected to be Preliminary Plans, ROW Plans, and Preliminary Bridge Plans

A. Environmental Document:

1. Prepare National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)/Reevaluation for Construction Authorization for both projects.
2. Prepare Certifications for Construction Letting authorizations on both projects.
3. Prepare for and attend Final Field Plan Reviews (FFPRs) and Constructability Reviews.
4. Prepare all updated studies prior to construction for LET.

B. Preliminary Design:

1. Pavement Evaluation/Underground Storage Tanks/Soil Survey.
2. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:

    a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
    b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
    c. Preliminary Signal Plans, if required.
    d. Preliminary Staging Plans.
    e. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).

3. Prepare Bridge Hydraulic Study.
4. Prepare Bridge Foundation Inspection (BFI) Report.
5. Field Surveys.
6. Prepare for and attend Constructability Review.
7. Prepare Cost Estimation (CES) with annual updates.
8. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
9. Prepare Location and Design Report.
10. Attend Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), prepare report and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

C. Utility Plans:

1. Prepare existing utility plans.
2. Provide 1st submission plans to the District Utilities Office.
3. Coordinate with the District Utilities Office to provide prints, as needed, to include but not limited to Preliminary Plans, Final Plans, Use-on Construction, and others.
4. Utility or Design changes/revisions during utility construction.

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

1. Approved Right-of-Way plans.
2. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way plans and staking.
3. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way plans.
4. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.

E. Final Design:

1. Complete final plans, including but not limited to, roadway design, bridge design.
2. Attend Final Field Plan Review (FFPR); prepare report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
3. Corrected/Revisions of Final Utilities.
4. Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Report.
5. Prepare Final Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) Package.
6. Prepare Approved Erosion Control Plans.
7. Complete Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews (FFPR & Final Design).
8. Prepare Cost Estimation (CES) Final cost estimate.
9. Prepare and submit Final Design Data Book.

F. Construction:

1. Review Shop Drawings.
2. Prepare Site Condition Reviews.

G. Attendance in meetings and writing of meeting minutes.

7. Related Key Team Leader(s):

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

8. Expected schedule includes the following milestone dates:

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – April 15, 2015.
B. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – August 15, 2018.
C. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans approved – April 2, 2019.
D. Right of Way Authorization – July 2, 2019.
E. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – February 20, 2020.
F. Final Plans for Letting – August 11, 2020.
G. Let Contract – October 27, 2020.

9. Available Information:

A. Approved Concept Report.
B. Approved Environmental Document.
C. Subsurface Utilities Engineering (SUE) Plans/Information.

*Project specific information can be accessed at the following website:
http://mydocs.dot.ga.gov/info/publicdownloads/Downloads/Forms/AllItems.aspx

This link will take you directly to the GDOT Public Downloads page, and follow the steps below:
A. Expand the "Transportation Services Procurement" folder.
B. Highlight the appropriate **RFQ-484-031315 (B1-2015) Available Project Files** folder (all files in this folder will appear at the bottom of the dialogue box).
C. Select and open the desired file(s).

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ 484-031315 C#5
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Engineering Design Services
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	March 13, 2015
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	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	3/13/2015	9:31 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
2	CDM Smith Inc	3/13/2015	11:49 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
3	Gresham, Smith and Partners	3/13/2015	9:05 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
4	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	3/13/2015	12:06 PM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
5	KCI Technologies, Inc.	3/13/2015	10:05 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
6	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	3/12/2015	11:32 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
7	Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated	3/13/2015	12:29 PM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
8	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	3/13/2015	11:36 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
9	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	3/13/2015	10:58 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
10	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	3/13/2015	10:43 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
11	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	3/13/2015	12:59 PM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
12	RS&H, Inc.	3/13/2015	12:10 PM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
~~13~~	~~TranSystems Corporation~~	~~3/13/2015~~	~~11:06 AM~~	~~x~~	~~x~~	~~x~~	~~x~~	~~x~~		~~Disqualified AC 3.15 missing~~
14	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	3/13/2015	9:54 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	

SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST

Solicitation #: RFQ 484-031315 C#5

Solicitation Title: Engineering Design Services

Engineering Design Services (Batch 1 - 2015) Contract #5

	Primes and Subconsultants	1.06(a)	1.06(b)	1.06(c)	1.06(d)	1.06(e)	1.06(f)	1.06(g)	1.07	1.09	1.10	3.02	3.03	3.06	3.07	3.08	3.12	3.13	3.15	4.01	4.04	5.01	5.02	5.03	5.06	5.07	5.08	6.01(a)	6.01(b)	6.02	6.03	6.05	9.01	Certificate Expires	Comments
1	**American Consulting Professionals, LLC**	X		X	X	X						X	X	X			X	X		X												X	3/31/2017	
	Atlanta Consulting Engineers, Inc.																		X															7/31/2015	
	Ecological Solutions	X				X		X																										2/29/2016	
	KCI Technologies, Inc.			X	X					X	x	X	X	X	X		x	X		X		X	X	X			X						X	7/31/2017	
	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	X	X			X			X	X		X	X	X				X															X	7/31/2015	
	MC Squared, Inc.																											X	X	X	X	X		11/30/2017	
	New South Associates, Inc.		X				X																											5/31/2017	
	Precision Planning, Inc.									X		X	X			X	X	X			X	X	X							X			X	7/31/2017	
	Settimio Consulting Services Inc.																								X	X								4/30/2016	
	Wilbum Engineering, LLC										X			X	X																			5/31/2017	
2	**CDM Smith Inc**	X	x	X	X	X	x		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	x	X	X							X	X	X	X	x	X	12/31/2017	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																									5/31/2017	
	United Consulting					X																					X	X	X	X		X		8/31/2017	
	Long Engineering, Inc.											X					X	X		X	X	X	X	X									X	1/31/2018	
	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	X				X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X							X		X	12/31/2015	
	GMR Aerial Surveys Inc. d/b/a Photo Science																					X	X	X	X	X								7/31/2016	
3	**Gresham, Smith and Partners**	X				X			x	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	x	X												X	**8/31/2017**	
	GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X																									11/30/2015	
	American Engineers, Inc.									X	X	X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	9/30/2016	
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X																										7/31/2017	
	Merrick and Company																					x	x	x	x	x								11/30/2017	
	MC Squared, Inc.																											X	X	X	X	X		11/30/2017	
4	**Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.**									X		X	X				X	X		X	X												X	**4/30/2017**	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																									5/31/2017	
	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X										X		X	9/30/2015	
	Gresham, Smith and Partners	X				X			x	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	x													X	8/31/2017	
	Long Engineering, Inc.											X					X	X		X	X	X	X	X		x							X	1/31/2018	
	GMR Aerial Surveys Inc. d/b/a Photo Science																					X	X	X	X	X								7/31/2016	
	TBE Group, Inc.																					X	X	X			X							5/31/2016	
	MC Squared, Inc.																											X	X	X	X	X		11/30/2017	
5	**KCI Technologies, Inc.**			X	X					X	x	X	X	X	X		x	X		X		X	X	X			X						X	**7/31/2017**	
	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	X	X			X			X	X		X	X	X				X															X	7/31/2015	
	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	X		X	X	X						X	X	X			X	X		X													X	3/31/2017	
	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	x		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	x	X				X			x					X	11/30/2017	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																									5/31/2017	
	Settimio Consulting Services Inc.																								X	X								4/30/2016	
	United Consulting					X																					X	X	X	X		X		8/31/2017	
	Contour Engineering, LLC																											X	X	X	X	X		4/30/2017	
	Roots Design Studio, LLC															x		X																**4/30/2015**	**Certificate Expires: 4/30/15**
	Sastry and Associates, Inc.																			X														3/31/2016	
6	**Michael Baker Jr., Inc.**	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	x	X				X			x					X	**11/30/2017**	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																									5/31/2017	
	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	X		X	X	X			X	X		X		X	X	X	X			X		X	X	X		X		X		X	X	X	2/28/2018	
	KCI Technologies, Inc.									X	x	X	X	X	X		x	X		X		X	X	X			X						X	7/31/2017	
	Settimio Consulting Services Inc.																								X	X								4/30/2016	
	Willmer Engineering, Inc.																											X	X	X	X	X		2/28/2017	
7	**Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated**	x				x				X	x	X	X	X	X		X	x		X	X										X		X	**2/29/2016**	
	CDM Smith Inc	X	x	X	X	X	x		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	x	X	X							X	X	X	X	x	X	12/31/2017	
	GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X																									11/30/2016	
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X																										7/31/2017	
	Thompson Engineering, Inc.											X	X					X														X	X	3/31/2016	
	Atlanta Consulting Engineers, Inc.																		X															7/31/2015	
	KCI Technologies, Inc.			X	X					X		X	X	X	X		x	X		X		X	X	X			X						X	7/31/2017	
	Aulick Engineering LLC																X				X													X	12/31/2017	
	URS Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		x	X							X	X	X	X	X	X	**6/30/2015**	**Certificate Expires: 6/30/15**
	Georgia Aerial Surveys, Inc.																																	4/30/2016	
	Settimio Consulting Services Inc.																								X	X								4/30/2016	
	Ranger Consulting, Inc.																											X	X	X	X	X		**5/31/2015**	**Certificate Expires: 5/31/15**

SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST

Solicitation #: RFQ 484-031315 C#5

Solicitation Title: Engineering Design Services

Engineering Design Services (Batch 1 - 2015) Contract #5

	Primes and Subconsultants	1.06(a)	1.06(b)	1.06(c)	1.06(d)	1.06(e)	1.06(f)	1.06(g)	1.07	1.09	1.10	3.02	3.03	3.06	3.07	3.08	3.12	3.13	3.15	4.01	4.04	5.01	5.02	5.03	5.06	5.07	5.08	6.01(a)	6.01(b)	6.02	6.03	6.05	9.01	Certificate Expires	Comments
8	**Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.**	X	X	X	X	X	x		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		x	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	**5/31/2015**	Certificate Expires: 5/31/15
	Bowler Engineers, Inc.													X				X															X	11/30/2016	
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X																										7/31/2017	
	Settimio Consulting Services Inc.																							X	X									4/30/2016	
	S.L. King & Associates, Inc.																		x															**5/31/2015**	**Certificate Expires: 5/31/15**
9	**Mulkey Engineers & Consultants**	X	X			X			X	X		X	X				X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X						X	**3/31/2017**	
	G.T. Hill Planners Corporation	x	x	x	x	x	x		x																									11/30/2015	
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X																										7/31/2017	
	Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated	x				x				X	x	X	X	X	X		X	x		X	X									X		X	2/29/2016	
	The Jaeger Company															x		x																8/31/2017	
	Atlanta Consulting Engineers, Inc.																		X															7/31/2015	
	Settimio Consulting Services Inc.																							X	X									4/30/2016	
	Professional Service Industries, Inc.																										x	x	x	x	x			12/31/2017	
	Ranger Consulting, Inc.																										X	X	X	X	X			**5/31/2015**	**Certificate Expires: 5/31/15**
10	**Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)**	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	x	X							x	x	x	x		X	**11/30/2017**	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																									5/31/2017	
	Long Engineering, Inc.											X					X	X		X	X	X	X	X			x						X	1/31/2018	
	MC Squared, Inc.																											X	X	X	X	X		11/30/2017	
	Rochester & Associates, Inc.											X					X	X				X	X	X									X	2/28/2017	
	The Sanborn Map Company, Inc.																								X	X								8/31/2017	
11	**Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.**									X	X	X	X	X	X	x	X	X		x	X												X	**1/31/2018**	
	TBE Group, Inc.																					X	X	X	x		X							5/31/2016	
	Atlanta Consulting Engineers, Inc.																		X															7/31/2015	
	Settimio Consulting Services Inc.																								X	X								4/30/2016	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																									5/31/2017	
	TranSystems Corporation											X	X				X	X		X	X	X	X	X									X	8/31/2017	
	Sycamore Consulting, Inc.								X																									8/31/2017	
	Ranger Consulting, Inc.																										X	X	X	X	X			**5/31/2015**	**Certificate Expires: 5/31/15**
12	**RS&H, Inc.**	x		x	x				x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x												x	**11/30/2016**	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																									5/31/2017	
	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	X				X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X							X		X	12/31/2015	
	Aulick Engineering LLC																X				X												X	12/31/2017	
	Atlanta Consulting Engineers, Inc.																		X															7/31/2015	
	Settimio Consulting Services Inc.																							X	X									4/30/2016	
	TBE Group, Inc.																					X	X	X			X							5/31/2016	
	Willmer Engineering, Inc.																										X	X	X	X	X			2/28/2017	
~~13~~	~~**TranSystems Corporation**~~											~~X~~	~~X~~				~~X~~	~~X~~		~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~									~~X~~	~~**8/31/2017**~~	~~**DISQUALIFIED**~~
	GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X																									11/30/2015	
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X																										7/31/2017	
	Sycamore Consulting, Inc.								X																									8/31/2017	
	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.									X	X	X	X	X	X	x	X	X		x	X												X	1/31/2018	
	Lose & Associates, Inc.															X																		11/30/2017	
	Aulick Engineering LLC																X				X												X	12/31/2017	
	Settimio Consulting Services Inc.																							X	X									4/30/2016	
	United Consulting					X																					X	X	X	X		X		8/31/2017	
	Ranger Consulting, Inc.																										X	X	X	X	X			**5/31/2015**	**Certificate Expires: 5/31/15**
14	**Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.**											X	X				X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X						X	**8/31/2015**	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																									5/31/2017	
	Contour Engineering, LLC																											X	X	X	X	X		4/30/2017	
	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.									X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	x	X												X	11/30/2016	
	GMR Aerial Surveys Inc. d/b/a Photo Science																					X	X	X	X	X								7/31/2015	
	Wilburn Engineering, LLC										X			X	X																			5/31/2017	

GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS
RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #5)
Engineering Design Services (B1-2015)

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

Coordination and Communication

Rhonda Badgett 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 providedc opies 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,preliminar y scoring,and comments MUST be completed prior to the Selection Committee Meeting and must be sent to the Procurement Facilitator by the deadline given in order to make efficient and effective usage of all Selection Committee Members time.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATING AVAILABILITY

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

Evaluation Meeting:

All completed Scoring Forms with the preliminary scores and comments for each criteria of each firm, must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Friday, March 27, 2015. 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, May 07, 2015. 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:	***Engineering Design Services***
Solicitation #:	***RFQ 484-031315 C#5***

PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Preliminary Scoring based on Published Criteria

(This Page For GDOT Use)

