DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

September 10, 2014

RFQ #: 484-071514
RFQ Title: Engineering Design Services, Contract 8, P.I. #0007055

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. **Long Engineering, Inc.**
2. **Gresham, Smith and Partners**
3. **Michael Baker Jr., Inc.**
4. **CDM Smith, Inc.**
5. **Mulkey Engineers and Consultants**

The Selection Committee recommends the selection of the top ranked firm, **Long Engineering, Inc.**

Concurrence with Award from Responsible Division Director:

Joe Carpenter, Division Director of P3/Program Delivery

Certification Procurement Requirements Met:

Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator

DJP:kcm

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.

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Engineering Design Services, Contract 8
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	July 15, 2014
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm

Georgia Department of Transportation

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Exhibit II - Certification	Exhibit III - GSICAA	Signed Addendum If Applicable	Compliant with Page # Limitations	Compliant with Required Format	Meets Required Area Classes	Comments
1	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	7/15/2014	11:03 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
2	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	7/15/2014	9:46 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Subs area class expires this year.
3	CDM Smith Inc	7/15/2014	11:07 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Subs area class expires this year.
4	CHA Consulting, Inc.	7/15/2014	9:29 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
5	Gresham, Smith and Partners	7/15/2014	11:04 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	**Prime's Certificate expires on 09/30/14. Also, the Subs also expires this year.**
6	Hatch Mott MacDonald, LLC	7/15/2014	11:18 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Subs area class expires this year.
7	Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC	7/15/2014	11:45 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
8	KCI Technologies, Inc.	7/15/2014	11:13 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	**Prime's Certificate expires on 09/30/14. Also, the Subs also expires this year.**
9	Long Engineering, Inc.	7/11/2014	9:17 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Subs area class expires in one month.
10	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	7/15/2014	10:16 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
11	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	7/15/2014	8:30 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Subs area class expires in one month.
12	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	7/15/2014	12:15 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Subs area class expires in one month.
13	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	7/15/2014	8:34 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Subs area class expires in one month.
14	Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	7/15/2014	10:55 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	**Prime's Certificate expires on 09/30/14. Also, the Subs also expires this year.**

15	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	7/15/2014	12:56 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	**Prime's Certificate expires on 12/31/14. Also, the Subs also expires this year.**
16	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	7/15/2014	9:44 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Subs area class expires this year.
17	TranSystems Corporation	7/15/2014	9:59 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	**Prime's Certificate expires on 09/30/14. Also, the Subs also expires this year.**
18	T.Y. Lin International	7/15/2014	1:08 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	Subs area class expires this year.
19	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	7/15/2014	8:15 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
20	Volkert, Inc.	7/15/2014	11:53 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	x	

SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST

Solicitation #: RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055

Solicitation Title: Engineering Design Services, Contract 8

	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	3.01	3.12	4.01	4.04	5.01	5.02	5.03	6.01(a)	6.01(b)	6.02	9.01	Certificate Expires	Comments
1	**AECOM Technical Services, Inc.**	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X							X	1/3/2015	
	Ecological Solutions	X				X		X													2/29/2016	
	GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X												11/30/2015	
	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	X				X				X	X			X	X	X				X	12/31/2016	
	Ranger Consulting, Inc.																X	X	X		5/31/2015	
2	**American Consulting Professionals, LLC**	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	
	Ecological Solutions	X				X		X													2/29/2016	
	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group LLC	X	X			X			X	X										X	7/31/2015	
	KCI Technologies, Inc.			X	X					X		X		X	X	X				X	**8/31/2014**	Expires in one month.
	Long Engineering, Inc.									X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	2/28/2015	
	MC Squared, Inc.																X	X	X		**10/31/2014**	Expires this year.
3	**CDM Smith Inc**	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	2/28/2015	
	Sycamore Consulting, Inc.								X												**11/30/2014**	Expires this year.
4	**CHA Consulting, Inc.**									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													**8/31/2014**	Expires this year.
	Willmer Engineering, Inc.																X	X	X		2/28/2017	
	Long Engineering, Inc.									X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	2/28/2015	
5	**Gresham, Smith and Partners**	X				X				X	X	X	X							X	**9/30/2014**	Expires this year.
	GT Hill Planners Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X												11/30/2015	
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X													**8/31/2014**	Expires this year.
	United Consulting					X											X	X	X		**8/31/2014**	Expires this year.
	American Engineers, Inc.									X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9/30/2016	
	Ecological Solutions	X				X		X													2/29/2016	
	URS Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	6/30/2015	
6	**Hatch Mott MacDonald, LLC**									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													**8/31/2014**	Expires this year.
	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	X				X				X	X			X	X	X				X	12/31/2015	Expires this year.
	MC Squared, Inc.																X	X	X		**10/31/2014**	
7	**Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC**									X	X	X	X							X	**2/29/2016**	
	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X							X	1/31/2015	
	Long Engineering, Inc.									X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	2/28/2015	
	Golder Associates, Inc.																X	X	X	X	2/28/2015	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X												5/31/2017	
8	**KCI Technologies, Inc.**			X	X					X		X		X	X	X				X	**8/31/2014**	Expires in one month.
	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	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	1/31/2015	
	United Consulting					X											X	X	X		**8/31/2014**	Expires in one month.
9	**Long Engineering, Inc.**									X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	**2/28/2015**	
	Atkins North America, Inc	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	**8/31/2014**	Expires in one month.
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X												5/31/2017	
	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/31/2015	
10	**Michael Baker Jr., Inc.**	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	
	Willmer Engineering, Inc.																X	X	X		2/28/2017	
	Long Engineering, Inc.									X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	2/28/2015	

SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST

Solicitation #: RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055

Solicitation Title: Engineering Design Services, Contract 8

11	**Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.**	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													**8/31/2014**	Expires in one month.
	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	11/30/2015	
12	**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													**8/31/2014**	Expires in one month.
	T. Y. Lin International									X	X	X								X	2/28/2015	
	Ranger Consulting, Inc.																X	X	X		5/31/2015	
13	**Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.**									X	X	X	X							X	**2/28/2015**	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X												5/31/2017	
	LandAir Surveying Company of Georgia													X	X	X					7/31/2017	
	S&ME, Inc.																X	X	X		**12/31/2014**	Expires this year.
	Sycamore Consulting, Inc.								X													
14	**Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)**	X							X	X	X	X	X							X	**11/30/2016**	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X												5/31/2017	
	United Consulting					X											X	X	X		**8/31/2014**	Expires in one month.
	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	X				X				X	X			X	X	X				X	12/31/2015	
15	**Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.**	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	**12/31/2014**	Expires this year.
	Contour Engineering, LLC																X	X	X		4/30/2017	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X												5/31/2017	
	Long Engineering, Inc.									X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	2/28/2015	
16	**STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates**			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	
	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.									X	X	X	X							X	4/30/2017	
	Luster National, Inc.																			X	9/30/2015	
	Sycamore Consulting, Inc.								X												11/30/2014	Expires this year.
	United Consulting					X											X	X	X		8/31/2014	Expires next month.
	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.									X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	8/31/2015	
17	**TranSystems Corporation**									X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	**8/31/2014**	Prime's Certificate Expires in one month.
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X												5/31/2017	
	Ranger Consulting, Inc.																X	X	X		5/31/2015	
	Sycamore Consulting, Inc.								X												11/30/2014	Expires this year.
	Pont Engineering, Inc.											X									11/30/2015	
18	**T.Y. Lin International**									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	
	Aulick Engineering LLC										X		X							X	12/31/2014	Expires this year.
	United Consulting					X											X	X	X		8/31/2014	Expires next month.
	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.									X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	8/31/2015	
19	**Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.**									X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	**8/31/2015**	
	T.Y. Lin International																				2/28/2015	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X												5/31/2017	
	Sycamore Consulting, Inc.								X												11/30/2014	Expires this year.
	Contour Engineering, LLC																X	X	X		4/30/2017	
20	**Volkert, Inc.**	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	7/31/2015	
	TBE Group, Inc.													X	X	X					5/31/2016	
	Willmer Engineering, Inc.																X	X	X		2/28/2017	

GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS
RFQ 484-071514, Contract 8
Engineering Design Services, P.I. No. 0007055
Bridge Replacement on SR 180 at Slaughter Creek

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

Coordination and Communication

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

Evaluation Process

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

Phase I

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

Phase II

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

Phase I
Evaluation of Statements of Qualifications

Evaluation of Eligible Submittals

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

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

Directions for use of the Evaluation Preliminary Scoring Forms:

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

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

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

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATING AVAILABILITY

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

Evaluation Meeting:

