DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

September 4, 2014

RFQ #: 484-071514
RFQ Title: Engineering Design Services – (B2-2014), Project/Contract #2 – (PI #321960-)

FROM: Darlene Parker, Transportation Services Procurement Manager

TO: Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator

SUBJECT: **Ranking Approval**

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

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

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

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

1. **STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates**
2. **American Engineers, Inc.**
3. **R. K. Shah & Associates**
4. **URS Corporation**
5. **QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.**

The Selection Committee recommends the selection of the top ranked firm, **STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates**.

Concurrence with Award from Responsible Division Director:

Joe Carpenter, Division Director of P3/Program Delivery

Certification Procurement Requirements Met:

Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator

DJP:rsf

Attachments

Date Posted: 6/16/2014

Georgia Department of Transportation

Request for Qualifications

To Provide

Engineering Design Services – (B2-2014)

RFQ-484-071514
Qualifications Due: July 15, 2014

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

v. 6-16-14

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS
484-071514

Engineering Design Services
Batch #2 (B2-2014)

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	Count(ies)	PI/Project #	Project Description
1	Troup	321715-	SR 14/US 29 FM CR 403/Upper Glass Bridge to Old Vernon Rd
2	Fayette	321960-	SR 85 from SR 92 to Grady Avenue
3	Floyd	621690-	SR 101 FM CR 740/Saddle TR to CR 335/Lombardy Way in Rome
4	Richmond	0008356	SR 4/US 1 FM CR 1503/Tobacco Road to CR 95/Meadowbrook Drive
5	Floyd	000400-	SR 101 Widening FM South Rome Bypass to CR 740/McCord Rd
6	Butts	000760-	SR 16 Widen From I-75 to City of Jackson
7	Jeff Davis, Montgomery	0007037	SR 135 @ Altamaha River - TIA
8	Union	0007055	Bridge Replacement on SR 180 at Slaughter Creek
9	Dekalb	0009400	SR 13 From Afton Lane to Shallowford Terrace – Phase II
10	Morgan, Oconee	222560-	SR 24/US 441 Fm Madison Bypass to Just N of Apalachee River/Oconee

This Request for Qualifications (RFQ) seeks to identify potential providers for the Scope of Services for each project/contract listed in Exhibit I. Firms that respond to this RFQ, and are determined by GDOT to be sufficiently qualified, may be deemed eligible, and invited to offer 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 Technical 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 one (1) Multi-Phase, Project Specific Contract to be awarded to one (1) firm, 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-484-071514. All firms are responsible for checking the GPR on a regular basis for updates, clarifications, and announcements. GDOT reserves the right to communicate via electronic-mail with the primary contact listed in the Statements of Qualifications. Other specific communications will be made as indicated in the remainder of this RFQ.

B. Phase I - Selection of Finalists

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

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

C. Finalist Notification for Phase II

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

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

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

E. Final Selection

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

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

III. Schedule of Events

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

PHASE I	DATE	TIME
a. GDOT issues public advertisement of **RFQ-484-071514**	6/16/2014	---------
b. Deadline for submission of written questions and requests for clarification	6/30/2014	2:00 PM
c. Deadline for submission of Statements of Qualifications	7/15/2014	2:00 PM
d. GDOT completes evaluation and issues notification and other information to finalist firms	TBD	
PHASE II		
e. Deadline for submission of written questions from finalists	TBD	2:00 PM
f. Phase II Response of Finalist firms due	TBD	TBA

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

A. Area Class Requirements and Certification

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

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

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

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

- Project Manager education, registration, relevant engineering experience, relevant project management experience, experience in utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance.
- Key Team Leaders' education, registration, relevant technical experience, and relevant experience in utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance.
- Prime Consultant's experience for the previous five (5) years in delivering projects of similar complexity, size, scope, and function.

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

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

- Project Manager Workload
- Workload capacity of Key Team Leader(s)
- Resources dedicated to delivering project
- Ability to Meet Project Schedule

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

A. Technical Approach – 40%

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

- Technical approach to delivering 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 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 - Identify and discuss the primary office which will be responsible for handling the specific project and the number and types of staff within the office and how this office could benefit the project and promote efficiency.

c. Narrative on Additional Resource Areas and Ability – Respondents are also allowed one page to provide information regarding additional resource areas identified as important to the project, to discuss how the key areas will integrate and work together on the project, to discuss any information which is pertinent to these areas, to provide a narrative regarding how the organization of the team, including the PM and Key Team Leaders can deliver the project on schedule given their workload capacity. (GDOT recognizes that some individuals may be able to meet the schedule while carrying heavier project loads.) Respondents may discuss the advantages of your team and the abilities of the team members which will enable the project to meet the proposed schedule as identified in **Exhibit I** (where applicable). If there is no proposed schedule, discuss the advantages of the team and the abilities of the team members which will enable the project to move as expeditiously as possible. **Respondents submitting more than the one additional page allowed, will be subject to disqualification.**

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

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

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

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

This information is limited to the organization chart, one page of text (for the Primary Office and Narrative on Ability discussion), and the tables.

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

The following information will only be requested of the shortlisted firms. The Selection Committee will evaluate the shortlisted firms using the information provided as requested below (NOTE: Scores from Phase I will be carried forward to Phase II). 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 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 Selecton 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-484-071514 and the words "STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS"** must be clearly indicated on the outside of all of the envelopes or boxes. Statements of Qualifications **must be physically received by GDOT** prior to the deadline indicated in the Schedule of Events (*Section III of RFQ*) at the exact address below:

Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT)
Attention: Karen Oaks
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: **Karen Oaks, e-mail: koaks@dot.ga.gov.** The deadlines for submission of questions relating to the RFQ are the times and dates shown in the (**Schedule of Events- Section III**). From the issue date of this solicitation until a successful proposer is selected and the award is made official and announced, respondents are subject to the Restriction of Communication in **Section I.B.**

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

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

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

A. There are two (2) submitals 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 disqualification**.

C. Submittals must be sealed in an opaque envelope or box, and reference **RFQ-484-071514 and the words "PHASE II RESPONSE"** must be clearly indicated on the outside of all of the envelopes or boxes. Statements of Qualifications **must be physically received by GDOT** prior to the deadline indicated in the Notice to Finalists at the exact address below:

Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT)
Attention: Karen Oaks
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.

D. Questions and Requests for Clarification

Questions about any aspect of the Phase II Response for Finalists, shall be submitted in writing via e-mail to: **Karen Oaks, e-mail: koaks@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 180 days after the close of the firm's fiscal 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 Number: STP00-0005-01(020)
2. PI Number: 321715-
3. County: Troup
4. Description: SR 14/US 29 FM CR 403/Upper Glass Bridge to Old Vernon Rd

5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Class 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 class listed below:

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

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

Number	Area Classes
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)
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 14/US 29 from CR 403/Upper Glass Bridge Road to Old Vernon Road, West of LaGrange in Troup County. The Consultant shall provide concept development, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the GDOT's Environmental Procedures Manual.

Task Order #1 is expected to be traffic analysis, public involvement for stakeholders, determination of logical termini, initial environmental studies, and concept report 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 (including 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 (1 possible detour/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/UST/Soil Survey.
2. Field Surveys (using the guidance provided in the GDOT Survey Manual):
3. Constructability meeting participation.
4. Cost Estimation System (CES) with annual updates.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
6. Location and Design Report.
7. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

D. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way 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. FFPR participation, 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 reviews.

6. Cost Estimation System (CES) final cost estimate.
7. Amendments and 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 meeting 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, Right-of-Way, Utilities, etc.) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

A. Roadway Design Lead.
B. NEPA Lead.

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

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – December 5, 2014.
B. Approved Concept Report – December 18, 2015.
C. Preliminary Field Plan Review – July 28, 2017.
D. Environmental approval – March 21, 2018.
E. Right of Way Plans approved – May 17, 2018.
F. Right of Way authorization – June 15, 2018.
G. Final Field Plan Review – February 19, 2019.
H. Final Plans Submitted for Letting – April 8, 2020.
I. Let Contract to Construction – June 25, 2020.

EXHIBIT I-2

Project/Contract 2

1. Project Number: STP00-0074-02(024)
2. PI Number: 321960-
3. County: Fayette
4. Description: SR 85 from SR 92 to Grady Avenue

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Classes
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 Classes
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
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
3.16	Value Engineering (VE)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
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 85 from SR 92 to Grady Avenue south of the City of Fayetteville in Fayette County. The Consultant shall provide concept development, 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, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the GDOT's Environmental Procedures Manual. The Consultant shall take into consideration the proposed operational improvement project from SR 92 in Fayette County to SR 16 in Coweta County labeled as AR-302 in Plan 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) when developing the concept and determining logical termini for PI Number 321960-.

Task Order #1 is expected to be survey, traffic analysis, public involvement for stakeholders, and determination of logical termini (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 (including I-bat if required), Archaeology].
2. Determine potential logical termini and submit form for approval.

3. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document using Special Studies previously approved:

   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 (1 possible detour/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/UST/Soil Survey.
2. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:

   a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
   b. Preliminary Signal Plans, if required.
   c. Preliminary Staging Plans.

3. Field Surveys (using the guidance provided in the GDOT Survey Manual).
4. Constructability meeting participation.
5. Cost Estimation System (CES) with annual updates.

6. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
7. Location and Design Report.
8. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

D. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way 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. FFPR participation, 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 reviews.
6. CES final cost estimate.
7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.

F. Construction:

1. Review shop drawings.
2. Site condition revisions.

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

H. 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, Right-of-Way, Utilities, etc.) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

A. Roadway Design Lead.
B. NEPA Lead.

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

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – December 15, 2014.
B. Approved Concept Report – October 14, 2015.
C. Preliminary Field Plan Review – January 30, 2017.
D. Right of Way Plans Approved – November 15, 2017.
E. Right of Way Authorization – December 15, 2017.
F. Final Field Plan Review – April 5, 2019.
G. Final Plans Submitted for Letting – September 24, 2019.
H. Let Contract to Construction – December 9, 2019.

EXHIBIT I-3

Project/Contract 3

1. Project Number: STP00-0167-01(013)
2. PI Number: 621690-
3. County: Floyd
4. Description: SR 101 FM CR 740/Saddle TR to CR 335/Lombardy Way in Rome

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane urban Roadway Design
3.05	Multi-lane Urban Interstate Limited Access 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
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
4.01	Minor Bridge Design
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The project would consist of the reconstruction of the SR 101 from CR 740/Saddle Trail to CR 335/Lombardy Way in Rome/Cartersville Highway (PI# 621690-), approximately 2 miles south of downtown Rome in Floyd County, Georgia. The Scope of Services includes preliminary construction plans, bridge plans, right-of-way plans, and final construction plans in accordance with the GDOT Plan Presentation Guide (PPG). All phases of the project should proceed using the guidance established in the Plan Development Process (PDP). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services.

Task Order #1 is expected to be preliminary plans completion and right-of-way plans completion (pending negotiation discussions).

A. Environmental Document:

1. The Environmental Document is being completed and re-evaluated under PI 632760-.
2. Coordination with the environmental Consultant for PI 632760- is required.

B. Preliminary Design from 20% to completion:

1. Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
2. Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
3. Constructability meeting participation.
4. Cost Estimation System (CES) with annual updates.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
6. Location and Design Report.
7. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

C. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way Plans and Staking.
2. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way Plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.

D. Final Design:

1. Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) package.
2. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
3. Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Report, as needed.
4. Erosion Control Plans.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
6. CES final cost estimate.
7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.

E. Construction:

1. Review shop drawings.
2. Site condition revisions.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

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

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – January 15, 2015.
B. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – July 18, 2016.
C. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans approved – April 27, 2017.
D. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – November 30, 2017.
E. Final Plans for Letting – May 23, 2019.
F. Let Contract – August 13, 2019.

EXHIBIT I-4

Project/Contract 4

1. Project Number: CSNHS-0008-00(356)
2. PI Number: 0008356
3. County: Richmond
4. Description: SR 4/US 1 FM CR 1503/Tobacco Road to CR 95/Meadowbrook Drive

5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their sub consultants, 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 sub consultant 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 sub consultants 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 sub consultant 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)
1.09	Location Studies
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)
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
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
5.08	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)
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The project will consist of the widening of SR 4/Deans Bridge Road from Tobacco Road to Meadow Brook Drive in Richmond County. Also included is the widening of existing SR 4 bridges (NB and SB) over Butler Creek. The Scope of Services includes preparation of the concept report, preliminary construction plans, right-of-way plans, and final construction plans in accordance with the GDOT plan presentation guide. The Scope of Services also includes database preparation, environmental documentation, and permitting as needed.

All phases of the project should proceed using the guideline established in the Plan Development Process (PDP). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), GDOT's Environmental Procedure Manual and all applicable design guidelines, including but not limited to the Department's Manual of Guidance (MOG), American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials's (AASHTO) Green Book, Roadside Design guide, Highway Capacity Manual, and GDOT's Standard Specification and Standards & Details, GDOT's Design Policy Manual, and GDOT's Bridge Design Manual.

Task Order #1 is expected to be survey, traffic analysis and public involvement for stakeholders (pending negotiations discussions).

A. Concept Report:

1. Field Surveys (using the guidelines provided in GDOT Survey Manual).
2. Traffic studies (to include, but not limited to pedestrian/hybrid beacons and crash data).
3. Cost estimates.
4. Initial Concept meeting preparation and attendance.
5. Concept meeting preparation, attendance and documentation.
6. Approved Concept Report.
7. Concept Design Data book.

B. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies Surveys Reports and Assessment of Effects [i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology (including I-bat), Archeology].
2. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents.
3. Preparation of 404 permit application.
4. Stream Buffer Variance.
5. Wetland Mitigation.
6. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.

7. Public Involvement (including but not limited to Public Information Open House (PIOH) and Public Hearing Open House PHOH):

   a. Multi-lingual PIOH and PHOH (Provide translators).
   b. Hold stakeholders' meeting.
   c. Plan and coordinate with mass transit (Marta and etc.).

8. Prepare for and attend the PFPRs, FFPR and constructability reviews.
9. Certification for Right-of-Way.
10. Environmental re-evaluation, as necessary.
11. Certification for Let

C. Preliminary Design:

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

   a. Preliminary Bridge/Wall Plans.
   b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
   c. Preliminary Signal Plans.

d. Preliminary Staging.
e. Preliminary Photometric layout.
f. Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Plans.
g. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) design.

2. Prepare design exceptions and design variances reports.
3. Constructability meeting participation.
4. Cost estimation with annual updates.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
6. Location and Design Report.
7. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
8. Attend other field reviews as necessary.

D. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Ways and Staking.
2. Revise Plans and deliver final Right-of-Way Plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.
4. Prepare and attend property owners' meeting.

E. Final Design:

1. Complete final Road Plans, including but not limited to:

a. Final Bridge/Wall Plans.
b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
c. Final Signal Plans.
d. Final Staging Plans.
e. Final Lighting Plans.
f. 2nd Submission Utility Plans.
g. Final Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) design.
h. Erosion Control Plans.

2. FFPR participation, report and responses (all plan sets and other information (Requested by Engineering Services).
3. Quality Assurance /Quality Control reviews.
4. Corrected FFPR plans.
5. Cost Estimation System (CES) final cost estimate.
6. Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) package.
7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.

F. Construction:

1. Use on Construction revisions.
2. Review shop drawings.
3. Site condition revisions.
4. Respond to erosion control issues during Construction.
5. Answer Construction field questions.

G. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews for all deliverables.

H. Attendance in monthly meetings and preparation of meeting minutes to discuss progress and/or issues (additional meetings may be required to discuss major project issues).

I. Prepare, reproduce and distribute Preliminary Field Plan Reviews (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) package, address/respond comments, and make plan changes.

J. Prepare, reproduce and distribute Preliminary and Final Plans and all supporting disciplines (signing and marking, erosion control, Right-of-Way, Utilities, etc.) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

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

   A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – January 5, 2015.
   B. Concept Development Summary- March 7, 2016.
   C. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – October 5, 2017.
   D. Right-Of- Way (ROW) Plans approved – April 6, 2018.
   E. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – April 4, 2019.
   F. Final Plans for Letting – July 5, 2019.
   G. Let Contract – October 6, 2019.