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING) Sum of Individual Rankings	(RANKING) Group Ranking
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	**31**	**11**
CDM Smith Inc	**3**	**1**
Gresham, Smith and Partners	**39**	**13**
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	**3**	**2**
KCI Technologies, Inc.	**15**	**5**
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	**3**	**3**
Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated	**3**	**4**
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	**36**	**12**
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	**15**	**6**
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	**15**	**7**
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	**15**	**8**
RS&H, Inc.	**19**	**9**
~~**TranSystems Corporation**~~	~~**39**~~	~~**13**~~
Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	**30**	**10**

1	CDM Smith Inc
2	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.
3	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
4	Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated
5	KCI Technologies, Inc.
6	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants
7	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)
8	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
9	RS&H, Inc.
10	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.
11	American Consulting Professionals, LLC
12	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.
13	Gresham, Smith and Partners
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
~~23~~	
24	

Evaluator 1

Evaluation Criteria →	Experience and Qualifications	Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Phase One Evaluator 1 Individual	
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***		
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	200	10
CDM Smith Inc	Adequate	Good	325	1
Gresham, Smith and Partners	Poor	Poor	0	13
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	1
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	5
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	1
Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated	Adequate	Good	325	1
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Poor	100	12
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Good	Adequate	300	5
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	Good	Adequate	300	5
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	5
RS&H, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
~~TranSystems Corporation~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~13~~
Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	10
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***	***500***	*%*

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #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

Firm Name: American Consulting Professionals

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20% — Assigned Rating → ~~adequate~~ marginal

Comments:
PM - 20 years exp, listed relative projects, not sure of his role (engineering)
Bridge - 13 years, listed as Bridge Lead on several projects
NEPA - 15 years, listed project # in Ports St. Lucie as Rollaway GDOT PDP only listed roundabout and TE projects.
Roadway - 18 years, listed (2) urban widenings and QC/QA on other projects
Prime - listed similar scope project exp.

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

Comments:
- Key Team Leaders appear to have ample time to commit
- Prime - appears to have adequate staff

Firm Name: COM Smith

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

Comments:
PM - 20 years exp, listed relative PM and engineering exp.
Roadway - 12 years exp, listed min. exp. only assisted in 2/3 projects listed
NEPA - 27 years exp. Listed relative NEPA exp.
Bridge - 11 years, listed only 1 projects as Bridge Engr. 2/3 he was ec/QA
Prime - listed adequate relative exp.

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

Comments:
- Key Team leaders appear to have ample time to commit
- Prime - org chart/narrative listed adequate resources

Firm Name: Gresham Smith + Partners

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

Comments:
PM - 23 years exp. listed several related projects, however didn't see where he was listed as PM in writeups
Roadway - 20 years, listed as roadway on several widening projects
NEPA - 26 years. NEPA Lead on several large projects.
Bridge - Not listed
Prime - listed adequate exp.

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30% — Assigned Rating → ~~adequate~~ poor

Comments:
Team listed ~~as bridge designers~~ minor bridge design. made mention of Bridge Design Lead in narrative but not on resource Chart

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #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

Firm Name: H+L

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating →	adequate/~~good~~

Comments:
PM - 25 years exp. Listed several like projects as PM
Roadway - Not registered in GA, Was roadway lead on Concept for this project 4/50 on a roadway widening project
Bridge - Lead designer on several BR projects, 15 years exp.
NEPA - 21 years exp. Good relative exp.
Prime - Did concept report, listed other similar projects

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

Comments:
Key Team Leads have good capacity
Resources of Firm appear good for scope/schedule of this project

Firm Name: K C I

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

Comments:
PM - 35+ years, 10 years as PM, has design background. Has good recent relat exp.
Roadway 15 years, Lead on several widening projects.
Bridge 25 years - Good project design exp.
NEPA - 18+ years, Both design and NEPA exp.
Prime - BR projects, widening projects

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

Comments:
Key leads - NEPA and Bridge leads have a lot of project commitments
Prime resources - org chart appears adequate
Narrative didn't speak much about availability resources / talked about approach.

Firm Name: Michael Baker

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

Comments:
PM - 28+ years transp., not much recent eng. exp, PM exp. has been dated as well.
Roadway - 17 years exp, several 2 to 4 lane widening projects.
Br. Lyc - 16 years, bridge work associated with widenings
NEPA - 41 years exp,
Prime -

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

Comments:
Key Team Leaders - all leads look ok for availability -

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #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

Firm Name: Moffatt Nichol

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

Comments:
PM - 19 years, relative PM exp.
~~Bridge 29 years, lead on several BR projects~~
NEPA - 27 years -
Bridge - 29 years, completed several BR projects as Lead
~~Roadway~~ Roadway - 24 years, lists several 2-4 lane projects
Prime - widen projects 2-4 lanes, NCDOT, FDOT.

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

Comments:
Key Team Leaders - All have adequate capacity
Prime resources - Org chart is through and complete

Firm Name: Moreland Altobelli

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

Comments:
PM - 25 years exp, relative project exp. as PM.
Roadway Lead - Not a PE, 27 years,
Bridge - 35 years, Lead on several BR projects
NEPA - 20 years - 2 to 4 lane, other locations.
Prime - listed ODOT, interchanges, would have liked to seen 2 to 4 lane widening exp.

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

Comments:
Key Team Leaders appear to have adequate capacity.
Prime has good resource on org chart

Firm Name: Mulkey

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

Comments:
PM - 25 years exp. Has been PM on a number of projects 2-4 lane widening
Bridge Lead, good project related exp.
NEPA, 16 years
Roadway, 19 years exp.
Prime - Has several 2 to 4 lane under design

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

Comments:
Key Leaders - PM is over booked; however, July 2015 he has no commitments

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #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

Firm Name: Parsons

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating →	~~adequate~~ / good

Comments

PM - 30 years exp., familiar with GDOT PM, listed as PM on projects that where delivered when he was PE and not PM.
Roadway, 21 years, listed widening/managed lanes
Bridge, 27 years, lead structural on Gaine reconn, CSX railroad, managed lanes
NEPA - 35 years -
Prime - listed intersection project, widening urban project, BR,

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

Comments

Key Team Leads - PM has a lot of project assignments
other leads appear ok.
Prime resources appear more than adequate

Firm Name: RS&H

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating →	~~adequate~~ good

Comments

PM - 29 years - HAS exp. w/ new location, widening projects
Roadway - 13 years exp. PM He was identified as doing anything on 2/3 projects listed
Bridge 29 years, good exp. would have liked to seen more write up
NEPA - 21 years - NEPA lead on BR, new local, widening project.
Prime - Good Realtime exp

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

Comments

Key Leads - PM has a lot of assignments, Bridge and NEPA appear to be stretched too
Prime - org chart appears to adequate resources

Firm Name: Trans Systems

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

Comments

PM - 20 years exp. - good eng. exp. listed pm exp
Bridge - 12 years exp. completed design on several BR projects
NEPA - 20 years - listed as env. PM on
Roadway - 30 years - eng exp is dated, no recent exp.
Prime - County/city project exp.