All completed Scoring Forms with the preliminary scores and comments for each criteria of each firm, must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Tuesday, July 29, 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, Contract 8***		1	Gresham, Smith and Partners
Solicitation #:	***RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055***		2	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.
PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Preliminary Scoring based on Published Criteria			3	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
(This Page For GDOT Use)			4	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
			5	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants
	(RANKING)		6	American Consulting Professionals, LLC
	Sum of		7	Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC
	Individual	Group	8	Long Engineering, Inc.
SUBMITTING FIRMS	**Rankings**	**Ranking**	9	CDM Smith Inc
			10	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	**10**	**3**	11	Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	**15**	**6**	12	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.
CDM Smith Inc	**20**	**9**	13	KCI Technologies, Inc.
CHA Consulting, Inc.	**44**	**18**	14	TranSystems Corporation
Gresham, Smith and Partners	**7**	**1**	15	T.Y. Lin International
Hatch Mott MacDonald, LLC	**38**	**16**	16	Hatch Mott MacDonald, LLC
Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC	**18**	**7**	16	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.
KCI Technologies, Inc.	**29**	**13**	18	CHA Consulting, Inc.
Long Engineering, Inc.	**18**	**8**	19	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	**12**	**4**	20	Volkert, Inc.
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	**9**	**2**		
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	**13**	**5**		
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	**25**	**10**		
Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	**26**	**11**		
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	**27**	**12**		
STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	**46**	**19**		
TranSystems Corporation	**30**	**14**		
T.Y. Lin International	**33**	**15**		
Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	**38**	**16**		
Volkert, Inc.	**46**	**19**		

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND RANKING OF SUBMITTALS - PHASE I

RFQ 484-071514, Contract 8, P.I. No. 0007055, Evaluator 1

	Evaluation Criteria	Experience and Qualification	Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Individual Total Score	Individual Rank
		Evaluator			
	SUBMITTING FIRMS	Categories			
1	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	Excellent	Good	425	1
2	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Good	Good	375	2
3	CDM Smith Inc	Marginal	Good	275	10
4	CHA Consulting, Inc.	Adequate	Poor	100	19
5	Gresham, Smith and Partners	Good	Good	375	2
6	Hatch Mott MacDonald, LLC	Marginal	Poor	50	20
7	Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC	Good	Adequate	300	8
8	KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
9	Long Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
10	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Good	Good	375	2
11	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	Good	Good	375	2
12	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Adequate	Good	325	6
13	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
14	Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	Good	Adequate	300	8
15	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	Adequate	Marginal	175	15
16	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	Marginal	Marginal	125	17
17	TranSystems Corporation	Marginal	Adequate	200	14
18	T.Y. Lin International	Adequate	Marginal	175	15
19	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	6
20	Volkert, Inc.	Marginal	Marginal	125	17

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 - Engineering Design Services, Contract 8, P.I. No. 0007055	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #:			

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: AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

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

PM is qualified and has extensive transportation related experience as well as PM experience. Roadway lead is qualified and has extensive transportation related experience. Bridge lead is qualified and has extensive relevant experience. The key team members have experience with GDOT practices. Based on the team and prime's demonstrated project experience the team appears excellent.

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

The team appears to be very diverse and has demonstrated experience similar to the proposed project. The availability of the team appears adequate. The resource and availability of the team appear to be good.

Firm Name: American Consulting Professionals, LLC

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

PM is qualified and has extensive transportation related experience as well as PM experience. Roadway lead is qualified and has suitable transportation related experience. Bridge lead is qualified and has suitable relevant experience. The key team members have experience with GDOT practices. Based on the team and prime's demonstrated project experience the team appears good.

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

The team appears to be very diverse and has demonstrated experience similar to the proposed project. The availability of the team appears adequate although all key team leads have approximately 50% availability. The resource and availability of the team appear to be good.

Firm Name: CDM Smith Inc

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

PM is qualified and has suitable experience including bridge design and bridge hydraulics. However his PM experience appears limited. Roadway lead is qualified and has an extensive amount experience. Bridge lead is qualified and has suitable experience. The bridge lead appears to have limited experience with GDOT practices but the other team members appear adequate. The Prime's demonstrated project experience and qualifications appears marginal.

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

The team appears to be very diverse and has demonstrated experience similar to the proposed project. The availability of the team appears adequate. The resource and availability of the team appear to be good.

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

PM is qualified and has extensive transportation related experience as well as PM experience. Roadway lead is qualified and has suitable transportation related experience and some experience with similar type projects. Bridge lead is qualified and has suitable experience. The key team members have experience with GDOT practices. Based on the team and prime's demonstrated project experience the team appears adequate.