EXHIBIT I-5

Project/Contract 5

1. Project Number: STP00-0000-00(400)
2. PI Number: 0000400
3. County: Floyd
4. Description: SR 101 Widening FM South Rome Bypass to CR 740/McCord Rd

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Classes
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane urban Roadway Design
3.05	Multi-lane Urban Interstate Limited Access 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 Classes
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
4.01	Minor Bridge Design
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The proposed project would consist of the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the SR 101 widening from South Rome Bypass to CR 740/McCord Road/Cartersville Highway Interchange (PI# 0000400) for approximately 3.1 miles. The Scope of Services includes preliminary construction plans, bridge plans, right-of-way plans, and final construction plans in accordance with the GDOT's Plan Presentation Guide (PPG). All phases of the project should proceed using the guidance established in the Plan Development Process (PDP). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services.

Task Order #1 is expected to be preliminary plans completion and right-of-way plans completion (pending negotiation discussions).

A. Environmental Document:

1. The Environmental Document is being completed and re-evaluated under P.I. 632760-.
2. Coordination with the environmental Consultant for P.I. 632760- is required.

B. Preliminary Design from 20% to completion:

1. Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
2. Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
3. Constructability meeting participation.
4. Cost Estimation System (CES) with annual updates.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control 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).

C. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way Plans and Staking.
2. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way Plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.

D. Final Design:

1. Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) package.
2. FFPR participation, report and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
3. Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Report as needed.
4. Erosion Control Plans.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
6. Cost Estimation System (CES) final cost estimate.
7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.

E. Construction:

1. Review shop drawings.
2. Site condition revisions.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

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

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – January 15, 2015.
B. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – July 18, 2016.
C. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans approved – April 27, 2017.
D. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) inspection – November 30, 2017.
E. Final Plans for Letting – May 23, 2019.
F. Let Contract – August 13, 2019.

EXHIBIT I-6

Project/Contract 6

1. Project Number: STP00-0000-00(760)
2. PI Number: 0000760
3. County: Butts
4. Description: SR 16 Widen FM I-75 to City of Jackson

5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Class 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

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 Classes
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 Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.16	Value Engineering (VE)
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 16 from I-75 to the City of Jackson in Butts County. 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 (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), 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.

Task Order #1 is expected to be traffic analysis, public involvement for stakeholders, 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. Prepare concept layouts and alignment alternatives.
4. Initial Concept meeting preparation and attendance.
5. Approved Concept Report.
6. Concept Design Data Book.
7. Concept meeting preparation and attendance.
8. Perform a Value Engineering (VE) study, if warranted.
9. Determine potential logical termini and submit form for approval.

B. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies Surveys Reports [i.e., Air, Noise, History, 4(f) resources, cemeteries, ecology (including I-bat if required), potential archaeological sites].
2. Determine potential logical termini and submit form for approval.
3. Determine if Individual permit is required and prepare a Practical Alternatives Report for approval.
4. Prepare for and attend a Public Information Open House (PIOH) if warranted.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

A. Roadway Design Lead.
B. NEPA Lead.

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

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – December 19, 2014.
B. Value Engineering Study – June 5, 2015.
C. Public Information Open House – April 15, 2016.
D. Approved Concept Report – May 25, 2016.

EXHIBIT I-7

Project/Contract 7

1. Project Number: CSBRG-0007-00(037)
2. PI Number: 0007037
3. Counties: Jeff Davis, Montgomery
4. Description: SR 135 @ Altamaha River - TIA

5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit 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 Classes
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
4.01	Minor Bridge Design
4.04	Hydraulic & Hydrological Studies (Bridges)

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 Classes
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
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.13	Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility 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)
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan
9.03	Field Inspection for Erosion Control

6. Scope:

The proposed project would replace the bridge on SR 135 over Altamaha River in Jeff Davis/Montgomery Counties. The Scope of Services for this project will include concept development, 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, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). 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 #1 is expected to be survey and concept (pending negotiation discussions).

A. Concept Report:

1. Complete Field Surveys (using the guidance provided in the GDOT Survey Manual):

   a. Provide survey database.
   b. Staking for bridge inspection.
   c. Staking for Right-of-Way acquisition.

2. Complete traffic studies.
3. Complete cost estimates.
4. Prepare for and attend detour meeting and prepare Detour Report.
5. Prepare for Concept meeting, attend, and document.
6. Complete approved Concept Report.
7. Prepare Concept Design Data Book.

B. Environmental Document to include a schedule and schedule updates in Primavera and T-PRO:

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

   a. Conduct Noise Survey and prepare reports (including Noise Barrier Analysis, if needed).
   b. Conduct Air Survey and prepare reports.

   c. Conduct Ecology Survey and prepare reports:

      1) Combined Ecology Resources/Assessment of Effects Report.
      2) Protected Species Survey and Report (two seasonal surveys, one report).
      3) Aquatic Survey and Report (mussels).
      4) Biological Assessment for Formal Section 7 (if necessary).

   d. Conduct Archeological Survey (Phase I) and prepare reports or Short Form.
   e. Conduct Historic Resource Survey and prepare reports.
   f. Prepare Cultural Resources Assessment of Effects (AOE).
   g. Prepare agency coordination.
   h. Section 4(f) Evaluation (if necessary). Or obtain de minimis concurrence (if necessary).
   i. Transmittal letters for all reports and application packages.
   j. Prepare environmental commitments table.
   k. Prepare special provisions, as needed.

2. Prepare National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents.
3. Prepare a 404 permit application package (General).
4. Prepare a Vegetative Buffer application package.

5. Conduct Public Involvement including preparation of any necessary displays/documentation and attending public meetings:

    a. All activities associated with a Public Information Open House (PIOH) or Detour Open House, including attending the meeting and the dry run and preparing the following materials: legal advertisement, PIOH handout, synopsis, summary of comments, and comment response letters(if necessary).
    b. Targeted public outreach activities including the preparation and distribution of project flyers (if necessary).

6. Conduct all Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
7. Attend and document minutes for additional meetings to discuss progress or issues.
8. Prepare for and attend the PFPR and FFPR:

    a. Prepare PFPR/FFPR information for Environmental Resource Impact Table (ERIT).

    b. Preparation for and attendance of Field Plan Reviews (FPR) (Preliminary and Final) including:

        1) Prepare Environmental Resource Impact Table (ERIT) and other materials for Field Plan Reviews.
        2) Attend Field Plan Reviews.
        3) Review FPR Reports and provide written responses to any environmental comments.

9. Prepare certification for Right-of-Way.
10. Updated surveys due to age, if needed.
11. Prepare No-change/change Catergorical Exclusion (CE) reevaluation for Construction authorization.
12. Two (2) NEPA document reevaluations.
13. Prepare two (2) certifications - one (1) for ROW authorizations and one (1) for Construction Letting authorization.
14. Two (2) Ecology addenda, including one (1) resurvey.
15. Prepare certification for Let.

C. Preliminary Design:

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

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

2. Prepare Bridge Hydraulic Study.
3. Prepare Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
4. Prepare Soil Survey.
5. Prepare for and attend Constructability review.
6. Prepare cost estimation with annual updates.
7. Complete Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
8. Prepare Location and Design Report.
9. Attend PFPR, prepare report and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

D. Utility Plans:

1. Prepare existing Utility Plans.
2. Provide 1st submission plans to the District's Utilities Office.

3. Coordinate with 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.

E. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way Plans and Staking.
2. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way Plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.

F. Final Design:

1. Complete final plans including but not limited to roadway design, bridge design, and request FFPR.
2. Attend FFPR, prepare report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
3. Prepare Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) package.
4. Prepare approved Erosion Control Plans.
5. Complete Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews (FFPR & Final).
6. Prepare Cost Estimation System (CES) final cost estimate.
7. Prepare amendments and revisions.
8. Prepare and submit Final Design Data Book.

G. Construction:

1. Review shop drawings.
2. Prepare site condition revisions.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

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

A. PE Notice to Proceed – December 19, 2014.
B. Concept Report Approval – October 11, 2015.
C. Approved Environmental Document – August 18, 2017.
D. PFPR Inspection – February 7, 2017.
E. Right-of-Way Plans Approved – October 16, 2017.
F. FFPR Inspection – May 11, 2018.
G. Final Plans for Letting – October 26, 2018.
H. Let Contract – January 15, 2019.

9. Available Information:

A. Design traffic.
B. Bridge Inspection Reports.
C. Existing bridge plans.

10. Assumptions:

A. Bridge to be replaced, not widened.
B. On-site detour or off-site detour required (to be determined during concept).
C. Coast Guard/Navigable Waterway permit required, coordination with Bridge Office required.

EXHIBIT I-8

Project/Contract 8

1. Project Number: CSBRG-0007-00(055)
2. PI Number: 0007055
3. County: Union
4. Description: Bridge Replacement on SR 180 at Slaughter Creek

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
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, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
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
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

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

Task Order #1 is expected to be for concept report approval, including all activities required for approval. These activities include survey, traffic analysis, public involvement with Forest Services & DNR, History & Ecology Survey Reports, initial concept team meeting, and concept team meeting (pending negotiation discussions).

A. Concept Report:

1. Traffic studies.
2. Cost estimates.
3. Initial Concept meeting preparation and attendance.
4. Concept meeting preparation and attendance.
5. Approved Concept Report.
6. Concept Design Data Book.

B. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies Surveys Reports and Assessment of Effects (i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, Archaeology).

2. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents:

   a. Categorical Exclusion.
   b. One NEPA document reevaluation for Construction.

3. Preparation of a NW23 Section 404 permit application.
4. Aquatic Survey.
5. Stream Buffer Variance.
6. Wetland Mitigation.
7. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
8. Public Involvement (1 possible detour/PIOH.)
9. Prepare for and attend the PFPR and FFPR.
10. Certification for Right-of-Way.
11. Certification for Let.

C. 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 Communication Plans.
   e. Preliminary Staging Plans.

2. Bridge Hydraulic Study.
3. Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
4. Pavement evaluation/UST/Soil survey.
5. Constructability meeting participation.
6. Cost estimation with annual updates.
7. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
8. Location and Design Report.
9. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

D. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way Plans and Staking.
2. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way Plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.

E. Final Design:

1. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
2. Erosion Control Plans.
3. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
4. Corrected FFPR plans.
5. CES final cost estimate.
6. Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) package.
7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Errors and omissions.
9. Final Design Data Book.

F. Construction:

1. Use on Construction revisions.
2. Review shop drawings.
3. Site condition revisions.

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

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

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

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

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

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

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – February 2, 2015.
B. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – June 1, 2017.
C. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans approved – June 11, 2017.
D. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – September 6, 2018.
E. Final Plans for Letting – December 18, 2018.
F. Let Contract – March 8, 2019.

EXHIBIT I-9

Project/Contract 9

1. Project Number: CSSTP000900400
2. PI Number: 0009400
3. Count: DeKalb
4. Description: SR 13 From Afton Ln to Shallowford Terrace – Phase II

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	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)
1.09	Location Studies
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 Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
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
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:

This project includes pedestrian lighting, adding a raised median in the existing two way left turn lane, and upgrading existing or adding new sidewalk to meet Americans with Disability Act (ADA) standards while minimizing structural work, right-of-way and utility impacts. In addition, multiple pedestrian hybrid beacons are proposed on this project along with mid-block pedestrian refuge/crossing islands. The Consultant shall provide concept development, field surveys, database enhancements and public involvement activities, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge/wall plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG) Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), NEPA, GDOT's Environmental Procedures Manual and all applicable design guidelines including, but not limited to Department's Manual of Guidance (MOG), American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Green Book, Roadside Design Guide, Highway Capacity Manual, GDOT's Standard Specification and Standards & Details, GDOT's Design Policy Manual, and GDOT's Bridge Design Manual.

Task Order #1 is expected to be survey, traffic analysis and public involvement for stakeholders (pending negotiation discussions).

A. Concept Report:

1. Field Surveys (using the guidance provided in the GDOT Survey Manual).
2. Traffic studies (to include but not limited to pedestrian/hybrid beacons and crash data).
3. Cost estimates.
4. Initial Concept meeting preparation and attendance..
5. Concept meeting preparation, attendance and documentation.
6. Approved Concept Report.
7. Concept Design Data Book.

B. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies surveys reports and assessment of effects (i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, Archaeology).
2. NEPA documents.
3. Preparation of 404 permit application.
4. Stream Buffer Variance.
5. Wetland Mitigation.
6. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.

7. Public Involvement (including but not limited Public Information Open House (PIOH) and Public Hearing Open House (PHOH):

   a. Multi-lingual PIOH and PHOH (Provide translators).
   b. Hold Stakeholder's meetings.
   c. Plan and coordinate with mass transit (MARTA and etc.).

8. Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) and Constructability review.
9. Certification for Right-of-Way.
10. Environmental re-evaluations as necessary.
11. Certification for Let.

C. Preliminary Design:

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

   a. Preliminary Bridge/Wall Plans.
   b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
   c. Preliminary Signal Plans.
   d. Preliminary Staging Plans.
   e. Preliminary Photometric Layout.
   f. Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Plans.
   g. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) design.

2. Prepare design exceptions and Design Variances Reports.
3. Constructability meeting participation.
4. Cost estimation with annual updates.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
6. Location and Design Report.
7. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
8. Attend other field reviews as necessary.

D. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way Plans and Staking.
2. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way Plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisitions.
4. Prepare for and attend property owners' meeting.

E. Final Design:

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

   a. Final Bridge/Wall Plans.
   b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
   c. Final Signal Plans.
   d. Final Staging Plans.
   e. Final Lighting Plans.
   f. 2nd Submission Utility Plans.
   g. Final MS4 design.
   h. Erosion Control Plans.

2. FFPR participation , report, and responses(all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
3. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
4. Corrected FFPR Plans.
5. Cost Estimation System (CES) final cost estimate.
6. Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) Package.
7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.

F. Construction:

1. Use on Construction revisions.
2. Review shop drawings.
3. Site condition revisions.
4. Respond to erosion control issues during construction.
5. Answer Construction field questions.

G. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews for all deliverables.

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

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

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

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

A. Roadway Design Lead.
B. NEPA Lead.
C. Public Involvement Lead.

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

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – January 15, 2015.
B. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – October 21, 2015.
C. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans approved – January 13, 2016.
D. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – September 28, 2016.
E. Final Plans for Letting – January 27, 2017.
F. Let Contract – April 13, 2017.

EXHIBIT I-10

Project/Contract 10

1. Project Number: EDS00-0441-00(042)
2. PI Number: 222560-
3. Counties: Morgan, Oconee
4. Description: SR 24/US 441 FM Madison Bypass To Just N Of Apalachee Riv/Ocone

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	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)
1.09	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
3.16	Value Engineering (VE)
4.01	Minor 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
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The project will consist of the Widening of SR 24/US 441 from the Madison Bypass to just North of the Apalachee River (PI #222560-). Also included in this widening will be the construction of three (3) bridges: SR 24 over Hard Labor Creek, Big Sandy Creek and the Apalachee River. The Scope of Services includes concept validation and revisions as needed, preliminary construction plans, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans, final bridge plans, and final construction plans in accordance with the GDOT Plan Presentation Guide (PPG). The scope of the project also includes the environmental document completion for the following projects PI #s 222560- & 122660-. PI #122660- is being designed under a separate contract and coordination with that Consultant will be required. A citizen advisory committee is anticipated for this project and meetings will be required as part of the environmental process.

- PI #222560- SR 24/US 441 from Madison Bypass to just north of the Apalachee River/Ocone
- PI #122660- SR 24/US 441 from north of the Apalachee River to the Watkinsville Bypass

All phases of the project should proceed using the guidance established in the Plan Development Process (PDP). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services.

Task Order #1 is expected to be field survey, traffic analysis and public involvement for stakeholders (pending negotiation discussions).

A. Concept Development:

1. Validate current Concept Report.
2. Revise Concept Report, if necessary.

B. Database Preparation:

1. Field Surveys (using the guidance provided in the GDOT Survey Manual).
2. Digital Terrain Model (DTM)/Top for all obscure areas within the projects survey limits.
3. Drainage structure locations and invert elevations.
4. Property resolution should be performed for each parcel within the survey limits.
5. All information should be submitted in the Inroads/Microstation V 8i format.

C. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies Surveys Reports and Assessment of Effects [i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology (including I-bat), Archaeology].

2. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Document. Using Special Studies previously approved:

   a. Environmental Assessment (EA).
   b. NEPA document reevaluation:

      1) PI 222560- for Right-of-Way, if necessary.
      2) PI 222560- for Construction.
      3) PI 122660- for Right-of-Way.
      4) PI 122660- for Construction.

3. Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Reviews (PFPRs) and Final Field Plan Reviews (FFPRs) for both projects.

D. Preliminary Design:

1. Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
2. Pavement Evaluation/UST & Monitoring wells/Soil Survey.
3. Bridge Hydraulic Study.
4. Preliminary Bridge Layouts.

5. 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 Communication Plans.
    e. Preliminary Staging Plans.

6. Pavement type selection.
7. Constructability meeting participation.
8. Cost Estimation System (CES) with annual updates.
9. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
10. Location and Design Report.
11. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way Plans and Staking.
2. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way Plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.

F. Final Design:

1. Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) package.
2. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
3. Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Report.
4. Final bridge plans.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
6. Cost Estimation System (CES) final cost estimate.
7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.

G. Construction:

1. Review shop drawings.
2. Site condition revisions.

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

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

J. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute 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 bridge and roadway plans and all supporting disciplines (signing and marking, erosion control, Right-of-Way, Utilities, etc.) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

8. Available Information:

   A. Concept Report:

      1. Approved Concept Report:

         a. PI #222560-.
         b. PI #122660-.

      2. Revised Concept Report for PI #122660-.
      3. Concept layouts.

   B. Database Preparation:

      1. Mapping.
      2. Survey control package.

   C. All previous completed environmental studies.

9. An accelerated schedule is required. The proposed schedule for milestone dates is as follows:

   A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – January 15, 2015.
   B. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – December 18, 2016.
   C. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans approved – September 27, 2017.
   D. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – August 15, 2018.
   E. Final Plans for Letting – December 15, 2019.
   F. Let Contract – March 15, 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-484-071514**

Solicitation/Contract Name: **Engineering Design Services – Batch #2 (B2-2014)**

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
(Contractor Name)

_____
Date

_____
Title of Authorized Officer or Agent of Consultant

_____
Printed Name of Authorized Officer or Agent

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN
BEFORE ME ON THIS THE

_____ DAY OF _____, 201_

_____
Notary Public

[NOTARY SEAL]

My Commission Expires: _____

EXHIBIT IV
Area Class Summary Example

Respondents should complete a table similar to the below and indicate by placing an "X" in the appropriate column indicating the firm which meets each required area class for each specific project with particular emphasis on the area classes which the Prime must hold as well as the 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 Engineering Design Services – Batch #2 (B2-2014)

		# 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 Resources Areas and Ability	->	Excluded 1
2. Project Manager Commitment Table	->	Excluded
3. Key Team Leaders Project Commitment Table	->	Excluded

ADDENDUM NO. 1

ISSUE DATE: July 3, 2014

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

RFQ-484-071514: Engineering Design Services (B2-2014)

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: Because of the changes to Exhibits I-1 through I-10 in the RFQ, as altered in this Addendum, signed acknowledgment of this addendum (this page) MUST be attached to your PROPOSAL.

Firm Name _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Typed Name and Title _____

Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT)
Office of Transportation Services Procurement
One Georgia Center
600 West Peachtree Street, NW
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.

I. Written Questions and Answers:

	Questions	Answers
1.	Page 14 of the Batch 2 RFQ (RFQ-484-071514), please clarify: a. Is Treasury Young the CPO? b. Is there a standard form for this? c. Is this new (I don't remember this from last year)? d. Does this just mean employed by our firm *in Georgia*? It's possible that we have former GDOT employees somewhere else that I don't know about.	a. Yes. b. Yes. c. No. d. Current list of all former Department employees employed by the firm refers to ALL that are applicable. The form is not required at this time to respond to the RFQ solicitation.

2.	a. Are the existing files available to view at your office, such as preliminary plans and other displays for the contracts in the RFQ? b. Can GDOT post the available concept reports and plans previously completed for any of the contracts for which these exist so we can review them?	Question #2, items a & b, available project files can be accessed on the GDOT Public Downloads page. Project folders are identified by Project PI Numbers: Access the website using the following link: http://mydocs.dot.ga.gov/info/publicdownloads/Downloads/Forms/AllItems.aspx Instructions: A. Expand the "Transportation Services Procurement" folder. B. Left Click Arrow on RFQ-484-071514- Available Project Files to expand folder. C. Highlight the appropriate PI Number folder (all files in this folder will appear at the bottom of the dialogue box). D. Select and open the desired file(s).
3.	Are the PE budgets listed in the PCSR for each project available for use or have those numbers been adjusted since their original authorization dates?	PE budget information will not be made available, not needed to submit Statement of Qualifications.
4.	To clarify, on page 8 at the top, Can Item B. Primary Office be 1 full page and Item C. Additional Resource Areas and Ability be 1 page as well. Your last page (page 50), indicates both together are 1 page.	Page 8 of RFQ, Item b. Primary Office and Item c. Narrative on Additional Resource Areas and Ability are grouped together to occupy one (1) page only.
5.	Do all Key Team Leaders have to be from the Prime Consultant or are we permitted to use a subconsultant?	No. Key Team Leaders are determined by the Prime Consultant, can be from the Prime's firm or their subconsultant's team.
6.	Why is 3.16 required of the team for some of these contracts? Doesn't Engineering Services use independent VE teams for the VE study?	Value Engineering, Area Class 3.16 will be removed from Exhibits I-1 through I-10. See Revised Exhibits below.
7.	None of the 10 contracts include area class 3.10 Utility Coordination. Contract Scopes for 1-1,1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 1-5, 1-7, 1-8, 1-9, & 1-10 all indicate final construction plans in there scope. Should 3.10 Utility Coordination services be added?	No. Area Class 3.10 Utility Coordination is not necessary for Exhibits I-1 through I-10.
8.	Contract Scopes for I-4 (PI # 0008356), I-5 (PI #0000400), I-7 (PI #0007037), I-8 (PI #0007055), 1-9 (PI #0009400), & 1-10 (PI #222560-) indicate services that carry the project through final construction plans. However, they all suggest that Task Order #1 is a diminished scope. Please define the actual scope of these contracts.	The Scope of Services identified for the Exhibits are the complete scope that will added to the Master Contract. The expected scope for Task Order #1 is established only to begin the project. Other Task Orders will be issued later to cover additional scope identified in the Master Contracts.

9.	Exhibit I-1 - Bridge plans have been included as part of the scope, however bridge design has not been included within the prequalification list. Will bridge design be required?	**Exhibit I-1, PI #321715-:** No. There is no bridge, preliminary bridge plans will be removed from the scope. See Revised Exhibit I-1 below.
10.	Contract I-1 indicates Preliminary Plans to include Field Surveys, but 5.01, 5.02, & 5.03 are not required area classes for the contract. Should they be added?	**Exhibit I-1, PI #321715-:** No. Survey to be completed in-house by District 3.
11.	Exhibit I-1 - It appears that survey services will be required for this project; however surveying is not included as a prerequisite. Will surveying be required?	**Exhibit I-1, PI #321715-:** No. Survey to be completed in-house by District 3.
12.	Exhibit I-1 – the schedule has 14 months between FFPR and letting submittal. Was this intentional?	**Exhibit I-1, PI #321715-:** Yes, additional time allows Right-of-Way parcels to be acquired.
13.	Exhibit I-2 - Bridge plans have been included as part of the scope, lists hydro and structures; however bridge design has not been included within the prequalification list. Will bridge design be required?	**Exhibit I-2, PI #321960-:** No. There are no bridges on this project. See Revised Exhibit I-2 below.
14.	Please clarify the length of project for Contract 2, PI 321960 in Fayette County. According to the Preconstruction Status Report for PI 321960 the length of project is 5.7 miles. The description of the project in the RFQ when measured is approximately 0.8 miles.	**Exhibit I-2, PI # 321960-:** The length will be 0.8 miles.
15.	Contract 3 - Requires 3.05 Urban Interstate Widening prequal – is this really necessary for this corridor?	**Exhibit 1-3, PI #621690-:** Yes.
16.	Exhibit I-3 - Based on a preliminary review of the project, it does not appear that there is a bridge within the construction limits. Please confirm that 4-01, Minor Bridge Design, will be required for this contract.	**Exhibit 1-3, PI #621690-:** The Department will keep Area Class 4.01 on this project for a subconsultant if structures are required.
17.	Contract 3, Are there any existing bridges/culverts in this alignment?	**Exhibit I-3, PI # 621690-:** No, but there may be a need to add them under a new alignment.
18.	Contract 3 – On page 22 under Item 7 list NEPA as a Key Lead, however, NEPA is not included as a prerequisite. Should NEPA Lead be removed?	**Exhibit I-3, PI #621690-**: Yes. See Revised Exhibit I-3 below.

19.	Contract 5 - The alignment's description is not clear. There is a McCord Drive, not Road and it's hard to pinpoint the termini.	**Exhibit I-5, PI #0000400:** The Project description has been changed from SR 101 Widening FM South Rome Bypass to CR 740/McCord Rd to SR 101 Widening FM South Rome Bypass to CR 740/McCord Drive – See Revised Exhibit I-5 below:
20.	Contract 5 - Requires 3.05 Urban Interstate Widening prequal – is this really necessary for this corridor?	**Exhibit I-5, PI #0000400:** Yes.
21.	Contract 5 – On page 28 under Item 7, Exhibit I-5 list NEPA as a Key Lead, however, NEPA is not included as a prerequisite. Should NEPA Lead be removed?	**Exhibit I-5, PI #0000400:** Yes. See Revised Exhibit I-5 below.
22.	Contract I-6 - Scope includes SUE Service 5.08. However, no Surveying area classes are included. Is this an oversight? Should Survey related services be added?	**Exhibit I-6, PI #0000760:** No. Survey will be completed in-house by District 3.
23.	Exhibit 6 - SUE and Soil Studies are included in the prerequisites. With this task only being Concept & Environmental, are these services necessary?	**Exhibit I-6, PI #0000760:** Yes, disciplines will be covered later in the Master Contract for future work.
24.	Contract I-7 - Task Order #1 indicates Survey & Concept only. Then, complete Field Surveys to include Staking for Right of Way acquisition. Please clarify if surveying efforts are to extend beyond concept for this contract and, if so, to what extent.	**Exhibit I-7, PI # 0007037:** Yes, surveying efforts will be located in future task orders.
25.	Contract I-9 - requires Preliminary Plans to include SUE Plans per the advertisement. SUE services 5.08 is not a required area class for the contract. Should it be?	**Exhibit I-9, PI # 0009400-:** Yes, Area Class 5.08 will be added. See Revised Exhibit I-9 below.
26.	Exhibit I-10 - Based on the scope of the project and numerous bridges, it appears that the prime consultant should be prequalified in 4.01, Minor Bridge Design. Please confirm that the prime consultant does not have to be prequalified in bridge design.	**Exhibit I-10, PI # 222560-:** Prime Consultant does not have to be prequalified in Area Class 4.01, Minor Bridge Design.

27.	Exhibit I-10, Since aerial surveys and photogrammetry are not listed in the area class table and a DTM for obscured areas only is noted in the scope on P. 43, are we to assume that aerial mapping is complete and only limited ground-run survey is required to merge with the mapping DTM to complete the database preparation phase of the project?	**Exhibit I-10, PI # 222560-:** No, surveys and mapping will be completed in-house by GDOT.

II. RFQ Section I., General Project Information, Contract Table is DELETED and REPLACED by the below:

Contract	Count(ies)	PI/Project #	Project Description
1	Troup	321715-	SR 14/US 29 FM CR 403/Upper Glass Bridge to Old Vernon Rd
2	Fayette	321960-	SR 85 from SR 92 to Grady Avenue
3	Floyd	621690-	SR 101 FM CR 740/Saddle TR to CR 335/Lombardy Way in Rome
4	Richmond	0008356	SR 4/US 1 FM CR 1503/Tobacco Road to CR 95/Meadowbrook Drive
5	Floyd	0000400	SR 101 Widening FM South Rome Bypass to CR 740/McCord Drive
6	Butts	0000760	SR 16 Widen From I-75 to City of Jackson
7	Jeff Davis, Montgomery	0007037	SR 135 @ Altamaha River - TIA
8	Union	0007055	Bridge Replacement on SR 180 at Slaughter Creek
9	Dekalb	0009400	SR 13 From Afton Lane to Shallowford Terrace – Phase II
10	Morgan, Oconee	222560-	SR 24/US 441 Fm Madison Bypass to Just N of Apalachee River/Oconee

III. RFQ Exhibits I-1 through I-10 are DELETED and REPLACED by the attached Exhibits I-1 through I-10.

EXHIBIT I-1

Project/Contract #1

1. Project Number: STP00-0005-01(020)
2. PI Number: 321715-
3. County: Troup
4. Description: SR 14/US 29 FM CR 403/Upper Glass Bridge to Old Vernon Rd

5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Class 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 classe listed below:

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

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA
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)
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 14/US 29 from CR 403/Upper Glass Bridge Road to Old Vernon Road, West of LaGrange in Troup County. The Consultant shall provide concept development, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, hydraulic and hydrological studies, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

Task Order #1 is expected to be traffic analysis, public involvement for stakeholders, determination of logical termini, initial environmental studies, and concept report 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 (including 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 (1 possible detour/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/UST/Soil Survey.
2. Field Surveys (using the guidance provided in the GDOT Survey Manual):
3. Constructability meeting participation.
4. Cost Estimation System (CES) with annual updates.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
6. Location and Design Report.
7. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

D. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way 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. FFPR participation, 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 reviews.
6. Cost Estimation System (CES) final cost estimate.
7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.

F. Construction:

1. Review shop drawings.
2. Use on Construction revisions
3. Site condition revisions.

G. Attendance in monthly meetings and preparation of meeting minutes s 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, Right-of-Way, Utilities, etc.) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

A. Roadway Design Lead.
B. NEPA Lead.

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

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – December 5, 2014.
B. Approved Concept Report – December 18, 2015.
C. Preliminary Field Plan Review – July 28, 2017.
D. Environmental approval – March 21, 2018.
E. Right of Way Plans approved – May 17, 2018.
F. Right of Way authorization – June 15, 2018.
G. Final Field Plan Review – February 19, 2019.
H. Final Plans submitted for Letting – April 7, 2020.
I. Let Contract to Construction – June 24, 2020.

EXHIBIT I-2

Project/Contract #2

1. Project Number: STP00-0074-02(024)
2. PI Number: 321960-
3. County: Fayette
4. Description: SR 85 from SR 92 to Grady Avenue

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	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
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
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 85 from SR 92 to Grady Avenue south of the City of Fayetteville in Fayette County. The Consultant shall provide concept development, field surveys and database enhancements, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, hydraulic and hydrological studies, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the GDOT's Environmental Procedures Manual. The Consultant shall take into consideration the proposed operational improvement project from SR 92 in Fayette County to SR 16 in Coweta County labeled as AR-302 in Plan 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) when developing the concept and determining logical termini for PI Number 321960-.

Task Order #1 is expected to be survey, traffic analysis, public involvement for stakeholders, and determination of logical termini (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 (including I-bat if required), Archaeology].
2. Determine potential logical termini and submit form for approval.

3. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document using Special Studies previously approved:

   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 (1 possible detour/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/UST/Soil Survey.
2. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:

   a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
   b. Preliminary Signal Plans, if required.
   c. Preliminary Staging Plans.

3. Field Surveys (using the guidance provided in the GDOT Survey Manual).
4. Constructability meeting participation.
5. Cost Estimation System (CES) with annual updates.
6. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
7. Location and Design Report.
8. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

D. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way 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. FFPR participation, 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 reviews.
6. CES final cost estimate.
7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.

F. Construction:

1. Review shop drawings.
2. Site condition revisions.

G. Attendance in monthly meetings and preparation of meeting minutes 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, Right-of-Way, Utilities, etc.) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.

7. Related Key Resources:

A. Roadway Design Lead.
B. NEPA Lead.

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

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – December 15, 2014.
B. Approved Concept Report – October 14, 2015.
C. Preliminary Field Plan Review – January 30, 2017.
D. Right of Way Plans approved – November 15, 2017.
E. Right of Way authorization – December 15, 2017.
F. Final Field Plan Review – April 5, 2019.
G. Final Plans submitted for Letting – September 24, 2019.
H. Let Contract to Construction – December 9, 2019.