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

Comments

Key Leads have good capacity
Prime resource - org chart only shows Bridge Lead as designers
write up didn't discuss a lot of support

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #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

Firm Name: Vaughn Melton

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

Comments:
PM - 27 years - Has knowledge and exp as Precon
Roadway - No GDOT exp listed, listed Int. improvmt
Bridge - 24 year - No GDOT, NC exp listed, listed BR.
NEPA - 27 years -

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

Comments:
NEPA Lead has a lot of commitments

Firm Name: Parson Brinckerhoff

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

Comments:
PM - 28 years, PMon widening projects, Lead on several others
Bridge - 30 years, Lead Structural on several projects
Roadway - 24 years, Lead engineer on several widening projects
NEPA - 16 years, NW coordor, SR 20 impr—, 140 widening

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

Comments:
Key team members - All appear to have adequate capacity
Resource availability - write up and resources appear good.

Firm Name:

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

Comments:

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

Comments:

Evaluator 2

Evaluation Criteria →	Experience and Qualifications	Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Phase One Evaluator 2 Individual	
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***		
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	200	11
CDM Smith Inc	Adequate	Good	325	1
Gresham, Smith and Partners	Poor	Poor	0	13
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	1
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	5
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	1
Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated	Adequate	Good	325	1
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Poor	100	12
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Good	Adequate	300	5
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	Good	Adequate	300	5
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	5
RS&H, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	5
~~TranSystems Corporation~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~13~~
Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	10
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***	***500***	*%*

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #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 then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points

Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm Name: American Consulting

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

PM recognizes environmental with design & public involvement; bridge - varied experience; NEPA - FL project done to GA standards? Project #1 not described (repeats 3rd project info); road lead "design support & coordination was provided for environmental documentation." Port St. Lucie project has a Palm Beach County contact (2 counties away); QC a concern as evidenced by NEPA lead project entries

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

4 SMEs for NEPA, ecology, air & noise; 1 each for history & archaeology; 2 aquatics; not a lot of depth; NEPA lead 60% available

Firm Name: CDM Smith

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

PM notes environmental including New Echota, also mentions EPM; road - same projects as PM, mentions environmental & EPM; NEPA - EAs and CEs; bridge - varied

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

NEPA - deeper with 4 SMEs; Ecology & aquatics - 2 each; history & archaeology - 1 each; NEPA lead 80% available

Firm Name: Gresham Smith

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	→	Poor

PM - 1 project mentions environmental, 1 mention spublic involvement; road - no mention of environmental; NEPA - 16/75 write-up mentions recreation 4(f) - Pleasant Hill not mentioned; no bridge lead; NEPA lead not included in relevant projects

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

4 NEPA SMEs, 1 each in other disciplines (only NEPA shows depth); assembled a team that has worked together frequently but NEPA lead not listed on relevant projects; NEPA lead 60+% available

can't address Bridge lead

Firm Name: Heath & Lineback

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

PM notes projects meeting environmental requirements; road - 1 project oversaw environmental sub; bridge notes PCE, public & NWP; NEPA notes 2 EAs; relevant project note environmental but do not include NEPA lead

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

EP only firm listed as prequalified in environmental but Kimley-Horne on team; org chart shows 1 SME per discipline - depth not shown on chart but narrative mentions "multiple in-house SMEs in each area/class." NEPA 65% available

Firm Name:	**KCI**
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating → **Adequate** Good

PM - all projects note environmental; road - relevant projects include environmental; bridge - varied; NEPA - 2 EAs, 3rd unspecified; US441 in Rabun mentioned 3 times - all note I-bat, 1 mentions brown, 1 mentions NLEB, 3rd doesn't mention 2nd species (inconsistency - good down to adequate)

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

Org chart shows 1 SME for each discipline but notes "76+ additional environmental staff;" KEA in lead but additional SMEs from EP; NEPA available 62%

Firm Name:	**Michael Baker**
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating → **Marginal** Adequate

PM - prepared PH layouts but no mention of environmental or EPM; road - relevant projects include environmental; bridge - varied; NEPA - 2 document types not noted, 3rd GEPA; NEPA lead noted on 2 of 5 relevant projects but write-ups lack environmental detail. Marginal - document type experiences listed not very relevant

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

Org chart shows 1 SME for each discipline, no indication of additional resources (several firms on team prequalified); narrative repeats qualifications of key team members, adds only that they can deliver on schedule

Firm Name:	**Moffatt & Nichol**
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating → Adequate **Adequate** Good

PM - initial discussion, no mention of environmental, 4 projects - 3 "federally funded NEPA" - only 1 provides any detail; bridge - varied; road - 1 of 3 mention environmental; NEPA - EAs, CEs; additional relevant projects do not include NEPA lead
or any of Key team members

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

Org chart shows 1 SME per discipline, no indication of additional resources though several firms prequalified; narrative - no additional information on environmental; NEPA 85% available

Firm Name:	**Moreland Altobelli**
	Assigned Rating → **Adequate**

PM - 4 of 5 projects note environmental; bridge - varied; NEPA - 3 projects primarily 106 lead, unclear how many have approve NEPA documents; road - 1 of 3 mention environmental; 5 relevant projects, only 1 mentions NEPA lead

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

DRAFT

no one to review her work

ARCHAEO PREQUAL IN QUESTION - firm lacks a full time archaeologist; 2nd archaeology firm not included; ecology does show a 2nd firm; org chart does not show depth - 1 SME per discipline; narrative doesn't provide additional information

Firm Name:	**Mulkey**	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating →	Good ✓

PM - 3 of 5 projects mention environmental; bridge - varied; NEPA - 2 EAs, district on call; road - mentions following EPM

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

Archaeology, air & noise - just 1 prequalified firm; org chart shows just 1 SME in these 3 disciplines; narrative doesn't add additional information for environmental; NEPA lead largely available

Firm Name:	**PB**	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating →	Good

PM - 5 projects, 1 mentions environmental, 1 mentions avoiding a cemetery, does note EPM; bridge - varied; NEPA - 2 EISs, 1 EA reeval; road - PM of NWC EIS; additional relevant projects include discussion on environmental but not NEPA lead

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

Org chart doesn't show depth of environmental team; PB staff just for NEPA, PI, noise, ecology & air; lists EP as support for archaeology, history, aquatics. Narrative notes 1 additional environmental staff - role unclear. NEPA lead - 55% available

Firm Name:	**Parsons Transportation**	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating →	Good

PM - projects don't mention environmental though notes he's worked with OES; road - projects don't mention environmental, does note EPM; bridge - varied; NEPA - EA & CEs in GA; VDOT on-call & FHWA Eastern Lands; additional relevant projects don't include NEPA lead

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

Org chart - just 1 SME for ecology, aquatics & archaeology but 2 prequalified firms on team; NEPA lead from Parsons but they're not prequalified in NEPA; NEPA lead 58% available

Firm Name:	**RS&H**	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating →	Good ✓

PM - projects listed include environmental issues; road - 3 projects, 1 mentions environmental; bridge - varied; NEPA - 2 EAs, 1 CE. Additional relevant projects don't include NEPA lead.

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

Org chart - 1 SME per discipline; narrative doesn't add information on environmental staff. NEPA lead 65% available

Firm Name:	**TranSystems**
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating → **Adequate**

PM - 9 projects, only 2 mention environmental; bridge - varied; NEPA - projects highlighted - EA, CE, GEPA though statement on extensive experience; road - no mention of environmental. Additional relevant projects do not include NEPA lead.