EXHIBIT I-3

Project/Contract #3

1. Project Number: STP00-0167-01(013)
2. PI Number: 621690-
3. County: Floyd
4. Description: SR 101 FM CR 740/Saddle TR to CR 335/Lombardy Way in Rome

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane urban Roadway Design
3.05	Multi-lane Urban Interstate Limited Access 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
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
4.01	Minor Bridge Design
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The project would consist of the reconstruction of SR 101 from CR 740/Saddle Trail to CR 335/Lombardy Way in Rome/Cartersville Highway (PI #621690-) approximately 2 miles south of Downtown Rome in Floyd County, Georgia. The Scope of Services includes preliminary construction plans, bridge plans, right-of-way plans, and final construction plans in accordance with the GDOT Plan Presentation Guide (PPG). All phases of the project should proceed using the guidance established in the Plan Development Process (PDP). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services.

Task Order #1 is expected to be preliminary plans completion and right-of-way plans completion (pending negotiation discussions).

A. Environmental Document:

1. The Environmental Document is being completed and re-evaluated under PI 632760-.
2. Coordination with the environmental Consultant for PI 632760- is required.

B. Preliminary Design from 20% to completion:

1. Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
2. Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
3. Constructability meeting participation.
4. Cost Estimation System (CES) with annual updates.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
6. Location and Design Report.
7. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

C. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way Plans and Staking.
2. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way Plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.

D. Final Design:

1. Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) package.
2. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
3. Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Report, as needed.
4. Erosion Control Plans.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
6. CES final cost estimate.
7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.

E. Construction:

1. Review shop drawings.
2. Site condition revisions.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

A. Roadway Design Lead.
B. Bridge Design Lead.

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

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – January 15, 2015.
B. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – July 18, 2016.
C. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans approved – April 27, 2017.
D. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – November 30, 2017.
E. Final Plans for Letting – May 23, 2019.
F. Let Contract – August 13, 2019.

EXHIBIT I-4

Project/Contract #4

1. Project Number: CSNHS-0008-00(356)
2. PI Number: 0008356
3. County: Richmond
4. Description: SR 4/US 1 FM CR 1503/Tobacco Road to CR 95/Meadowbrook Drive

5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their sub consultants, 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 sub consultant 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 sub consultants 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 sub consultant 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)
1.09	Location Studies
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)
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
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

5.08	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)
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The project will consist of the widening of SR 4/Deans Bridge Road from Tobacco Road to Meadow Brook Drive in Richmond County. Also included is the widening of existing SR 4 bridges (NB and SB) over Butler Creek. The Scope of Services includes preparation of the concept report, preliminary construction plans, right-of-way plans, and final construction plans in accordance with the GDOT Plan Presentation Guide (PPG). The Scope of Services also includes database preparation, environmental documentation, and permitting as needed.

All phases of the project should proceed using the guideline established in the Plan Development Process (PDP). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), GDOT's Environmental Procedure Manual and all applicable design guidelines, including but not limited to the Department's Manual of Guidance (MOG), American Association of State Highway and Transportation Official's (AASHTO) Green Book, Roadside Design guide, Highway Capacity Manual, and GDOT's Standard Specification and Standards & Details, GDOT's Design Policy Manual, and GDOT's Bridge Design Manual.

Task Order #1 is expected to be survey, traffic analysis and public involvement for stakeholders (pending negotiations discussions).

A. Concept Report:

1. Field Surveys (using the guidelines provided in GDOT Survey Manual).
2. Traffic studies (to include, but not limited to pedestrian/hybrid beacons and crash data).
3. Cost estimates.
4. Initial Concept meeting preparation and attendance.
5. Concept meeting preparation, attendance and documentation.
6. Approved Concept Report.
7. Concept Design Data book.

B. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies Surveys Reports and Assessment of Effects [i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology (including I-bat), Archeology].
2. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents.
3. Preparation of 404 permit application.
4. Stream Buffer Variance.
5. Wetland Mitigation.
6. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.

7. Public Involvement (including but not limited to Public Information Open House (PIOH) and Public Hearing Open House PHOH):

   a. Multi-lingual PIOH and PHOH (Provide translators).
   b. Hold stakeholders' meeting.
   c. Plan and coordinate with mass transit (Marta and etc.).

8. Prepare for and attend the PFPRs, FFPR and constructability reviews.
9. Certification for Right-of-Way.
10. Environmental re-evaluation, as necessary.

11. Certification for Let

C. Preliminary Design:

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

   a. Preliminary Bridge/Wall Plans.
   b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
   c. Preliminary Signal Plans.
   d. Preliminary Staging.
   e. Preliminary Photometric layout.
   f. Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Plans.
   g. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) design.

2. Prepare design exceptions and design variances reports.
3. Constructability meeting participation.
4. Cost estimation with annual updates.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
6. Location and Design Report.
7. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
8. Attend other field reviews as necessary.

D. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Ways and Staking.
2. Revise Plans and deliver final Right-of-Way Plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.
4. Prepare and attend property owners' meeting.

E. Final Design:

1. Complete final Road Plans, including but not limited to:

a. Final Bridge/Wall Plans.
b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
c. Final Signal Plans.
d. Final Staging Plans.
e. Final Lighting Plans.
f. 2nd Submission Utility Plans.
g. Final Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) design.
h. Erosion Control Plans.

2. FFPR participation, report and responses (all plan sets and other information (Requested by Engineering Services).
3. Quality Assurance /Quality Control reviews.
4. Corrected FFPR plans.
5. Cost Estimation System (CES) final cost estimate.
6. Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) package.
7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.

F. Construction:

1. Use on Construction revisions.
2. Review shop drawings.
3. Site condition revisions.
4. Respond to erosion control issues during Construction.
5. Answer Construction field questions.

G. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews for all deliverables.

H. Attendance in monthly meetings and preparation of meeting minutes to discuss progress and/or issues (additional meetings may be required to discuss major project issues).

I. Prepare, reproduce and distribute Preliminary Field Plan Reviews (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) package, address/respond comments, and make plan changes.

J. Prepare, reproduce and distribute Preliminary and Final Plans and all supporting disciplines (signing and marking, erosion control, Right-of-Way, Utilities, etc.) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

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

   A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – January 5, 2015.
   B. Concept Development Summary- March 7, 2016.
   C. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – October 5, 2017.
   D. Right-Of- Way (ROW) Plans approved – April 6, 2018.
   E. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – April 4, 2019.
   F. Final Plans for Letting – July 5, 2019.
   G. Let Contract – October 6, 2019.

EXHIBIT I-5

Project/Contract #5

1. Project Number: STP00-0000-00(400)
2. PI Number: 0000400
3. County: Floyd
4. Description: SR 101 Widening FM South Rome Bypass to CR 740/McCord Drive

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane urban Roadway Design
3.05	Multi-lane Urban Interstate Limited Access 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
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
4.01	Minor Bridge Design
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The proposed project would consist of the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the SR 101 Widening from South Rome Bypass to CR 740/McCord Drive/Cartersville Highway interchange (PI# 0000400) for approximately 3.1 miles. The Scope of Services includes preliminary construction plans, bridge plans, right-of-way plans, and final construction plans in accordance with the GDOT Plan Presentation Guide (PPG). All phases of the project should proceed using the guidance established in the Plan Development Process (PDP). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services.

Task Order #1 is expected to be preliminary plans completion and right-of-way plans completion (pending negotiation discussions).

A. Environmental Document:

1. The Environmental document is being completed and re-evaluated under PI #632760-.
2. Coordination with the environmental Consultant for PI #632760- is required.

B. Preliminary Design from 20% to completion:

1. Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
2. Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
3. Constructability meeting participation.
4. Cost Estimation System (CES) with annual updates.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control 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).

C. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way Plans and Staking.
2. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way Plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.

D. Final Design:

1. Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) package.
2. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
3. Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Report as needed.
4. Erosion Control Plans.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
6. Cost Estimation System (CES) final cost estimate.
7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.

E. Construction:

1. Review shop drawings.
2. Site condition revisions.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

A. Roadway Design Lead.
B. Bridge Design Lead.

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

G. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – January 15, 2015.
H. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – July 18, 2016.
I. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans approved – April 27, 2017.
J. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – November 30, 2017.
K. Final Plans for Letting – May 23, 2019.
L. Let Contract – August 13, 2019.

EXHIBIT I-6

Project/Contract #6

1. Project Number: STP00-0000-00(760)
2. PI Number: 0000760
3. County: Butts
4. Description: SR 16 Widen FM I-75 to City of Jackson

5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Class 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

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 Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
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 16 from I-75 to the City of Jackson in Butts County. 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 (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), 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.

Task Order #1 is expected to be traffic analysis, public involvement for stakeholders, approval of logical termini, initial environmental studies, concept approval (pending negotiation discussions).

A. Concept Report:

1. Traffic studies.
2. Cost estimates.
3. Prepare concept layouts and alignment alternatives.
4. Initial Concept meeting preparation and attendance.
5. Approved Concept Report.
6. Concept Design Data Book.
7. Concept meeting preparation and attendance.
8. Perform a Value Engineering (VE) study, if warranted.
9. Determine potential logical termini and submit form for approval.

B. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies Surveys Reports [i.e., Air, Noise, History, 4(f) resources, cemeteries, ecology (including I-bat if required), potential archaeological sites].
2. Determine potential logical termini and submit form for approval.
3. Determine if Individual permit is required and prepare a Practical Alternatives Report for approval.
4. Prepare for and attend a Public Information Open House (PIOH) if warranted.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

A. Roadway Design Lead.
B. NEPA Lead.

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

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – December 19, 2014.
B. Value Engineering Study – June 5, 2015.
C. Public Information Open House – April 15, 2016.
D. Approved Concept Report – May 25, 2016.

EXHIBIT I-7

Project/Contract #7

1. Project Number: CSBRG-0007-00(037)
2. PI Number: 0007037
3. Counties: Jeff Davis,Montgomery
4. Description: SR 135 @ Altamaha River - TIA

5. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 5.B. Respondents should submit 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 Classes
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
4.01	Minor Bridge Design
4.04	Hydraulic & Hydrological Studies (Bridges)

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 Classes
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
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.13	Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility 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)
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan
9.03	Field Inspection for Erosion Control

6. Scope:

The proposed project would replace the bridge on SR 135 over Altamaha River in Jeff Davis, Montgomery Counties. The Scope of Services for this project will include concept development, 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, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). 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 #1 is expected to be survey and concept (pending negotiation discussions).

A. Concept Report:

1. Complete Field Surveys (using the guidance provided in the GDOT Survey Manual):

   a. Provide survey database.
   b. Staking for bridge inspection.
   c. Staking for Right-of-Way acquisition.

2. Complete traffic studies.
3. Complete cost estimates.
4. Prepare for and attend detour meeting and prepare Detour Report.
5. Prepare for Concept meeting, attend, and document.
6. Complete approved Concept Report.
7. Prepare Concept Design Data Book.

B. Environmental Document to include a schedule and schedule updates in Primavera and T-PRO:

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

   a. Conduct Noise Survey and prepare reports (including Noise Barrier Analysis, if needed).
   b. Conduct Air Survey and prepare reports.
   c. Conduct Ecology Survey and prepare reports:

      1) Combined Ecology Resources/Assessment of Effects Report.
      2) Protected Species Survey and Report (two seasonal surveys, one report).
      3) Aquatic Survey and Report (mussels).
      4) Biological Assessment for Formal Section 7 (if necessary).

   d. Conduct Archeological Survey (Phase I) and prepare reports or Short Form.
   e. Conduct Historic Resource Survey and prepare reports.
   f. Prepare Cultural Resources Assessment of Effects (AOE).
   g. Prepare agency coordination.
   h. Section 4(f) Evaluation (if necessary). Or obtain de minimis concurrence (if necessary).
   i. Transmittal letters for all reports and application packages.
   j. Prepare environmental commitments table.
   k. Prepare special provisions, as needed.

2. Prepare National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents.
3. Prepare a 404 permit application package (General).
4. Prepare a Vegetative Buffer application package.
5. Conduct Public Involvement including preparation of any necessary displays/documentation and attending public meetings:

a. All activities associated with a Public Information Open House (PIOH) or Detour Open House, including attending the meeting and the dry run and preparing the following materials: legal advertisement, PIOH handout, synopsis, summary of comments, and comment response letters(if necessary).
b. Targeted public outreach activities including the preparation and distribution of project flyers (if necessary).

6. Conduct all Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
7. Attend and document minutes for additional meetings to discuss progress or issues.
8. Prepare for and attend the PFPR and FFPR:

   a. Prepare PFPR/FFPR information for Environmental Resource Impact Table (ERIT).
   b. Preparation for and attendance of Field Plan Reviews (FPR) (Preliminary and Final) including:

      1) Prepare Environmental Resource Impact Table (ERIT) and other materials for Field Plan Reviews.
      2) Attend Field Plan Reviews.
      3) Review FPR Reports and provide written responses to any environmental comments.

9. Prepare certification for Right-of-Way.
10. Updated surveys due to age, if needed.
11. Prepare No-change/change Catergorical Exclusion (CE) reevaluation for Construction authorization.
12. Two (2) NEPA document reevaluations.
13. Prepare two (2) certifications - one (1) for ROW authorizations and one (1) for Construction Letting authorization.
14. Two (2) Ecology addenda, including one (1) resurvey.
15. Prepare certification for Let.

C. Preliminary Design:

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

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

2. Prepare Bridge Hydraulic Study.
3. Prepare Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
4. Prepare Soil Survey.
5. Prepare for and attend Constructability review.
6. Prepare cost estimation with annual updates.
7. Complete Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
8. Prepare Location and Design Report.
9. Attend PFPR, prepare report and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

D. Utility Plans:

1. Prepare existing Utility Plans.
2. Provide 1st submission plans to the District's Utilities Office.
3. Coordinate with 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.

E. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way Plans and Staking.
2. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way Plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.

F. Final Design:

1. Complete final plans including but not limited to roadway design, bridge design, and request FFPR.
2. Attend FFPR, prepare report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
3. Prepare Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) package.
4. Prepare approved Erosion Control Plans.
5. Complete Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews (FFPR & Final).
6. Prepare Cost Estimation System (CES) final cost estimate.
7. Prepare amendments and revisions.
8. Prepare and submit Final Design Data Book.

G. Construction:

1. Review shop drawings.
2. Prepare site condition revisions.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

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

A. PE Notice to Proceed – December 19, 2014.
B. Concept Report Approval – October 11, 2015.
C. Approved Environmental Document – August 18, 2017.
D. PFPR Inspection – February 7, 2017.
E. Right-of-Way Plans Approved – October 16, 2017.
F. FFPR Inspection – May 11, 2018.
G. Final Plans for Letting – October 26, 2018.
H. Let Contract – January 15, 2019.

9. Available Information:

A. Design traffic.
B. Bridge Inspection Reports.
C. Existing bridge plans.

10. Assumptions:

A. Bridge to be replaced, not widened.
B. On-site detour or off-site detour required (to be determined during concept).
C. Coast Guard/Navigable Waterway permit required, coordination with Bridge Office required.

EXHIBIT I-8

Project/Contract #8

1. Project Number: CSBRG-0007-00(055)
2. PI Number: 0007055
3. County: Union
4. Description: Bridge Replacement on SR 180 at Slaughter Creek

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
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, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
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
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide concept development, field surveys and database enhancements, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services. All deliverables shall be in accordance

with the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the GDOT's Environmental Procedures Manual.

Task Order #1 is expected to be for concept report approval, including all activities required for approval. These activities include survey, traffic analysis, public involvement with forest services & DNR, History & Ecology Survey Reports, initial concept team meeting, and concept team meeting (pending negotiation discussions).

A. Concept Report:

1. Traffic studies.
2. Cost estimates.
3. Initial Concept meeting preparation and attendance.
4. Concept meeting preparation and attendance.
5. Approved Concept Report.
6. Concept Design Data Book.

B. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies Surveys Reports and Assessment of Effects (i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, Archaeology).
2. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents:

    a. Categorical Exclusion.
    b. One NEPA document reevaluation for Construction.

3. Preparation of a NW23 Section 404 permit application.
4. Aquatic Survey.
5. Stream Buffer Variance.
6. Wetland Mitigation.
7. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
8. Public Involvement (1 possible detour/PIOH.)
9. Prepare for and attend the PFPR and FFPR.
10. Certification for Right-of-Way.
11. Certification for Let.

C. 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 Communication Plans.
    e. Preliminary Staging Plans.

2. Bridge Hydraulic Study.
3. Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
4. Pavement evaluation/UST/Soil survey.
5. Constructability meeting participation.
6. Cost estimation with annual updates.
7. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
8. Location and Design Report.

9. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

D. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way Plans and Staking.
2. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way Plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.

E. Final Design:

1. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
2. Erosion Control Plans.
3. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
4. Corrected FFPR plans.
5. CES final cost estimate.
6. Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) package.
7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Errors and omissions.
9. Final Design Data Book.

F. Construction:

1. Use on Construction revisions.
2. Review shop drawings.
3. Site condition revisions.

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

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

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

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

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

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

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – February 2, 2015.
B. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – June 1, 2017.
C. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans approved – June 11, 2017.
D. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – September 6, 2018.
E. Final Plans for Letting – December 18, 2018.
F. Let Contract – March 8, 2019.

EXHIBIT I-9

Project/Contract 9

1. Project Number: CSSTP000900400
2. PI Number: 0009400
3. County: DeKalb
4. Description: SR 13 From Afton Ln to Shallowford Terrace – Phase II

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	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)
1.09	Location Studies
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 Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
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
5.08	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:

This project includes pedestrian lighting, adding a raised median in the existing two way left turn lane, and upgrading existing or adding new sidewalk to meet Americans with Disability Act (ADA) standards while minimizing structural work, right-of-way and utility impacts. In addition, multiple pedestrian hybrid beacons are proposed on this project along with mid-block pedestrian refuge/crossing islands. The Consultant shall provide concept development, field surveys, database enhancements and public involvement activities, development of the environmental document including all required special studies, preliminary construction plans, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge/wall plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services. All deliverables shall be in accordance with the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG) Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), NEPA, GDOT's Environmental Procedures Manual and all applicable design guidelines including, but not limited to Department's Manual of Guidance (MOG), American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Green Book, Roadside Design Guide, Highway Capacity Manual, GDOT's Standard Specification and Standards & Details, GDOT's Design Policy Manual, and GDOT's Bridge Design Manual.

Task Order #1 is expected to be survey, traffic analysis and public involvement for stakeholders (pending negotiation discussions).

A. Concept Report:

1. Field Surveys (using the guidance provided in the GDOT Survey Manual).
2. Traffic studies (to include but not limited to pedestrian/hybrid beacons and crash data).
3. Cost estimates.
4. Initial Concept meeting preparation and attendance..
5. Concept meeting preparation, attendance and documentation.
6. Approved Concept Report.
7. Concept Design Data Book.

B. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies surveys reports and assessment of effects (i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, Archaeology).
2. NEPA documents.
3. Preparation of 404 permit application.
4. Stream Buffer Variance.
5. Wetland Mitigation.
6. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
7. Public Involvement (including but not limited Public Information Open House (PIOH) and Public Hearing Open House (PHOH):

    a. Multi-lingual PIOH and PHOH (Provide translators).
    b. Hold Stakeholder's meetings.
    c. Plan and coordinate with mass transit (MARTA and etc.).

8. Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) and Constructability review.

9. Certification for Right-of-Way.
10. Environmental re-evaluations as necessary.
11. Certification for Let.

C. Preliminary Design:

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

   a. Preliminary Bridge/Wall Plans.
   b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
   c. Preliminary Signal Plans.
   d. Preliminary Staging Plans.
   e. Preliminary Photometric Layout.
   f. Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Plans.
   g. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) design.

2. Prepare design exceptions and Design Variances Reports.
3. Constructability meeting participation.
4. Cost estimation with annual updates.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
6. Location and Design Report.
7. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
8. Attend other field reviews as necessary.

D. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way Plans and Staking.
2. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way Plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisitions.
4. Prepare for and attend property owners' meeting.

E. Final Design:

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

   a. Final Bridge/Wall Plans.
   b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
   c. Final Signal Plans.
   d. Final Staging Plans.
   e. Final Lighting Plans.
   f. 2nd Submission Utility Plans.
   g. Final MS4 design.
   h. Erosion Control Plans.

2. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
3. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
4. Corrected FFPR Plans.
5. Cost Estimation System (CES) final cost estimate.
6. Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) Package.

7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.

F. Construction:

1. Use on Construction revisions.
2. Review shop drawings.
3. Site condition revisions.
4. Respond to erosion control issues during construction.
5. Answer Construction field questions.

G. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews for all deliverables.

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

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

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

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

A. Roadway Design Lead.
B. NEPA Lead.
C. Public Involvement Lead.

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

A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – January 15, 2015.
B. Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – October 21, 2015.
C. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans approved – January 13, 2016.
D. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – September 28, 2016.
E. Final Plans for Letting – January 27, 2017.
F. Let Contract – April 13, 2017.

EXHIBIT I-10

Project/Contract 10

1. Project Number: EDS00-0441-00(042)
2. PI Number: 222560-
3. Counties: Morgan, Oconee
4. Description: SR 24/US 441 FM Madison Bypass To Just N Of Apalachee Riv/Ocone

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	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)
1.09	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)
4.05	Bridge Inspection
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The project will consist of the Widening of SR 24/US 441 from the Madison Bypass to just North of the Apalachee River (PI #222560-). Also included in this widening will be the construction of three (3) bridges: SR 24 over Hard Labor Creek, Big Sandy Creek and the Apalachee River. The Scope of Services includes concept validation and revisions as needed, preliminary construction plans, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging plans, final bridge plans, and final construction plans in accordance with the GDOT Plan Presentation Guide (PPG). The scope of the project also includes the environmental document completion for the following projects PI #s 222560- & 122660-. PI #122660- is being designed under a separate contract and coordination with that Consultant will be required. A citizen advisory committee is anticipated for this project and meetings will be required as part of the environmental process.

- PI #222560- SR 24/US 441 from Madison Bypass to just north of the Apalachee River/Ocone
- PI #122660- SR 24/US 441 from north of the Apalachee River to the Watkinsville Bypass

All phases of the project should proceed using the guidance established in the Plan Development Process (PDP). All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services.

Task Order #1 is expected to be field survey, traffic analysis and public involvement for stakeholders (pending negotiation discussions).

A. Concept Development:

1. Validate current Concept Report.
2. Revise Concept Report, if necessary.

B. Database Preparation:

1. Field Surveys (using the guidance provided in the GDOT Survey Manual).
2. Digital Terrain Model (DTM)/Top for all obscure areas within the projects survey limits.
3. Drainage structure locations and invert elevations.
4. Property resolution should be performed for each parcel within the survey limits.
5. All information should be submitted in the Inroads/Microstation V 8i format.

C. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies Surveys Reports and Assessment of Effects [i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology (including I-bat), Archaeology].

2. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Document. Using Special Studies previously approved:

   a. Environmental Assessment (EA).
   b. NEPA document reevaluation:

      1) PI 222560- for Right-of-Way, if necessary.
      2) PI 222560- for Construction.
      3) PI 122660- for Right-of-Way.
      4) PI 122660- for Construction.

3. Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Reviews (PFPRs) and Final Field Plan Reviews (FFPRs) for both projects.

D. Preliminary Design:

1. Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
2. Pavement Evaluation/UST & Monitoring wells/Soil Survey.
3. Bridge Hydraulic Study.
4. Preliminary Bridge Layouts.

5. 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 Communication Plans.
    e. Preliminary Staging Plans.

6. Pavement type selection.
7. Constructability meeting participation.
8. Cost Estimation System (CES) with annual updates.
9. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
10. Location and Design Report.
11. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way Plans:

1. Coordinate field review of Right-of-Way Plans and Staking.
2. Revise plans and deliver final Right-of-Way Plans.
3. Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.

F. Final Design:

1. Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) package.
2. Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
3. Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Report.
4. Final bridge plans.
5. Quality Assurance/Quality Control reviews.
6. Cost Estimation System (CES) final cost estimate.
7. Amendments and revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.

G. Construction:

1. Review shop drawings.
2. Site condition revisions.

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

I. Attendance in monthly meetings and preparation of meeting minutes 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 bridge and roadway plans and all supporting disciplines (signing and marking, erosion control, Right-of-Way, Utilities, etc.) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

8. Available Information:

   A. Concept Report:

      1. Approved Concept Report:

         b. PI #222560-.
         c. PI #122660-.

      2. Revised Concept Report for PI #122660-.
      3. Concept layouts.

   B. Database Preparation:

      1. Mapping.
      2. Survey control package.

   C. All previous completed environmental studies.

9. An accelerated schedule is required. The proposed schedule for milestone dates is as follows:

   A) Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – January 15, 2015.
   B) Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) Inspection – December 18, 2016.
   C) Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans approved – September 27, 2017.
   D) Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Inspection – August 15, 2018.
   E) Final Plans for Letting – December 15, 2019.
   F) Let Contract – March 15, 2020.

ADDENDUM NO. 2

ISSUE DATE: August 14, 2014

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

RFQ-484-071514: Engineering Design Services (B2-2014)
Contract #2, PI# 321960-

NOTE: PLEASE REVIEW CAREFULLY!

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

NOTE: Signed acknowledgment of this addendum (this page) MUST be attached to your PROPOSAL.

Firm Name _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Typed Name and Title _____

Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT)
Office of Transportation Services Procurement
One Georgia Center
600 West Peachtree Street, NW
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.

I. Written Questions and Answers:

	Questions	Answers
1.	Please confirm that limits for Special Studies and Investigation for Environmental Document "NEPA-EA" limits are from SR 92/Ramah Road to Old SR 92/Grady Ave.	The limits for Special Studies and Investigation for Environmental Document "NEPA-EA" are SR 85 from approximately 0.1 miles north of Price Road to SR 85 at Grady Avenue.

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Engineering Design Services
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	July 15, 2014
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Exhibit II - Certification	Exhibit III - GSICAA	Signed Addendum If Applicable	Compliant with Page # Limitations	Compliant with Required Format	Meets Required Area Classes	Comments *In minimum Requirements which are not reviewed by Selection Committee
1	American Engineers, Inc.	7/15/2014	9:31 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
2	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	7/15/2014	9:45 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
3	CDM Smith Inc	7/15/2014	11:05 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
4	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	7/15/2014	12:57 PM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
5	Columbia Engineering	7/15/2014	12:46 PM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
6	CROY Engineering, LLC	7/15/2014	10:41 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
7	Gresham, Smith and Partners	7/15/2014	11:01 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
8	Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	7/15/2014	11:18 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
9	KCI Technologies, Inc.	7/15/2014	11:13 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
10	Keck & Wood, Inc.	7/15/2014	11:07 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
11	Long Engineering, Inc.	7/15/2014	9:16 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
12	Lowe Engineers, LLC	7/15/2014	12:08 PM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
13	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	7/15/2014	10:19 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
14	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	7/15/2014	8:34 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
15	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	7/15/2014	12:12 PM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
16	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	7/15/2014	8:31 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
17	Pond & Company	7/15/2014	11:51 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
18	QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	7/15/2014	12:11 PM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
19	R. K. Shah & Associates	7/15/2014	10:22 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
20	Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	7/15/2014	10:55 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
21	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	7/15/2014	9:43 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
22	Thompson Engineering, Inc.	7/14/2014	3:44 PM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
23	T. Y. Lin International	7/15/2014	1:07 PM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
24	URS Corporation	7/14/2014	11:58 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	
25	Volkert	7/14/2014	11:52 AM	x	x	x	x	x	x	

SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST

Solicitation #: RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2

Solicitation Title: Engineering Design Services

	Primes and Subconsultants	1.06(a)	1.06(b)	1.06(c)	1.06(d)	1.06(e)	1.06(f)	1.06(g)	1.07	1.10	3.01	3.02	3.06	3.07	3.09	3.13	5.01	5.02	5.03	5.08	6.01(a)	6.05	9.01	Certificate Expires	Comments
1	**American Engineers, Inc.**									X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	**8/30/2016**	
	Gresham, Smith and Partners	X				X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X	9/30/2014	
	GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X															11/30/2015	
	Ecological Solutions	X				X		X																2/29/2016	
	Sycamore Consulting, Inc.								X															11/30/2014	
	United Consulting					X														X	X	X		8/31/2017	
2	**American Consulting Professionals, LLC**	X		X	X	X					X	X	X			X							X	**3/31/2017**	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															5/31/2017	
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X																7/31/2017	
	KCI Technologies, Inc.			X	X						X	X				X	X	X	X				X	7/31/2017	
	MC Squared, Inc.																				X	X		10/31/2014	
	Wilburn Engineering, LLC									X			X	X	X									9/30/2014	
3	**CDM Smith Inc**	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X		X	**2/28/2015**	
	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	2/28/2015	
	So-Deep, Inc.																			X				11/30/2014	
	Ranger Consulting, Inc.																				X	X		5/31/2015	
	Sycamore Consulting, Inc.								X															11/30/2014	
4	**Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.**										X	X	X	X		X							X	**5/31/2017**	
	Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	5/31/2016	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															5/31/2017	
	TBE Group, Inc.																X	X	X	X				5/31/2016	
	United Consulting					X														X	X	X		8/31/2017	
	Wilburn Engineering, LLC									X			X	X	X									9/30/2014	
	LandAir Surveying Company of Georgia																X	X	X					7/31/2017	
5	**Columbia Engineering**										X	X	X			X	X	X	X				X	**10/31/2014**	
	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.										X	X				X							X	4/30/2017	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															5/31/2017	
	Wilburn Engineering, LLC									X			X	X	X									9/30/2014	
	United Consulting					X														X	X	X		8/31/2017	
6	**CROY Engineering, LLC**	X							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	**7/31/2017**	
	New South Associates, Inc.		X				X																	5/31/2017	
	River to Tap - R2T, Inc.			X	X																		X	7/31/2016	
	Register-Nelson, Inc.	X				X		X																7/31/2014	
	Overland Engineering, LLC																			X				2/28/2015	
	Contour Engineering, LLC																				X	X		4/30/2017	
7	**Gresham, Smith and Partners**	X				X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X	**9/30/2014**	
	GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X															11/30/2015	
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X																7/31/2017	
	United Consulting					X														X	X	X		8/31/2017	
	American Engineers, Inc.									X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	9/30/2016	

SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST

Solicitation #: RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2

Solicitation Title: Engineering Design Services

8	**Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.**	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	**5/31/2016**
	Corporate Environmental Risk Management, LLC/ aka C.E.R.M., LLC																X	X	X		X			5/31/2016
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															5/31/2017
	United Consulting					X														X	X	X		8/31/2017
	Willmer Engineering, Inc.																				X	X		2/28/2017
9	**KCI Technologies, Inc.**			X	X						X	X				X	X	X	X				X	**7/31/2017**
	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	X		X	X	X					X	X	X			X							X	3/31/2017
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															5/31/2017
	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X	1/31/2015
	United Consulting					X														X	X	X		8/31/2017
10	**Keck & Wood, Inc.**										X	X				X							X	**10/31/2014**
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															5/31/2017
	Michael Hightower								X															1/31/2017
	Bowler Engineers, Inc.												X			X							X	11/30/2016
	GCA, Inc.									X			X	X	X									6/30/2017
	Rochester & Associates, Inc.										X	X				X	X	X	X				X	2/28/2017
	United Consulting					X														X	X	X		8/31/2017
11	**Long Engineering, Inc.**										X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X				X	**2/28/2015**
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															5/31/2017
	Moreland Atlobelli Associates, Inc.																							5/31/2015
	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	12/31/2014
	T. Y. Lin International									X	X	X	X	X		X							X	2/28/2015
	URS Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X	X	6/30/2015
12	**Lowe Engineers, LLC**									X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	**10/31/2015**
	Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	5/31/2016
	Willmer Engineering, Inc.																				X	X		2/28/2017
	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	9/30/2015
	TBE Group, Inc.																X	X	X	X				5/31/2016
	Sycamore Consulting, Inc.								X															11/30/2014
13	**Michael Baker Jr., Inc.**	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X	**1/31/2015**
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															5/31/2017
	Wolverton & Associates, Inc.									X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	3/31/2017
	Willmer Engineering, Inc.																				X	X		2/28/2017
14	**Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.**	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	**5/31/2015**
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X																7/31/2017
	GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X															11/30/2015
	New South Associates, Inc.		X				X																	5/31/2017
	Bowler Engineers, Inc.												X			X							X	11/30/2016
15	**Mulkey Engineers & Consultants**	X	X			X			X		X	X				X	X	X	X	X			X	**3/31/2017**
	GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X															11/30/2015
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X																7/31/2017
	Grice Consulting Group, LLC									X			X	X	X									4/30/2015
	Ranger Consulting, Inc.																				X	X		5/31/2015

SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST

Solicitation #: RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2

Solicitation Title: Engineering Design Services

16	**Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.**									X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X	**2/28/2015**
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X																7/31/2017
	GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X															11/30/2015
	LandAir Surveying Company of Georgia																X	X	X					7/31/2017
	S&ME, Inc.																				X	X		12/31/2014
	Sycamore Consulting, Inc.								X															11/30/2014
	TBE Group, Inc.																X	X	X	X				5/31/2016
17	**Pond & Company**									X	X	X	X	X		X							X	**12/31/2014**
	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	X				X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	12/31/2015
	United Consulting					X														X	X	X		8/31/2017
	GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X															11/30/2015
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X																7/31/2017
18	**QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.**									X	X	X	X	X		X							X	**10/31/2014**
	GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X															11/30/2015
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X																7/31/2017
	Accura Engineering & Consulting Services, Inc.																X	X	X	X	X			3/31/2016
	Foresite Group, Inc.									X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X	5/31/2015
	United Consulting					X														X	X	X		8/31/2017
19	**R. K. Shah & Associates**										X	X		X		X							X	**4/30/2017**
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															5/31/2017
	Sycamore Consulting, Inc.								X															11/30/2014
	Wilburn Engineering, LLC									X			X	X	X									9/30/2014
	LandAir Surveying Company of Georgia																X	X	X					7/31/2017
	United Consulting					X														X	X	X		8/31/2017
20	**Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)**	X							X	X	X	X	X	X		X							X	**11/30/2016**
	AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.	X		X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	10/31/2015
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															5/31/2017
	S&ME, Inc.																				X	X		12/31/2014
	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	X				X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	12/31/2015
21	**STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates**			X		X					X	X	X	X	X	X							X	**6/30/2016**
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															5/31/2017
	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	X	X			X			X		X	X	X			X							X	7/31/2015
	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	12/31/2014
	United Consulting					X														X	X	X		8/31/2017
	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.										X	X				X	X	X	X	X			X	8/31/2015
22	**Thompson Engineering, Inc.**										X	X				X						X	X	**3/31/2015**
	TranSystems Corporation										X	X				X	X	X	X				X	8/31/2017
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															5/31/2017
	Foresite Group, inc.									X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X	5/31/2015
	TBE Group, Inc.																X	X	X	X				5/31/2016
	Sycamore Consulting, inc.								X															11/30/2014
	United Consulting					X														X	X	X		8/31/2017
	Ranger Consulting, Inc.																				X	X		5/31/2015

SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST

Solicitation #: RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2

Solicitation Title: Engineering Design Services

23	**T. Y. Lin International**									X	X	X	X	X		X							X	**2/28/2015**	
	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	X	X			X			X		X	X				X	X	X	X	X			X	3/31/2017	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															5/31/2017	
	GCA, Inc.									X			X	X	X									6/30/2017	
	United Consulting					X														X	X	X		8/31/2017	
	Long Engineering, Inc.										X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X				X	2/28/2015	
24	**URS Corporation**	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X	X	**6/30/2015**	
	Development Planning & Engineering, Inc.										X	X				X	X	X	X				X	4/30/2015	
	Accura Engineering & Consulting Services, Inc.																X	X	X	X	X			3/31/2016	
	Ranger Consulting, Inc.																				X	X		5/31/2015	
	New South Associates, Inc.		X				X																	5/31/2017	
	Ecological Solutions	X				X		X																2/29/2016	
25	**Volkert**	x		x	x	x					x	x				x							x	**7/31/2017**	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															5/31/2017	
	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLc	X	X			X			X		X	X	X			X							X	7/31/2015	
	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	X				X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	12/31/2015	
	TBE Group, Inc.																X	X	X	X				5/31/2016	
	Willmer Engineering, Inc.																				X	X		2/28/2017	

GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS
RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2
Engineering Design Services – (B2-2014)

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

Coordination and Communication

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

Evaluation Process

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

Phase I

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

Phase II

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

Phase I
Evaluation of Statements of Qualifications

Evaluation of Eligible Submittals

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

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

Directions for use of the Evaluation Preliminary Scoring Forms:

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

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

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

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATING AVAILABILITY

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

Evaluation Meeting:

All completed Scoring Forms with the preliminary scores and comments for each criteria of each firm, must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Wednesday, July 23, 2014. The completed forms must be turned in at the conclusion of the meeting.

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

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

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

Phase II

Evaluation of Technical Approach and Past Performance

- Finalists will be required to submit a written response which must detail the Technical approach (including design concepts and use of alternative methods).

- Past Performance - Procurement will be checking references and will provide the results of the reference checks to the Selection Committee. The Selection Committee will also be allowed to bring any information for consideration they have available regarding the Firm's performance on any project/contract.

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

Evaluation Meeting:

All notes must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Tuesday, August 26, 2014. The Selection Committee will discuss and determine a final committee rating for each criteria and will provide summary comments as to why the Committee feels the rating is warranted. The Committee will assign the following ratings:

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

FINAL SCORING AND SELECTION

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

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE PRELIMINARY SCORING AND RANKING OF SUBMITTALS

Solicitation Title:	***Engineering Design Services***
Solicitation #:	***RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2***

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

(This Page For GDOT Use)

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING) Sum of Individual Rankings	Group Ranking
American Engineers, Inc.	3	1
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	38	13
CDM Smith Inc	54	24
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	39	17
Columbia Engineering	27	9
CROY Engineering, LLC	42	19
Gresham, Smith and Partners	27	10
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	40	18
KCI Technologies, Inc.	33	12
Keck & Wood, Inc.	61	25
Long Engineering, Inc.	39	15
Lowe Engineers, LLC	31	11
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	42	19
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	12	4
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	51	23
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	38	14
Pond & Company	21	7
QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	15	5
R. K. Shah & Associates	6	2
Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	21	8
STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	20	6
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	39	16
T. Y. Lin International	45	21
URS Corporation	10	3
Volkert	46	22

1	American Engineers, Inc.
2	R. K. Shah & Associates
3	URS Corporation
4	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.
5	QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.
6	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates
7	Pond & Company
8	Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)
9	Columbia Engineering
10	Gresham, Smith and Partners
11	Lowe Engineers, LLC
12	KCI Technologies, Inc.
13	American Consulting Professionals, LLC
14	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
15	Long Engineering, Inc.
16	Thompson Engineering, Inc.
17	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.
18	Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.
19	CROY Engineering, LLC
19	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
21	T. Y. Lin International
22	Volkert
23	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants
24	CDM Smith Inc
25	Keck & Wood, Inc.
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	

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 Engineers, Inc.	Excellent	Excellent	500	1
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Excellent	Good	425	10
CDM Smith Inc	Adequate	Good	325	20
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	Adequate	Good	325	20
Columbia Engineering	Excellent	Good	425	10
CROY Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	25
Gresham, Smith and Partners	Good	Good	375	16
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	Good	Good	375	16
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Good	Good	375	16
Keck & Wood, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	20
Long Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Excellent	400	13
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Adequate	Good	325	20
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Good	Good	375	16
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	Excellent	Excellent	500	1
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Good	Excellent	450	4
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Excellent	Excellent	500	1
Pond & Company	Good	Excellent	450	4
QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Excellent	400	13
R. K. Shah & Associates	Good	Excellent	450	4
Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	Good	Excellent	450	4
STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	Excellent	Good	425	10
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Excellent	400	13
T. Y. Lin International	Good	Excellent	450	4
URS Corporation	Good	Excellent	450	4
Volkert	Adequate	Good	325	20
Maximum Points allowed =	*200*	*300*	*500*	%

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #:	1		

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

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points

Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points

Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points

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

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

Firm Name: American Engineering, Inc.

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

Comments: Key Team Members Demonstrate high number of yrs of experience, as well as experience with a variety of ODOT projects similar to the one proposed under this contract. Key Team shows excellent history with the performance on past projects

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

Comments: Key teams show excellent availability with little to no additional work @ NTP for this project.

Firm Name: American Consulting Professionals, LLC

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

Comments: PM lists good project experience comparable to this project in addition to previous experience working @ Fayette County. Roadway & NEPA lead also list good project experience.

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

Comments: Key team members show roughly ~~[illegible]~~ half time availability for this project.

Firm Name: CDM Smith Inc.

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

Comments: PM and Roadway lead list few projects similar to the one proposed under this contract. Roadway lead lists only 6 yrs. experience.

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

Comments: Key team members show roughly half time availability for this project.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #:	1		

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

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points

Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points

Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points

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

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

Firm Name: Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.

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

Comments: NEPA lead shows good previous project experience. Roadway leads lists only 7yrs experience and does not provide much detail as to similar project experience as proposed on this project.

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

Comments: Key Team members currently show approximately 50% utilization

Firm Name: Columbia Engineering

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

Comments: Team list very good levels of experience with similar projects. PM list a large number of similar projects.

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

Comments: Key team members list good availability for this project with Roadway lead promising 75% capacity.

Firm Name: CROY Engineering, LLC

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

Comments: PM & Roadway list ~~several~~ more than one project similar to the one proposed under this contract. NEPA should list more projects with environmental conflicts to work through.

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

Comments: Key team members show adequate availability to complete this project.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #:	1		

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

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points

Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points

Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points

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

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

Firm Name: Gresham Smith and Partners

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

Comments: Key Team Members list several good examples of projects of similar type with which they have experience.

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

Comments: Key Teams show good availability for this project & Roadway lead promising 75% capacity to devote.

Firm Name: Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.

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

Comments: Key Team Members list several good examples of projects of similar type & which they have experience

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

Comments: Key Team Members show available capacity for this project @ or above 50%

Firm Name: KC Technologies, Inc.

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

Comments: PM + Roadway Lead list a large number of yrs of experience + list several similar projects completed. Roadway lead lists some projects in which she was PM + not Roadway Lead.

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

Comments: Key Team Members demonstrate good availability for this project.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #:	1		

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

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points

Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points

Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points

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

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

Firm Name: Keck & Wood Inc

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

Comments: PM shows [redacted] an excellent number of yrs experience, but few projects similar in scope to this one. Roadway lead also lists no projects similar in scope. NEPA lead shows good experience level for this project.

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

Comments: Key Team Mostly show good availability for this project. Roadway Lead lists several commitments in early design stage.

Firm Name: Long Engineering, Inc

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

Comments: PM show extensive yrs of experience & complex projects, but does not list projects similar to this area class. Roadway lead does not list projects similar to the one under this contract.

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

Comments: Key Team shows very few previous project commitments in mid or early stages of development and reports few commitment hours.

Firm Name: Lowe Engineers, LLC

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

Comments: Roadway lead lists some projects in area class, but also list grad date as 2006.

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

Comments: Key Team shows good availability for this project with most team members below half capacity.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Michael Baker Jr. Inc.

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

Comments: Key Team lists good years of experience on similar projects. Roadway lead lists only one similar project.

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

Comments: Key Team reports @ least 50% availability for this project.

Firm Name: Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.

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

Comments: PM list extensive number of projects in similar area classes. Roadway lead only list BK projects.

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

Comments: Key Team reports well over 50% capacity for this project.

Firm Name: Mulkey Engineers & Consultants

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

Comments: PM demonstrates a very good number of yrs experience + several projects similar to this project. NEPA lists fewer projects that are as similar.

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

Comments: Key Team Members report @ least 50% capacity for this project. PM + NEPA report well over 50% capacity.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #:	1		

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

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points

Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points

Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points

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

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

Firm Name: Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

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

Comments: PM and leading lead list several similar projects with which they have experience. PM list over 30 yrs. experience.

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

Comments: Key Team Members all list very good monthly capacity at present and several projects are expected to be completed @ end of this year.

Firm Name: Pond & Company

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

Comments: Key Team Members list good experience & projects of similar type.

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

Comments: Key Team Members list approx 50% capacity with much of that work in final design phase.

Firm Name: QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.

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

Comments: PM + leading lead list a number of yrs of experience, but few projects in this area class.

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

Comments: Application states firm holds no GDOT work currently. Key team members list well are 50% capacity @ present.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #:	1		

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

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points

Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points

Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points

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

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

Firm Name: R.K. Shah & Associates

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

Comments: PM lists tremendous experience both in yrs & similar projects. Roadway lead lists similar projects, but performed QA only on most listed.

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

Comments: All key team member list capacity @ well over 50%.

Firm Name: Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)

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

Comments: Key Team demonstrated a good number of years of experience & lists experience w/ several projects in same area class.

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

Comments: Key team states availability for this project is @ 75%.

Firm Name: STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates

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

Comments: Team demonstrates previous experience with the project and provides insight into the successful completion. Key team demonstrates good experience w/ other projects in same area class.

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

Comments: Key Team demonstrated approx. 50% capacity.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #:	1		

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

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points

Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points

Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points

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

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

Firm Name: Thompson Engineering Inc.

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

Comments: PM + Roadway lead list a variety of projects involving interchange or interstate design, but very few urban roadway widening projects. NEPA lead does not list many distinct conflicts that have been resolved thru the process including, Logical Termini, PAR, EJ, etc.

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

Comments: Key Team list capacity well above 50% post. after the end of 2014

Firm Name: T.Y.Lin International

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

Comments: PM + Roadway lead list experience w/ projects similar to the one under this contract. NEPA lead should list specific similar conflicts she has resolved under previous projects that might be pertinent to this project.

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

Comments: Key Team list available capacity above 50% for this project.

Firm Name: URS Corporation

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

Comments: Key Team demonstrates knowledge of L.T. analysis and successfull acceptance on previous projects by FHWA.

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

Comments: Several key team members demonstrate full capacity for this project.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Volkert

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

Comments: Good number of yrs of experience are given for each key team member. Discussion of previous project experience does not include items likely needed for this project. (LT in particular)

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

Comments: Key Team members WBT capacity @ a little under 50%.

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:

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 Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	1
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	6
CDM Smith Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	Adequate	Good	325	1
Columbia Engineering	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
CROY Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
Gresham, Smith and Partners	Good	Adequate	300	6
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	6
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
Keck & Wood, Inc.	Good	Marginal	225	23
Long Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	6
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	6
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Adequate	Marginal	175	25
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
Pond & Company	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	1
R. K. Shah & Associates	Adequate	Good	325	1
Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	Good	Adequate	300	6
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
T. Y. Lin International	Good	Marginal	225	23
URS Corporation	Adequate	Good	325	1
Volkert	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
Maximum Points allowed =	*200*	*300*	*500*	%

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #:	2		

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

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points

Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points

Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points

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

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

Firm Name: American Engineers, Inc.

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

Comments: Project Team has relevant experience.

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

Comments: each member of the Project Team has over 100 Hours per month availability for this project at this time.

Firm Name: American Consulting Professionals, LLC

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

Comments: Project Team has relevant experience. Each member of the team has about 15 years experience. Included a plan on how to apply relevant experience to this project.

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

Each of the team member has 80-100 hours of commitment to other projects.

Firm Name: CDM Smith Inc

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

Comments : Project Team has relevant experience.

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

Comments: Project team's availability is reasonable.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.

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

Comments: Project Team has relevant experience.

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

Comments: Each team member is has less than 40 hours commitment at this time. Available for meetings on a short notice.

Firm Name: Columbia Engineering

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

Comments: Relavant experience

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

Comments: Adequate availability

Firm Name: CROY Engineering, LLC

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

Comments: Adequate relevant experience

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

Comments: Adequate availability

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Gresham, Smith and Partners

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

Comments: Experianced team and QA /QC process but no discussions regarding specific approc for this project.

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

Comments: Adequate availability .

Firm Name: Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.

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

Comments: SOQ includes their Project understanding and a discussion regarding QA/QC process.

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

Comments: Project teams availability is adequate.

Firm Name: KCI Technologies, Inc.

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

Comments: Adequate experience.

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

Comments: Adequate availability.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Keck & Wood, Inc.

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

Comments: Experienced project team, SOQ includes a discussion regarding QA/QC, importance of maintaining quality and tracking schedules.

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

Comments: Robert Renwick has 12 current assignments.

Firm Name: Long Engineering, Inc.

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

Comments: Adequate relevant experience.

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

Comments: Adequate resource availability.

Firm Name: Lowe Engineers, LLC

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

Comments: Experienced project team, SOQ includes a discussion regarding QA/QC, importance of communication with PM regarding project delivery, early coordination.

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

Comments: Adequate resource availability.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

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

Comments: Adequate relevant experience.

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

Comments: Adequate resource availability.

Firm Name: Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.

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

Comments: Experienced project team, SOQ includes a discussion regarding QA/QC, their approach for this project.

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

Comments: Adequate availability.