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

1 firm prequalified in environmental disciplines; org chart lists just 1 SME per discipline (NEPA lists 2); narrative doesn't provide additional information on environmental staff. NEPA lead largely available

Firm Name:	**Vaughn & Melton**
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating → **Adequate**

PM only lists bridges — Marginal

PM - relevant projects do not mention environmental; road doesn't mention environmental; bridge - varied; NEPA - EA, CE, reevaluation. Additional relevant projects do not include NEPA lead.

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

Only 1 firm prequalified in environmental disciplines though narrative notes multiple SMEs available (org chart also shows 1 SME per discipline); narrative lists 1 individual as NEPA lead, org chart shows a different individual - unclear who is NEPA lead; person shown as environmental lead is 70% available

Evaluator 3

Evaluation Criteria →	Experience and Qualifications	Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Phase One Evaluator 3 Individual	
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***		
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	200	10
CDM Smith Inc	Adequate	Good	325	1
Gresham, Smith and Partners	Poor	Poor	0	13
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	1
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	5
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	1
Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated	Adequate	Good	325	1
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Poor	100	12
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Good	Adequate	300	5
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	Good	Adequate	300	5
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	5
RS&H, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	5
~~TranSystems Corporation~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~13~~
Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	10
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***	***500***	*%*

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #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

Firm Name: American Consulting

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

Comments

Lead PM has lots of widening & design experience. No Bridge projects listed?
↳ confusing layout. Should list PM experience
Would like to see more relevant exp. from Nepa lead.
Prime → No bridge listed

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

Comments

Nepa lead busy.
Roadway eng. also has PM duties on 2 projects.

Firm Name: CDM Smith

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

Comments

Good lead experience. Listed the same project on all. (Bampton Rd Conn)

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

Comments

Good availability for all leads.

Firm Name: Gresham Smith & Partners

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

Comments

Would like to see more relevant experience from PM lead. & Roadway
Where is Bridge lead?? ~~[illegible]~~
↳ Required for this project

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

Comments

⇒ No info on Bridge design lead. Name mentioned in summary though.
↳ Required for this project.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #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

Firm Name: Heath & Lineback

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

Comments: Good lead & Prime exp. listed. Would like more roadway exp.

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

Comments: Good resource availability.

Firm Name: KCI

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

Comments: Good projects listed, Good length of underrun projects for Leads

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

Comments: Great Narrative. called out utilities/ive & exp. w/ proj. corridor
Nepa is loaded w/ projects

Firm Name: Michael Baker

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

Comments: Short project lengths for lead PM. Good Prime exp.

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

Comments:

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #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

Firm Name: Moffatt & Nichol

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

Comments: No long project length. Good project listed for Leads

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

Comments: Good availability

Firm Name: Modjeski Moreland Atlobe II

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

Comments: Good exp. & examples. would like more relevant Georgia proj.

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

Comments: OK availability w/ time commitment. Need more depth w/ key.

Firm Name: Mulkey

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

Comments: Good PM & lead exp.

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

Comments: Good avail. for capacity.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #5)	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3	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 qualifications/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points

Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points

Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm Name: Parsons Brinckerhoff

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

Comments: Good exp.

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

Comments: Roadway Design lead busy.

Firm Name: Parsons Transportation Group

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

Comments: Good lead PM exp. Good Prime projects listed.

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

Comments: Lead PM project not listed. #0006048

Firm Name: RS&H

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

Comments: Good exp for PM. Roadway lead roles not in proj. listed not clear.

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

Comments: Potential High workload for PM; would also like to see more depth on org. chart

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #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 qualifications/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points

Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points

Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm Name: ~~Transystems~~ Disqualified

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

Comments: ~~Actual roles of leads in their projects is confusing~~
~~Exp. ok. would like more detail.~~

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

Comments: ~~Good availability~~

Firm Name: Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers.

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

Comments: ~~Key~~ Lead PM exp. No Roadway projects in GA listed.
OK ↳ only Bridge replacement listed. or Bridge lead
would like more local proj. / exp. for Prime
would like to see widening projects for PM.

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

Comments: Not clear on Nepa lead.
OK time commitment.

Firm Name:

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

Comments:

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

Comments:

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

Solicitation Title:	***Engineering Design Services***
Solicitation #:	***RFQ 484-031315 C#5***

PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria FOR TOP TEN SUBITTALS

(This Page For GDOT Use)

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING) Score	Group Ranking
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	**200**	**10**
CDM Smith Inc.	**325**	**2**
Gresham, Smith and Partners	**0**	**13**
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	**325**	**2**
KCI Technologies, Inc.	**375**	**1**
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	**325**	**2**
Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated	**325**	**2**
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	**100**	**12**
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	**300**	**6**
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	**300**	**6**
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	**300**	**6**
RS&H, Inc.	**300**	**6**
Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	**200**	**10**

1	KCI Technologies, Inc.
2	CDM Smith Inc.
2	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.
2	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
2	Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated
6	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants
6	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)
6	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
6	RS&H, Inc.
10	American Consulting Professionals, LLC
10	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.
12	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.
13	Gresham, Smith and Partners

Evaluation Criteria →

	Experience and Qualifications	Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Scores and Group Ranking	
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***		
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	200	10
CDM Smith Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	2
Gresham, Smith and Partners	Poor	Poor	0	13
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	2
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	2
Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated	Adequate	Good	325	2
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Poor	100	12
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Good	Adequate	300	6
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	Good	Adequate	300	6
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	6
RS&H, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	6
Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	10
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***	***500***	*%*

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Marginal

Evaluation team agree firms experience and qualifications is marginal. Project manager listed similar relevant projects.but did not identify role played in projects. NEPA lead has very relevant project experience. Bridge lead has prior experience on several relevant projects. Roadway lead has eighteen (18) years experience but most shown as QC/QA experience. Prime showed QA/QC concerns.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

Evaluation team agree resource availability and workload capacity is adequate. Lack of depth was seen for archaeology and history in presentation and narrative. NEPA lead shows sixty percent (60%) availability. Project manager, Roadway lead and Bridge lead each have adequate capacity and availability. Organization chart lacks sufficient depth for environmental.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	CDM Smith Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

Evaluators agree firms experience and qualification is adequate. Project manager experience is adequate having worked on the Brampton Road project. NEPA lead listed both EA and CE experience. Roadway lead mentions environmental aspect in narrative (acknowledging integration process). Roadway lead has twelve (12) years experience but assisted with only two (2) projects. Evaluators voiced concern about lack of Lead experience on previous projects. Bridge lead listed two (2) relevant projects- has actual experience on one (1) only.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluation team agree resource availability and workload capacity is good. Organization chart is substantial displaying availability of two (2) hydraulic resources. Roadway lead and Bridge lead show high level of availability with the ability to take on additional work. History and archaeology narrative lack depth listing only two (2) people- did not identify any additional resources for this project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Gresham, Smith and Partners	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Poor

Evaluators agree firms experience and qualifications is poor. Would have liked to see more relevant project work experience. Project manager and team leads listed nonsimilar project experience.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Poor

Evaluators agree firms resource availability and workload capacity is poor. Narrative provided adequate depth but information is repeated several times.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