Firm Name: Mulkey Engineers & Consultants

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

Comments: Experienced project team.

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

Comments: Team member has significant commitment at this time.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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 of more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points

Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points

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

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

Firm Name: Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

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

Comments: Adequate relevant experience.

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

Comments: Adequate availability.

Firm Name: Pond & Company

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

Comments: Adequate relevant experience.

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

Comments: Adequate availability. Design leads current commitment is 96 hours.

Firm Name: QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.

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

Comments: Adequate relevant experience. SOQ describes their organized electronic planning system.

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

Comments: Good availability of design team leader and PM .

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: R. K. Shah & Associates

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

Comments: The projects completed never had a request for additional information. Applies VE Principle .

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

Comments: Team member is available for over a 100 hours per month. Same point of contact from beginning to end of the project.

Firm Name: Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)

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

Comments: Adequate experience, value engineering culture.

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

Comments: Adequate availability

Firm Name: STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates

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

Comments: Experienced project team, SOQ includes discussion regarding them being project delivery and scheduled focused. Also includes a discussion regarding construction field reviews of plans.

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

Comments: Adequate availability

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Thompson Engineering, Inc.

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

Comments: Adequate experience.

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

Comments: Susan Thomas has too many assignments.

Firm Name: T. Y. Lin International

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

Comments: Experienced project team, SOQ includes a discussion regarding QA/QC, importance of constructability & MOT.

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

Comments: Design lead has too many assignments.

Firm Name: URS Corporation

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

Comments: Adequate relevant experience.

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

Comments: SOQ includes project specific issues such as LT, Public Involvement, MS4...each team member is available more than 100 hours at this time/

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Volkert

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

Comments: Minimum relevant experience.

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

Comments: Adequate availability

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

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 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 Engineers, Inc.	Good	Excellent	450	1
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
CDM Smith Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	Good	Adequate	300	18
Columbia Engineering	Good	Good	375	5
CROY Engineering, LLC	Good	Good	375	5
Gresham, Smith and Partners	Good	Good	375	5
Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	18
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Good	Good	375	5
Keck & Wood, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	18
Long Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	14
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Good	375	5
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	14
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	Good	Good	375	5
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Poor	Adequate	150	25
Pond & Company	Good	Good	375	5
QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	Good	Excellent	450	1
R. K. Shah & Associates	Good	Excellent	450	1
Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	Good	Good	375	5
STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	Excellent	Good	425	4
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	14
T. Y. Lin International	Good	Adequate	300	18
URS Corporation	Good	Good	375	5
Volkert	Adequate	Good	325	14
Maximum Points allowed =	*200*	*300*	*500*	%

(1)

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: American Engineering, Inc.

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

Comments: PM & all Key team members have extensive experience w/ GDOT widening projects.

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

Comments: 70% Availability of highly qualified staff.

Firm Name: American Consulting Professionals, LLC

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

Comments: Listed as PM on only 3 GDOT projects & only 1 taken thru final plan phases. Designer & NEPA listed no GDOT experience

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

Comments: Adequate resource + workload capacity

Firm Name: CDM Smith Inc.

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

Comments: Listed as PM on 2 GDOT projects (1 was a widening) Roadway Designer listed no GDOT experience. NEPA has good GDOT experience

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

Comments: Adequate resource + workload capacity

(2)

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyors and Architects, P.C.

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% — Assigned Rating → [redacted] Good

Comments: PM listed as Lead Engineer (not PM) on 2 GDOT projects
Design Lead listed as Roadway Eng. on 1 GDOT proj. + Project Eng. on 2 GDOT projects.
NEPA lead — extensive GDOT experience

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

Comments: Adequate availability

Firm Name: Columbia Engineering

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% — Assigned Rating → [redacted] Good

Comments: All Key team members have very good widening + GDOT experience

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

Comments: Good availability.

Firm Name: CROY Engineering, LLC

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% — Assigned Rating → [redacted] Good

Comments: PM + NEPA have Good widening + GDOT experience
Designer has adequate experience

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

Comments: Good availability

(3)

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Gresham, Smith and Partners

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

Comments: PM + Designer have good widening + GDOT experience
NEPA has adequate experience

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

Comments: Good availability

Firm Name: Jacobs Engineering Group Inc.

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

Comments: Adequate PM + Designer widening + GDOT experience
Extensive NEPA experience

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

Comments: Adequate availability

Firm Name: KCI Technologies, Inc.

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

Comments: PM + Designer have extensive widening + GDOT experience
NEPA has good experience

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

Comments: Key team has good availability

(4)

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Keck & Wood, Inc.

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

Comments: PM & NEPA have extensive widening + GDOT experience
Designer has limited experience

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

Comments: PM & NEPA have good availability
Designer has adequate availability

Firm Name: Long Engineering, Inc.

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

Comments: PM has extensive experience w/ widening + GDOT projects
Designer has limited experience as designer on widening GDOT projects
NEPA has no experience on widening or EA/FONSI

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

Comments: Good availability

Firm Name: Lowe Engineers, LLC

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

Comments: PM & Designer have adequate ~~exp~~ widening + GDOT experience
NEPA has extensive experience

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

Comments: Key team members have good availability

(5)

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and — Assigned Rating → Adequate

Comments: PM - Extensive widening + GDOT Experience
Designer - Very good widening + GDOT experience
NEPA - Minimal widening + GDOT experience (unclear from bio)

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

Comments: Key team members have good availability

Firm Name: Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.

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

Comments: PM has extensive widening + GDOT Experience
Designer has minimal widening experience
NEPA has good experience

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

Comments: Good availability

Firm Name: Mulkey Engineers & Consultants

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

Comments: PM has extensive widening + GDOT experience
NEPA has good experience
Unclear about Designer experience. All project examples list him as PM + not designer

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

Comments: Adequate availability

(6)

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

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

Comments: PM - there is no such thing as a Preconstruction Project Manager
- PM has very minimal project mgmt, experience
Design + NEPA have good widening + GDOT experience

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

Comments: Adequate availability.

Firm Name: Pond & Company

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

Comments: Key Team has good widening + GDOT experience

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

Comments: Good availability

Firm Name: GK4 /dba/ Pennell Associates Inc.

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

Comments: Key Team has extensive widening + GDOT experience

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

Comments: Key team has very good availability

(7)

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: R.K. Shah & Associates

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

Comments: All key Team members have extensive widening + GDOT experience

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

Comments: Excellent availability

Firm Name: Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)

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

Comments: Key Team has very good widening + GDOT experience

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

Comments: Good key team availability

Firm Name: STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates

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

Comments: Key project team has very extensive widening + GDOT experience

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

Comments: Good key team availability.

(8)

DRAFT

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Thompson Engineering, Inc.

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

Comments: PM has good widening & GDOT exp
Designer has minimal - widening exp.
NEPA has fair widening exp.

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

Comments: Key Team has good availability

Firm Name: T. Y. Lin International

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

Comments: All Key team members have good widening & GDOT experience

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

Comments: PM & Designer have adequate availability
NEPA has very good availability

Firm Name: URS Corporation

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

Comments: Key team have very good widening & GDOT experience.

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

Comments: Key team has ~~[illegible]~~ very good availability

9

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	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: Volkert

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

Comments: PM + Designer have adequate widening + GDOT exp
NEPA has very good experience

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

Comments: Key Team has good availability

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:

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 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2***

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 Engineers, Inc.	450	1
R. K. Shah & Associates	450	1
URS Corporation	450	1
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	375	6
QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	400	5
STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	425	4
Pond & Company	325	9
Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	325	9
Columbia Engineering	375	6
Gresham, Smith and Partners	375	6
Lowe Engineers, LLC	325	9
KCI Technologies, Inc.	325	9
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	300	16
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	250	17
Long Engineering, Inc.	325	9
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	325	9
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	325	9

1	American Engineers, Inc.
1	R. K. Shah & Associates
1	URS Corporation
4	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates
5	QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.
6	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.
6	Columbia Engineering
6	Gresham, Smith and Partners
9	Pond & Company
9	Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)
9	Lowe Engineers, LLC
9	KCI Technologies, Inc.
9	Long Engineering, Inc.
9	Thompson Engineering, Inc.
9	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.
16	American Consulting Professionals, LLC
17	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

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 Engineers, Inc.	Good	Excellent	450	1
R. K. Shah & Associates	Good	Excellent	450	1
URS Corporation	Good	Excellent	450	1
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	Good	Good	375	6
QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Excellent	400	5
STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	Excellent	Good	425	4
Pond & Company	Adequate	Good	325	9
Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	Adequate	Good	325	9
Columbia Engineering	Good	Good	375	6
Gresham, Smith and Partners	Good	Good	375	6
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Adequate	Good	325	9
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	9
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	16
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	17
Long Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	9
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	9
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	Adequate	Good	325	9
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***	***500***	**%**

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	American Engineers, Inc.	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

The PM has 30 years experience with a good variety of urban and rural widening projects. Roadway team lead has a good variety of experience related to this type of project. The NEPA team lead also has good credentials, good background and adequate experience.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Excellent

The PM and team leads have approximately 70% availability. The roadway team lead has only one project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	R. K. Shah & Associates	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

The PM has a vast number of years of experience and has experience with roadway widenings that will benefit this project. The roadway team lead provided some roadway widening projects, however their responsibilities for the projects was mainly QA/QC. The NEPA team lead has good experience with road widening.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Excellent

The PM and team leads have over 100 hours of capacity each, which will be sufficient for this project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	URS Corporation	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

The PM and roadway design lead have very good experience on a complex road widening project (Highway 92 widening in Douglasville). The evaluation team noted the consultant demonstrated experience with MS4 design. The NEPA lead has good experience with widening projects.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Excellent

The PM has almost 100% availability. The roadway team lead has one project at 90% completion and a second project near completion. The NEPA team lead also has more than 50% availability.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

The PM has extensive roadway widening experience. The roadway design lead listed several bridge replacement projects, but has minimal widening experience. The NEPA lead has good experience with widening projects.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

Roadway design lead has two projects with over 50% availability. The NEPA team lead has several projects in final design stages with over 50% availability. The PM also has over 50% availability.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM and the roadway team lead have adequate widening experience. The NEPA lead has good experience with widening projects. The evaluation team would have liked the PM and roadway team lead to have more urban widening projects.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Excellent

The PM and key team leads all had over 50% availability and will not have an issue staffing this project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Excellent

The evaluation team especially liked the fact that the PM and roadway team lead are currently working a road widening project on this corridor. The consultant has an experienced project team, including specific work regarding project delivery and scheduled focus. The consultant also provided some details on their approach of construction field reviews of the plans for this corridor. The NEPA team lead has extensive experience with engineering and construction management, which is added value for this project.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The PM and key team leads all have approximately 50% availability and will not have an issue staffing this project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Pond & Company	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM and roadway team lead provided a couple of examples of their experience with roadway widening projects and environmental aspects of projects. The evaluation team would have liked to see more experience with urban widening projects for the PM and roadway design team lead. The NEPA lead has good experience with widening projects.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The roadway team lead has 96 hours committed to projects with most of the projects coming to an end. The PM appears to have adequate availability even though they have several open projects in concept phase. The NEPA team lead also has adequate availability to do the work associated with this project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM has adequate experience with roadway urban and rural widening projects. The roadway team lead has some experience with roadway widening projects, however they have not taken a project from concept to final design. The NEPA team lead appears to have adequate experience related to the requirements of this project. The evaluation team would have liked the consultant's team to have more experience with the GDOT PDP process.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The PM and key team leads specify that they will have 75% availability. The NEPA team lead has a number of projects however the evaluation team believes they have adequate availability to do the work associated with this project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Columbia Engineering	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

The PM and roadway team lead have good experience with urban widening projects, with the PM having more years experience. The NEPA lead has relevant experience with widening projects.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The PM and roadway design lead have several on-going projects with most coming to an end soon. The NEPA team lead has a number of projects however the evaluation team believes they have adequate availability to do the work associated with this project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Gresham, Smith and Partners	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

The PM and roadway team lead have good experience with urban and rural widening projects. The NEPA team lead listed project specific requirements for this project and has good GDOT PDP experience. The consultant has an experienced team with a good QA/QC process.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The PM has good availability for this project, while the roadway team lead has 96 hours of current commitments which will allow them to adequately support this project. The NEPA team lead has only two projects and has excellent availability for this project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Lowe Engineers, LLC	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM and roadway team lead have adequate experience with general roadway widening projects. The NEPA lead has extensive experience with widening projects. The evaluation team would have liked to have seen more urban widening experience for the PM and roadway team lead.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The PM and key team leads all have approximately 50% availability and will not have an issue staffing this project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	KCI Technologies, Inc.	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM has good urban and rural widening experience, while the roadway team lead has experience with urban and rural widening projects. The NEPA lead has adequate experience with widening projects, however the evaluation team would have liked to see the NEPA team lead have more experience with GDOT PDP processes. The evaluation team would have liked the roadway design lead to have more urban roadway widening experience.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The PM and key team leads all have approximately 50% availability and will not have an issue staffing this project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS

Firm	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

The PM demonstrated good engineering and project management experiences suitable for this project. The roadway team lead had adequate experience with roadway widening projects. The NEPA lead has adequate experience with widening projects. The evaluation team noted positively that the consultant did provide specific information as to how the team members experiences would be beneficial to this project. The evaluation team would have liked the roadway team lead and the NEPA lead to have experience with GDOT's PDP process.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM, roadway team lead and NEPA team lead all have 80 to 100 hours commitment to other projects at this time, but availability should be adequate availability for this project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM has a lot of experience with the GDOT PDP process and has extensive engineering experience. However the evaluation team was unclear as to the role the PM played with the projects listed as the SOQ did not contain this level of information. The roadway team lead and the NEPA team lead have adequate experience with roadway widening experience.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM and the roadway team lead have over 88 hours currently committed to current projects. The NEPA team lead has adequate availability for the needs of this project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Long Engineering, Inc.	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM has extensive experience with roadway widening and GDOT PDP processes. The roadway team lead has limited experience on roadway widening projects and GDOT PDP processes. The NEPA team lead has good credentials but limited experience with roadway widening projects.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The PM and team leads have approximately 70% availability.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Thompson Engineering, Inc.	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM has adequate experience with roadway widening projects and a lot of experience with GDOT PDP processes. The roadway team lead has limited experience on roadway widening projects. The NEPA team lead has adequate experience on roadway widening projects.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The PM and key team leads all have greater than 50% availability, however the number of projects for the NEPA team lead could be problematic.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM has listed only lead engineer experience and no project management experience. The roadway team lead provided a list of projects which are relevant to this project, however the SOQ did not provide details regarding the lead's specific role with the projects. The NEPA team lead has experience with roadway widening projects and extensive experience with GDOT PDP processes.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The PM and key team leads have less than 40 hours a month in committed work, therefore providing enough capacity for this project.

Georgia Department of Transportation

SELECTION OF FINALISTS

RFQ-484-071514
Engineering Design Services – (B2-2014)

The Georgia Department of Transportation is pleased to announce the selections of the following firms as finalists regarding the above RFQ for (B2-2014), Contracts 1-10:

Selected Finalists:

Project/Contract #1 – (PI/Project # 321715-)

1. American Engineers, Inc.
2. Development Planning & Engineering, Inc.
3. Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
4. Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.
5. Thompson Engineering, Inc.

Project/Contract #2 – (PI/Project # 321960-)

1. American Engineers, Inc.
2. QK4, Inc.
3. R. K. Shah & Associates
4. STV/Ralph Whitehead Associates
5. URS Corporation

Project/Contract #3 - (PI/Project # 621690-)

1. Lowe Engineers, LLC
2. R. K. Shah & Associates
3. Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc.
4. T. Y. Lin International
5. Wolverton & Associates, Inc.

Project/Contract #4 - (PI/Project # 0008356)

1. AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
2. Atkins North America, Inc.
3. Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.
4. Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.
5. Thompson Engineering, Inc.

Project/Contract #5 - (PI/Project # 0000400)

1. American Engineers, Inc.
2. CDM Smith, Inc.
3. KCI Technologies, Inc.
4. Thompson Engineering, Inc.
5. Wolverton & Associates, Inc.

Project/Contract #6 - (PI/Project # 0000760)

1. Development Planning & Engineering, Inc.
2. Gresham, Smith and Partners
3. Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.
4. Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
5. Volkert, Inc.

Project/Contract #7 - (PI/Project # 0007037)

1. Gresham, Smith and Partners
2. Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.
3. Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.
4. Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
5. Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc.