Evaluators agree firms experience and qualification is adequate. Project manager included project with environmental aspects. Project manager has good relevant experience listing several similar projects. Bridge lead has over fifteen (15) years experience with similar project experience. Roadway lead has less than ten (10) years experience and is not registered in the State of Georgia. NEPA lead has good experience. NEPA lead included two (2) Environmental Assessments and additional relevant projects.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluation team agree firms resource availability and workload capacity is good. Edwards-Pitman is the only team member prequalified in environmental. NEPA lead has 65% availability. Bridge and Roadway leads have good capacity and is able to take on new work. Organization chart listed two (2) resources under roadway design.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	KCI Technologies, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluators agree firms experience and qualifications is good. Project manager mentioned US 441/SR 15 widening project in Rabun County, GA. Project manager has very solid experience on similar projects. All team leads have done work on similar projects. Roadway lead has 15 years experience and served as lead on several prior projects listed. NEPA lead has good experience listing two (2) Environmental Assessments.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

Evaluators agree resource availability and workload capacity is adequate. Organization chart show one (1) subject matter expert (SME) for each discipline. NEPA lead has sixty-two (62%) availability. Bridge and Roadway leads have large number of projects in various stages. Resources appear to be more than adequate.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The evaluation team agree the firms experience and qualifications is adequate. NEPA lead did not address environmental projects. Project manager has considerable good work experience on similar projects, however, none of the experience is recent (all work experience is dated). Roadway lead has experience on several widening projects of similar complexity. Bridge lead has experience on two (2) widening projects.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluators agree firms resource availability and workload capacity is good. Narrative provided adequate depth. Information provided is repeated several time. Firm indicates they can deliver project on schedule.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

Evaluation team agree firms experience and qualifications is adequate. All team leads have good work experience on similar projects. NEPA lead has relevant experience. Projects provided did not include any Georgia projects, all work done out of state. None of the key team leads were involved with projects provided for similar projects/experience. Project manager is new to firm. Organization of SOQ response was somewhat confusing.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluators agree firms resource availability and workload capacity is good. Organization chart presented was very thorough and detailed. All team leaders have adequate availability. Organization chart listed one (1) subject matter expert (SME) per discipline and presented no additional resources.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

Evaluators agree firms experience and qualifications is adequate. Project manager has adequate experience. Bridge lead has over thirty-five (35) years experience listing several project but none were widening projects. Roadway lead has twenty (20) years experience but does not have Professional Engineer (P.E.). Firm does not have full-time environmental person on staff. (MAAI prequalification in environmental 1.06 going before Pre-Qual Committee April 2015). NEPA lead experience is limited, only involved in 1 of 5 projects listed.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Poor

Evaluators agree firms resource availability and workload capacity is poor. Firm does not have 'full-time' Archaeologist on staff, does not have anyone to review resources work. Organization chart lacked depth, narrative did not provide sufficient information.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluators agree firms experience and qualifications is good. NEPA lead mentions two (2) Environmental Assessments (EA's) and is familiar with the Environmental Procedures Manual. All leads have good relative project experience. Project manager has road widening and bridge experience. Prime currently has several widening projects. Bridge lead has 35+ years experience with bridge replacement and lead experience. Roadway lead has nineteen (19) years experience and has experience on the SR 120/Old Alabama Road project.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

Evaluators agree firms resource availability and workload capacity is adequate. Firm identified one (1) subject matter expert (SME) of each discipline. Narrative provided no additional information on resource availability and access. Project manager appears to be heavy into one project (360 Macland Road widening project). Final plans are about 95% complete. Organization chart is adequate.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluators agree firms experience and qualifications is good. Project manager was/is Northwest Corridor project manager. NEPA lead noted two (2) EIS and RIB out, listed additional relevant projects but did not identify specific NEPA lead. Roadway lead has over twenty (20) years experience work experience on similar road widening projects, Northwest Corridor and I-20 project. Bridge lead has over 24 years experience on Northwest Corridor, I-20 and similar road widening projects.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

The evaluation team agree firms resource availability and workload capacity is adequate. Organization chart lacked depth on environmental. Listed one (1) person for air quality/noise, one (1) ecologist and One (1) NEPA resource, did not provide additional information for support. NEPA lead has about 55% availability based on workload. Roadway lead has tight schedule with a large number of projects- projects should conclude by mid-July 2015. Bridge lead has good availability.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluators agree firms experience and qualifications is good. Project manager has twenty (20) years experience. Project manager was preconstruction engineer on projects listed. Roadway lead has twenty-one (21) years experience, has road widening experience. Bridge lead has good relative work experience on similar projects. NEPA shows experience with EA's and CE's in Georgia.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

Evaluators agree firms resource availability and workload capacity is adequate. NEPA lead is not prequalified in NEPA and has fifty (50%) availability for this project. Projects listed show Environment Assessment for I-75 managed lane (Design-Build Project). Project Manager has considerable number of projects, appears to split time between Virginia and Georgia- this could be problematic. Roadway and Bridge lead not project heavy, availability is adequate.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	RS&H, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluation team agree firms experience and qualifications is good. Project manager has considerable experience on projects listed but did not list role/responsibilities on projects. Bridge lead listed similar experience on US 60 (Missouri), did not list role/responsibilities on project. NEPA lead noted complicated CE experience.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

Evaluators agree firms resources and workload capacity is adequate. Organization chart did not provide information on environmental staff. Project manager has a considerable number of projects in final plan stage but several are under construction. Team leads and resources look good.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Evaluators agree firms experience and qualification is marginal. Project manager listed only bridge replacement project experience. Experience listed was preconstruction engineer- no relevant experience provided. Roadway lead did not list any GDOT specific projects. Listed short three (3) lane intersection with bridge- no other details provided. Bridge lead listed all out-of-state experience, has four (4) lane bridge widening experience.			
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Evaluators agree firms resource availability and workload capacity is adequate. SOQ was unclear on NEPA lead (organization chart and narrative identify two (2) different people). All leads have good availability.			

Georgia Department of Transportation

SELECTION OF FINALISTS

RFQ 484-031315
Engineering Design Services (B1-2015)

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

Contract #1 - PI# 0007856 (Henry County)

Development Planning & Engineering, Inc.
Jacobs Engineering Group
Gresham, Smith & Partners
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

Contract #3 – PI# 621570- (Paulding County)

Gresham Smith and Partners
Development Planning & Engineering, Inc.
Lowe Engineers, LLC
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants
RS&H, Inc.

Contract #4 - PI# 630975- & 630977- (Cherokee County)

McGee Partners, Inc.
Atkins North America, Inc.
Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.
Wolverton & Associates, Inc.
URS Corporation

Contract #5 – PI# 721290 & 721295 (Clayton, Fayette County)

CDM Smith, Inc.
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Moffatt & Nichol
KCI Technologies, Inc.

Russell R. McMurry, P. E., Commissioner

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

One Georgia Center, 600 West Peachtree Street, NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30308
Telephone: (404) 631-1000

April 20, 2015

NOTICE TO SELECTED FINALISTS

To: CDM Smith, Inc.; Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.; KCI Technologies, Inc.; Michael Baker Jr., Inc.; Moffatt & Nichol

Please send an e-mail confirming receipt of this notice to Rhonda Badgett (rbadgett@dot.ga.gov).

Re: RFQ-484-031315 – Engineering Design Services (B1-2015), Contract #5
PI# 721290 & 721295, Clayton & Fayette Counties

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-484-031315), page 9, VII. Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response – Phase II Response, A & B and pages 10-11, IX. Instructions for Submittal for Phase II – Technical Response and Past Performance Response, A - E 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 scope of services, and/or management of the project, including the approach to a successful bridge design.
    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 project and project area 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.	4/20/2015	--------
2. D eadline for submission of written questions from finalists (e-mail preferred)	4/23/2015	2:00 PM
3. GDOT Receives Submittals I & 2 for Phase II	4/29/2015	2:00 PM

C. Finalist Selection

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

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

Please address any questions you may have to Rhonda Badgett, and congratulations, again, to each of you!

Rhonda Badgett
Contract Specialist II
rbadgett@dot.ga.gov
404-631-1431

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ 484-031315 C#5
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Engineering Design Services
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	April 29, 2015
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Compliant with Page # Limitations
1	KCI Technologies, Inc.	4/29/2015	12:17 PM	X
2	CDM Smith Inc.	4/29/2015	1:28 MPM	X
3	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	4/29/2015	1:12 PM	X
4	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	4/28/2015	12:06 PM	X
5	Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated	4/29/2015	12:07 PM	X

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF SUBMITTALS

Solicitation Title:	***Engineering Design Services***
Solicitation #:	***RFQ 484-031315 C#5***

PHASE I AND PHASE II -Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criter

1	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.
2	Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated
3	CDM Smith Inc.
4	KCI Technologies, Inc.
5	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

(This Page For GDOT Use)

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING) Sum of Total Score	Group Ranking
KCI Technologies, Inc.	**650**	**4**
CDM Smith Inc.	**700**	**3**
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	**825**	**1**
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	**600**	**5**
Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated	**800**	**2**

Evaluation Criteria →

	PHASE I		PHASE II			
	Experience and Qualifications	Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Technical Approach - Suitability	Past Performance	Group Scores and Ranking	
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***	***400***	***100***		
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Good	Good	Adequate	Good	650	4
CDM Smith Inc.	Adequate	Good	Good	Good	700	3
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Excellent	825	1
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Adequate	Good	Adequate	Good	600	5
Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Good	800	2
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***	***400***	***100***	***1000***	**%**

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	KCI Technologies, Inc.		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate

Evaluators agree the firms technical approach is adequate. Technical approach did good job discussing project challenges but presented no innovative ideas. Approach addressed logical termini aspects. Firm highlighted public involvement as their only special skill. Quality control (QC) does not address environmental aspects of project.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluators agree firms past performance is good. All evaluators have worked with firm in the past but not in the last five (5) years. Rating is based primarily on TSP Reference Check as project information is more current.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	CDM Smith Inc.		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluators agree firms technical approach is good. Firm presented overall good technical approach with detailed discussion on bridge and alignment. Presented innovative bridge design strategy. Identified project challenges and presented very specific approach for challenges identified. Technical approach showed a familiarity with area and project issues.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluators agree firms past performance is good. Two (2) evaluators have worked with firm and had good experience with projects worked by firm.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Excellent

Evaluators agree firms technical approach is excellent. Approach discussed coordination with all team members in detail. Quality assurance identifies multi-level independent reviews. Presented a very thorough and specific project approach. Identified project challenges and presented possible resolution(s) for each challenge presented. Project schedule presented.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Excellent

Evaluators agree firms past performance is excellent. One (1) evaluator recently worked with firm on project stating firm performed well. Other evaluators have no recent involvement but prior experience with firm was good.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate

Evaluation team agree firms technical approach is adequate. Technical approach did not offer any unique or innovative ideas for project. Overall the approach was much too general offering too few project specific details. There was no mention of right-of-way milestones.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluators agree firms past performance is good. None of the evaluators have prior work history with firm and agree to accept TSP ratings presented.

RFQ	RFQ 484-031315 C#5	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Moffatt & Nichol Incorporated		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Excellent

Evaluators agree technical approach is excellent. Approach presented detailed project specific information emphasizing ecology and community. Approach pointed out and discussed details of corridor challenges and addressed consequences if issues are not addressed. Approach detailed roadway and bridge design.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluators agree firms past experience is good. Evaluators have no prior work experience with firm and each agree with the TSP rating presented.

RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #5), PI # 721290 & 721295-
Engineering Design Services

Reference Check Scores for
CDM Smith, Inc.

Reference A

Firm Name	Moffat & Nichol		
Project Name	Brampton Road Connector		
Project Manager	Michael Thomas, P.E.	Title	Senior Project Manager
Contact Information	904-205-8531		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	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.		10
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		8
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		9
Comments	Able to come in ahead of schedule on major project milestone. Firm was very communicative, stayed on top of project. Stayed on schedule and within budget.		

Reference B

Firm Name	Chatham County, Dept. of Engineering, Savannah, GA		
Project Name	Johnny Mercer Blvd. - Street Design		
Project Manager	Leon Davenport, P.E.	Title	[redacted]
Contact Information	912-652-7800		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	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.		7
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		9
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		8
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		7
Comments	Firm performed well from technical standpoint. PIOH conducted did not go well with citizenery and community. Team presented very good idea. Very professional and receptive to suggestions and scope changes.		

RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #5), PI # 721290 & 721295-
Engineering Design Services

Reference Check Scores for
Heath & Lineback

Reference A

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation, Atlanta, GA		
Project Name	I-520 Widening & Interchange Reconfiguration		
Project Manager	George Brewer	Title	Project Manager
Contact Information	[redacted]		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	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.		10
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		10
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		10
Comments	Professional firm. Provided quality plans. Team stayed on schedule and within budget. Very responsive and kept firm apprised of what was going on with project.		

Reference B

Firm Name	Department of Transportation Barrow County, GA		
Project Name	SR 211/SR 124 Inter		
Project Manager	[redacted]	Title	[redacted]
Contact Information	[redacted]		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	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.		9
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		9
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		8
Comments	Missed terminated access in design,corrected problem. Professional and flexible.		

RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #5), PI # 721290 & 721295-
Engineering Design Services

Reference Check Scores for
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Reference A

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation, Atlanta, GA		
Project Name	SR 53 over Chestatee River Bridge Replacement		
Project Manager	[redacted]	Title	[redacted]
Contact Information	[redacted]		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	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.		10
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		9
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		9
Comments	Good team, very responsive and professional. Team was proactive. Kept GDOT in loop on project status. Maintained budget and met deliverables.		

Reference B

Firm Name	Douglas County Dept. of Transportation, Douglasville, GA		
Project Name	Lee Road from SR 92/Fairburn Road to I-20		
Project Manager	[redacted]	Title	[redacted]
Contact Information	[redacted]		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	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.		7
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		7
Comments	Firm was proactive in bringing problem issues to the table. Deliverables on schedule. Very good team assigned to project. Very professional and knowledgeable firm (firm turnover 3X). Proactiave. Maintained open communications keeping officials informed on project status.		

RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #5), PI # 721290 & 721295-
Engineering Design Services

Reference Check Scores for
Moffatt & Nichols

Reference A

Firm Name	North Carolina Dept. of Transportation, Raleigh, NC		
Project Name	Brawley School Road Widening and I-77 Interchange		
Project Manager	[redacted]	Title	[redacted]
Contact Information	[redacted]		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	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
Comments	Very large project with tight schedule. Firm was very professional, responsive and flexible.		

Reference B

Firm Name	Florida Department of Transportation (District 5), Lake City Florida		
Project Name	SR 10 Atlantic Boulevard		
Project Manager	[redacted]	Title	[redacted]
Contact Information	[redacted]		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	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.		9
Comments	Firm is very good & brand new to district. Had impossible schedule but firm made it happen. New to district with learning curve. Two PMs on project, very strong and knowledgeable. Performed really well on project. Stayed on schedule even with impossible schedule-went a little over budget but not firms fault. Team/firm provides good customer service. Strong firm, very responsible. Very communicative and proactive in forseeing potential issues.		