Project/Contract #8 - (PI/Project # 0007055)

1. CDM Smith Inc.
2. Gresham, Smith and Partners
3. Long Engineering, Inc.
4. Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
5. Mulkey Engineers & Consultants

Project/Contract #9 – (PI/Project # 0009400)

1. Atkins North American, Inc.
2. Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
3. Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
4. Pond & Company
5. T. Y. Lin International

Project/Contract #10 – (PI/Project # 222560-)

1. Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.
2. Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.
3. Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.
4. STV/Ralph Whitehead Associates
5. URS Corporation

Keith Golden, P.E., Commissioner

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

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

August 8, 2014

NOTICE TO SELECTED FINALISTS

To: American Engineers, Inc.; Qk4, Incorporated; R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.; STV Incorporated dba STV/Ralph Whitehead Associates (STV); and URS Corporation

Please send an e-mail confirming receipt of this notice to R. Steve Farrar (rfarrar@dot.ga.gov).

Re: RFQ-484-071514 Contract #2 – Engineering Design Services Batch #2, PI# 321960-, Fayette County

On behalf of the Selection Committee for the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) referenced above, we congratulate you and your firm on being selected as a finalist for further consideration. This notice shall serve as an official request for additional required information and action from finalists. **Please refer to the original solicitation (RFQ-484-071514), page 8, VII. Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response – Phase II Response, A & B and page 10, IX. Instructions for Submittal for Phase II – Technical Approach and Past Performance Response, A - D for instructions to submit your package.** As a finalist, your firm is required to comply with the written instructions and remaining schedule below:

A. <u>Technical Approach - 40%</u>

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 addressing anticipated design concepts, use of any alternative methods for delivery (if applicable), and/or management of the project.
   b. Identify any unique challenges of the project and how your firm intends to mitigate these challenges, including 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. <u>Past Performance - 10%</u>

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.	08/08/2014	---------
2. Deadline for submission of written questions from finalists (e-mail preferred)	08/12/2014	2:00 PM
3. GDOT Receives Submittals I and 2 for Phase II	08/19/2014	2:00 PM

C. Finalist Selection

Final selection will be determined by carrying the scores from **Phase I** forward for each Finalist and by evaluating the **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 R. Steve Farrar, and congratulations, again, to each of you!

R. Steve Farrar
rfarrar@dot.ga.gov
404-631-1561

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Engineering Design Services
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	August 19, 2014
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Compliant with Page # Limitations	Addendum #2
1	American Engineers, Inc.	8/19/2014	10:45 AM	X	X
2	R. K. Shah & Associates	8/19/2014	11:26 AM	X	X
3	URS Corporation	8/19/2014	12:43 PM	X	X
4	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	8/18/2014	11:43 AM	X	X
5	QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	8/19/2014	11:36 AM	X	X

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF SUBMITTALS

Solicitation Title:	***Engineering Design Services***	1	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates
Solicitation #:	***RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2***	2	American Engineers, Inc.
PHASE I AND PHASE II -Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overal Ranking based on Published Criteria		3	R. K. Shah & Associates
		4	URS Corporation
		5	QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.

(This Page For GDOT Use)

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING) Sum of Total Score	Group Ranking
American Engineers, Inc.	900	2
R. K. Shah & Associates	850	3
URS Corporation	825	4
STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	925	1
QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	800	5

Evaluation Criteria →

	PHASE I		PHASE II		Group Scores and Ranking	
	Experience and Qualifications	Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Technical Approach - Suitability	Past Performance		
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***	***400***	***100***		
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Engineers, Inc.	Good	Excellent	Excellent	Adequate	900	2
R. K. Shah & Associates	Good	Excellent	Good	Excellent	850	3
URS Corporation	Good	Excellent	Good	Good	825	4
STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Excellent	925	1
QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Excellent	Good	Excellent	800	5
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***	***400***	***100***	***1000***	**%**

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	American Engineers, Inc.		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Excellent

The evaluation team stated that the consultant coordinated with stakeholders knowledgeable of the project and they addressed all the challenges related to the project. The evaluation team also stated the consultant provided preliminary high-level survey information and good QC discussion.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Adequate

Evaluators are in agreement with the ratings provided by the checked references and feel these are a fair representation of the past performance.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	R. K. Shah & Associates		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good

The evaluation team noted that some details from the site visit were included in the technical proposal. The evaluation team stated that the consultant would have been assigned a higher score if specific details would have been provided (i.e. MS4 documentation, QA/QC process and identification of stakeholders).

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Excellent

Evaluators are in agreement with the ratings provided by the checked references and feel these are a fair representation of the past performance.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	URS Corporation		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good

The evaluation team stated that the consultant hit on most of the issues with this project in the technical approach write-up. The evaluation team noted that the consultant provided good detail on how they would approach the project from a technical perspective. The consultant would have received a higher rating if more project specific information was provided (i.e. environment resources, identified stakeholders, public involvement).

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Good

Evaluators are in agreement with the ratings provided by the checked references and feel these are a fair representation of the past performance. Evaluator #1 had direct involvement with the consultant and agrees the rating supports their past performance.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Excellent

The evaluation team stated the technical approach was very specific to the project and addresses the challenges of the project. For example, the project management approach indicates the consultant is committed to the deadlines. The evaluation team also noted that the consultant's prior knowledge of the project is an added value related to the technical approach.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Excellent

Evaluators are in agreement with the ratings provided by the checked references and feel these are a fair representation of the past performance.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514 Batch 2 Contract 2	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good

The evaluation team noted that the consultant provided a number of solutions for connectivity of parcels that might be difficult on this project and stated potential solutions for MS4 placement. The evaluation team stated the consultant provided very generic information related to project management. The evaluation team also noted the consultant provided high-level environmental resource information.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Excellent

Evaluators are in agreement with the ratings provided by the checked references and feel these are a fair representation of the past performance. Evaluator #1 had direct involvement with the consultant and agrees the rating supports their past performance.

Reference Check Summary for
RFQ 484-071514 (Contract #2, PI# 321960-)
Engineering Design Services (B2-2014)

Questions (to be answered on 1-10 scale, 10 indicates best)	American Engineers, Inc.	R.K. Shah & Associates	URS Corporation	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	QK4 /dba/ Presenell Associates, Inc
1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.					
Reference A	7	10	9	9	8
Reference B	8	10	9	10	9
Section Average	7.50	10.00	9.00	9.50	8.50
2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.					
Reference A	7	10	8	9	9
Reference B	9	10	8	10	9
Section Average	8.00	10.00	8.00	9.50	9.00
3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.					
Reference A	7	10	9	9	9
Reference B	8	10	8	10	10
Section Average	7.50	10.00	8.50	9.50	9.50
4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management					
Reference A	7	10	8	9	9
Reference B	8	10	8	10	9
Section Average	7.50	10.00	8.00	9.50	9.00
5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.					
Reference A	6	10	9	9	9
Reference B	8	8	8	9	9
Section Average	7.00	9.00	8.50	9.00	9.00
Overall Average	**7.50**	**9.80**	**8.40**	**9.40**	**9.00**

RFQ 484-071514 (Contract #2, PI# 321960-)
Engineering Design Services (B2-2014)

Reference Check Notes for
American Engineers, Inc.

Reference A

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation		
Project Name	SR 920 Major Urban Widening Project (2011 - Present)		
Project Manager	Darrell DeJean	Title	Project Manager
Contact Information	404-631-1567		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.		7
	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.		7
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management		7
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		6
Comments	The consultant is average with deliveries and technical design responses. The PM believes more leg-work is necessary to get design information from the consultant as compared to other consultants, but the consultant is working to do better.		

Reference B

Firm Name	Public Works Department, Houston County Georgia		
Project Name	Moody Road Major Urban Widening Project (2008-2012)		
Project Manager	Brian Jones	Title	County Engineer
Contact Information	478-987-4280		
	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.		9
	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	Had some hiccups on the project, but overall the project was successful. Would use the firm again.		

RFQ 484-071514 (Contract #2, PI# 321960-)
Engineering Design Services (B2-2014)

Reference Check Notes for
R.K. Shah & Associates

Reference A

Firm Name	Public Works Department, Houston County Georgia		
Project Name	SPLOST # CW06-12 (3/2012 - 3/2013)		
Project Manager	Brian Jones	Title	County Engineer
Contact Information	478-987-4280		
	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	Very satisfied with the firm and team. Firm stayed within budget, stayed on schedule. Team was very efficient, professional and communicative keeping Department personnel apprised of project progress.		

Reference B

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation		
Project Name	PI # 362930, Upson County (04/2007 - 5/2011)		
Project Manager	Jason Mobley	Title	District Design Engineer
Contact Information	706-646-7571		
	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.		8
Comments	The consultant put the wrong PI # on the SOQ, it should be PI # 322290. Really good team. Plans are good. Very little corrections on plans. Very thorough.		

RFQ 484-071514 (Contract #2, PI# 321960-)
Engineering Design Services (B2-2014)

Reference Check Notes for
URS Corporation

Reference A

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation		
Project Name	Peachtree Road Corridor, Atlanta GA (02/2001 - Present)		
Project Manager	Albert Welch	Title	Senior Project Manager
Contact Information	404-631-1690		
	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.		9
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management		8
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		9
Comments	The consulting firm did a good job under difficult circumstances. Their management team is solid across the board. The firm worked well with local sponsors and local government. The firm is very flexible.		

Reference B

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation		
Project Name	State Route 99 Widening and Reconstruction Projects Glynn County (2011 - Present)		
Project Manager	Matt Bennett	Title	District Program Manager
Contact Information	912-530-4392		
	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		8
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		8
Comments	The program manager you get makes a huge difference. Mr. Castronova is a really good PM and is very responsive.		

RFQ 484-071514 (Contract #2, PI# 321960-)
Engineering Design Services (B2-2014)

Reference Check Notes for
STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates

Reference A

Firm Name	Hall County Public Works		
Project Name	Spout Springs Road Widening (2011 - Present)		
Project Manager	Jody Woodall	Title	Civil Engineer 3
Contact Information	770-531-6800		
	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.		9
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management		9
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		9
Comments	Very satisfied with the team. Very responsive to the needs of Hall County. Always open to meet with property owners and government officials at any time.		

Reference B

Firm Name	York County, South Carolina		
Project Name	SC 901 Widening (2004 - 2011)		
Project Manager	Phil Leazer	Title	Program Manager of Capital Project Sales and Use Tax Program
Contact Information	803-818-5763		
	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.		9
Comments	STV is now the project manager for many of the state's road projects and they are doing a great job so far. This project was a difficult roadway design project, which had many challenges. The consultant step-up to the task and helped the public and state understand why the engineering design was the way it was. They did not nickel-dime the project.		

RFQ 484-071514 (Contract #2, PI# 321960-)
Engineering Design Services (B2-2014)

Reference Check Notes for
QK4 /dba/ Presenell Associates, Inc

Reference A

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation		
Project Name	US1 Widening (2001 - 2011)		
Project Manager	David Norwood	Title	State Scheduling Engineer
Contact Information	404-631-1523		
	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.		9
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		9
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management		9
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		9
Comments	The consultant is a good firm to work with. They take ownership of the project and look ahead to the future to ensure projects stay on schedule. Always responsive to our needs.		

Reference B

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation		
Project Name	Statewide Intersection Task Order (upgrade 81 intersections) 2006 - 2012		
Project Manager	Derrick Cameron	Title	Assistant State Project Review Engineer
Contact Information	404-631-1223		
	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		9
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		9
Comments	The consultant did a really good job. Very knowledgable of the work assigned. Staffed the project appropriately for the different phases of work.		

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : STV*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY STV ARCHITECTS INC Status:Active

DUNS: 002504678 +4: CAGE Code: 3GFL9 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Jul 10, 2015 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 205 W WELSH DR
City: DOUGLASSVILLE State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA
ZIP Code: 19518-8713 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV INCORPORATED Status:Active

DUNS: 048357735 +4: CAGE Code: 1CMZ0 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Jul 10, 2015 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 225 PARK AVE S
City: NEW YORK State/Province: NEW YORK
ZIP Code: 10003-1604 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV CONSTRUCTION, INC. Status:Active

DUNS: 784200201 +4: CAGE Code: 4KPW4 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Jul 30, 2015 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 205 WEST WELSH DR
City: DOUGLASSVILLE State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA
ZIP Code: 19518-8713 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV GROUP, INCORPORATED Status:Active

DUNS: 044520146 +4: CAGE Code: 2N222 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Jul 11, 2015 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 205 W WELSH DR
City: DOUGLASSVILLE State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA
ZIP Code: 19518-8713 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV ARCHITECTS, P.C. Status:Active

DUNS: 078491251 +4: CAGE Code: 5M7F9 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Jul 11, 2015 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 225 PARK AVE S FL 5
City: NEW YORK State/Province: NEW YORK
ZIP Code: 10003-1604 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY SHDP STV I, LLC Status:Active

DUNS: 078617986 +4: CAGE Code: 745L9 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Jul 24, 2015 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 2060 Broadway Ste 480
City: Boulder State/Province: COLORADO
ZIP Code: 80302-5228 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV CONSTRUCTION, INC. Status:Active

DUNS: 602455649 +4: CAGE Code: 4KZJ8 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Jul 10, 2015 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 225 PARK AVE S FL 5
City: NEW YORK State/Province: NEW YORK
ZIP Code: 10003-1604 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV INCORPORATED Status:Active

DUNS: 121340855 +4: CAGE Code: 1P9D1 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Jul 10, 2015 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 7125 AMBAMDADOR RD STE 200
City: BALTIMORE State/Province: MARYLAND
ZIP Code: 21244-2708 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV INCORPORATED Status:Active

DUNS: 106768252 +4: CAGE Code: 0HAW1 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Jul 10, 2015 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 205 W WELSH DR
City: DOUGLASSVILLE State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA
ZIP Code: 19518-8713 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV-RS&H Joint Venture — Status:Active

DUNS: 079364580 +4: CAGE Code: 74AW1 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: May 1, 2015 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 448 Viking Dr Ste 200
City: VIRGINIA BEACH State/Province: VIRGINIA
ZIP Code: 23452-7377 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV-ELLERBE BECKET JV — Status:Active

DUNS: 806871229 +4: CAGE Code: 50H90 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Mar 13, 2015 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 225 PARK AVE S FL 5
City: NEW YORK State/Province: NEW YORK
ZIP Code: 10003-1604 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV-BRPH JOINT VENTURE — Status:Active

DUNS: 078722783 +4: CAGE Code: 6UQE4 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Mar 13, 2015 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 205 W Welsh Dr
City: Douglassville State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA
ZIP Code: 19518-8713 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV-URS JOINT VENTURE — Status:Active

DUNS: 831554006 +4: CAGE Code: 5MPU5 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Feb 11, 2015 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 225 PARK AVE S FL 5
City: NEW YORK State/Province: NEW YORK
ZIP Code: 10003-0000 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV Group, Inc. — Status:Active

DUNS: 148096555 +4: CAGE Code: 1KS79 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Dec 13, 2014 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 12 Clawson Ave
City: Ramah State/Province: NEW MEXICO
ZIP Code: 87321 Country: UNITED STATES

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
STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates 3505 Koger Boulevard, Suite 205 Duluth, GA 30096	6/13/13	6/30/16

SIGNATURE

Russell R McMurry

1. Transporation Planning

___	1.01	State Wide Systems Planning
___	1.02	Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning
___	1.03	Aviation Systems Planning
X	1.04	Mass and Rapid Transportation Planning
X	1.05	Alternate System and Corridor Location Planning
___	1.06	Unknown
___	1.06a	NEPA Documentation
___	1.06b	History
X	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
X	1.12	Major Investment Studies
X	1.13	Non-Motorized Transportation Planning

2. Mass Transit Operations

X	2.01	Mass Transit Program (Systems) Management
X	2.02	Mass Transit Feasibility and Technical Studies
___	2.03	Mass Transit Vehicle and Propulsion System
X	2.04	Mass Transit Controls, Communications and Information Systems
___	2.05	Mass Transit Architectural Engineering
___	2.06	Mass Transit Unique Structures
X	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
X	3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
X	3.07	Traffic Operations Design
___	3.08	Landscape Architecture

3. Highway Design Roadway (Continued)

X	3.09	Traffic Control Systems Analysis, Design and Implementation
X	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)
___	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
___	9.03	Field Inspections for Compliance of Erosion and Sedimentation Control Devices Installations