Engineering Design Services

Reference Check Scores for
KCI Technologies, Inc.

Reference A

Firm Name	North Carolina Turnpike Authority, Raleigh, NC		
Project Name	Monroe Bypass Connector		
Project Manager	Tracy Creech	Title	Project Manager
Contact Information	[redacted]		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	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.		9
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		8
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		8
Comments	Firm very professional meeting all deliverable schedules and staying on budget. Very complex project. Firm was flexible and communicative.		

Reference B

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation, Atlanta, GA		
Project Name	SR 133 Widening (Worth County) PI# 000519		
Project Manager	[redacted]	Title	[redacted]
Contact Information	[redacted]		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	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.		8
	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.		10
Comments	Selected firm based on team (resources) Stan Hicks headed up project. Very flexible. Met all schedules and had monthly coordination meeting to keep GDOT apprised of project status. Stayed on budget. Proactive team. Part of alignment needed to be determined before starting project, team performed well with this adjustment.		

Reference Check Summary for
RFQ 484-031315 (Contract #5), PI # 721290 & 721295-
Engineering Design Services

Questions (to be answered on 1-10 scale, 10 indicates best)	CDM Smith, Inc.	Heath & Lineback	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Moffatt & Nichols	KCI Technologies, Inc.
1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.					
Reference A	9	10	10	8	8
Reference B	8	8	8	9	9
Section Average	8.50	9.00	9.00	8.50	8.50
2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.					
Reference A	9	10	10	8	8
Reference B	7	8	8	10	8
Section Average	8.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	8.00
3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.					
Reference A	10	10	10	8	9
Reference B	9	9	8	9	8
Section Average	9.50	9.50	9.00	8.50	8.50
4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.					
Reference A	8	10	9	8	8
Reference B	8	9	7	10	9
Section Average	8.00	9.50	8.00	9.00	8.50
5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.					
Reference A	9	10	9	8	8
Reference B	7	8	7	9	10
Section Average	8.00	9.00	8.00	8.50	9.00
Overall Average	**8.40**	**9.20**	**8.60**	**8.70**	**8.50**

View assistance for Search Results

Search Results

Current Search Terms: "Heath & Lineback Engineers Inc.*"

Your search for ""Heath & Lineback Engineers Inc.*" returned the following results...

Notice: This printed document represents only the first page of your SAM search results. More results may be available. To print your complete search results, you can download the PDF and print it.

Entity **HEATH & LINEBACK ENGINEERS INC** Status: **Active**

DUNS: 933303059 **CAGE Code: 050Y5** View Details

Has Active Exclusion?: No **DoDAAC:**

Expiration Date: 12/03/2015 **Delinquent Federal Debt? No**

Purpose of Registration: All Awards

Glossary

Search Results

Entity

Exclusion

Search Filters

By Record Status

By Functional Area - Entity Management

By Functional Area - Performance Information

SAM | System for Award Management 1.0

IBM v1.P.27.20150327-1711

Note to all Users: This is a Federal Government computer system. Use of this system constitutes consent to monitoring at all times.

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
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc. 2390 Canton Road Building 200 Marietta, GA 30066-5393	4/10/14	4/30/17

SIGNATURE

Glenn Bowman

1. Transporation Planning

___	1.01	State Wide Systems Planning
___	1.02	Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning
___	1.03	Aviation Systems Planning
___	1.04	Mass and Rapid Transportation Planning
___	1.05	Alternate System and Corridor Location Planning
___	1.06	Unknown
___	1.06a	NEPA Documentation
___	1.06b	History
___	1.06c	Air Studies
___	1.06d	Noise Studies
___	1.06e	Ecology
___	1.06f	Archaeology
___	1.06g	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
___	1.07	Attitude, Opinion and Community Value Studies
___	1.08	Airport Master Planning
X	1.09	Location Studies
___	1.10	Traffic Studies
___	1.11	Traffic and Toll Revenue Studies
___	1.12	Major Investment Studies
___	1.13	Non-Motorized Transportation Planning

2. Mass Transit Operations

___	2.01	Mass Transit Program (Systems) Management
___	2.02	Mass Transit Feasibility and Technical Studies
___	2.03	Mass Transit Vehicle and Propulsion System
___	2.04	Mass Transit Controls, Communications and Information Systems
___	2.05	Mass Transit Architectural Engineering
X	2.06	Mass Transit Unique Structures
___	2.07	Mass Transit Electrical and Mechanical Systems
___	2.08	Mass Transit Operations Management and Support Services
___	2.09	Aviation
___	2.10	Mass Transit Program (Systems) Marketing

3. Highway Design Roadway

X	3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Rural Generally Free Access Highway Design
X	3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-Lane with Curb and Gutter Generally Free Access Highways Design Including Storm Sewers
X	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
X	3.04	Multi-Lane, Limited Access Expressway Type Highway Design
X	3.05	Design of Urban Expressway and Interstate
___	3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
___	3.07	Traffic Operations Design
___	3.08	Landscape Architecture

3. Highway Design Roadway (Continued)

___	3.09	Traffic Control Systems Analysis, Design and Implementation
___	3.10	Utility Coordination
___	3.11	Architecture
X	3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
X	3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
___	3.14	Historic Rehabilitation
___	3.15	Highway Lighting
___	3.16	Value Engineering
___	3.17	Design of Toll Facilities Infrastructure

4. Highway Structures

X	4.01	Minor Bridges Design
X	4.02	Major Bridges Design
___	4.03	Movable Span Bridges Design
X	4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
X	4.05	Bridge Inspection

5. Topography

___	5.01	Land Surveying
___	5.02	Engineering Surveying
___	5.03	Geodetic Surveying
___	5.04	Aerial Photography
___	5.05	Aerial Photogrammetry
___	5.06	Topographic Remote Sensing
___	5.07	Cartography
___	5.08	Subsurface Utility Engineering

6. Soils, Foundation & Materials Testing

___	6.01a	Soil Surveys
___	6.01b	Geological and Geophysical Studies
___	6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
___	6.03	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Soils and Foundation)
___	6.04a	Laboratory Materials Testing
___	6.04b	Field Testing of Roadway Construction Materials
___	6.05	Hazard Waste Site Assessment Studies

8. Construction

___	8.01	Construction Supervision

9. Erosion and Sedimentation Control

X	9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control and Comprehensive Monitoring Program
___	9.02	Rainfall and Runoff Reporting
X	9.03	Field Inspections for Compliance of Erosion and Sedimentation Control Devices Installations

Georgia Department of Transportation

SELECTION OF FIRM FOR NEGOTIATIONS

RFQ-484-031315
Engineering Design Services (B1-2015)

The Georgia Department of Transportation is pleased to announce the selection of the following firm(s) for the purpose of initiating negotiations regarding the above RFQ:

Contract #1 - P. I. # 0007856 (Henry County)

Development Planning & Engineering, Inc.

Contract #3 - P. I. # 621570- (Paulding County)

RS&H, Inc.

Contract #4 - P. I. # 630975- & 630977- (Cherokee County)

McGee Partners, Inc.

Contract #5 - P. I. # 721290 & 721295 (Clayton, Fayette County)

Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.