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

The team resources listed in the project organizational chart appear to be limited. There's not real detail for the environmental disciplines, no Bridge Hydraulic resource listed and no emphasis on QC. Although the availability of the team appears adequate for the project the lack of demonstrated staffing indicates that the team is considered poor.

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

PM is qualified and has extensive transportation related experience as well as PM experience. Roadway lead is qualified and has suitable transportation related experience. Bridge lead is qualified and has extensive relevant experience. The key team members have experience with GDOT practices. Based on the team and prime's demonstrated project experience the team appears good.

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

The team appears to be very diverse and has demonstrated experience similar to the proposed project. The availability of the team appears adequate. The resource and availability of the team appear to be good.

Firm Name:	Hatch Mott MacDonald, LLC	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating →	Marginal

PM is qualified and has extensive transportation related experience. His PM experience includes work as a sub-consultant and a few projects that are not similar in scope. Roadway lead is qualified but has limited experience. Bridge lead is qualified and has extensive relevant experience and demonstrated experience in LRFD. The key team members have experience with GDOT practices. Based on the team and prime's demonstrated project experience the team appears marginal.

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

The resources did not clearly show who will perform the Bridge Hydraulics work and the environmental roles are not specifically shown. The availability of the key team members only lists the status of the projects and not the effort. The resource and availability of the team appear to be poor.

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

PM is qualified and has extensive transportation related experience as well as PM experience. Roadway lead is qualified and has suitable transportation related experience. Bridge lead is qualified and has suitable relevant experience. The bridge lead appears to have limited experience with GDOT practices but the other team members appear adequate. Based on the team and prime's demonstrated project experience the team appears good.

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

The resources did not clearly show who will perform the Bridge Hydraulics work. The availability of the key team members appears adequate. The resource and availability of the team appear to be adequate.

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

PM is qualified and has extensive transportation related experience as well as PM experience. Roadway lead is qualified and has suitable transportation experience but has limited experience similar in scope. Bridge lead is qualified and has suitable experience but has limited experience similar in scope. The Prime's experience is adequate but only had the PM involved out of the key team leads. The Bridge lead has limited experience with GDOT practices but the other key team members have suitable experience with GDOT practices. The team qualifications and experience appears to be adequate.

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

The team resources for the proposed project appear to be limited and do not account for QC/QA. The key team members appear to have adequate capacity to perform the work. The overall resources and availability for the team is adequate.

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

PM is qualified and has extensive transportation related experience as well as PM experience. Roadway lead is qualified and has suitable transportation experience but has limited experience similar in scope. Bridge lead is qualified and has suitable relevant experience. The Prime's experience and that of the key team members is good. The key team members have experience with GDOT practices. The team qualifications and experience appears to be adequate.

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

The team resources for the proposed project appear to be limited showing primarily the key team members and does not list various aspect necessary for environmental. The key team members appear to have adequate capacity to perform the work. The overall resources and availability for the team is adequate.

Firm Name:	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating →	Good

PM is qualified and has suitable transportation related experience as well as PM experience. Roadway lead is qualified and has suitable transportation related experience. Bridge lead is qualified and has suitable relevant experience. The Prime's experience and that of the key team members is good. The key team members have experience with GDOT practices. The team qualifications and experience appears to be good.

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

The team resources for the proposed project appear to be good. The key team members have adequate capacity to perform the work. The overall resources and availability for the team is good.

Firm Name:	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating →	Good

PM is qualified and has extensive transportation experience as well as PM experience but has limited projects that are similar in scope. Roadway lead is qualified and has suitable transportation experience but has limited experience similar in scope. Bridge lead is qualified and has extensive relevant experience and experience with LRFD. The Prime's experience and that of the key team leads is good. The key team members have suitable experience with GDOT practices. The team qualifications and experience appears to be good.

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

The team resources for the proposed project appear to be good. The key team members have adequate capacity to perform the work. The overall resources and availability for the team is good.

Firm Name:	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants

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

PM is qualified and has suitable transportation related experience as well as PM experience including multiple bridge replacement projects. Roadway lead is qualified and has suitable transportation related experience and some experience with similar type projects. Bridge lead is qualified and has suitable relevant experience. The key team members have experience with GDOT practices, however the Bridge lead does not. It should be noted that the Bridge lead is not an employee of the Prime. Based on the team and prime's demonstrated project experience the team appears adequate.

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

The team appears to be very diverse and has demonstrated experience similar to the proposed project. The availability of the team appears adequate, however the Roadway lead is completing work that if delayed could interfere with the project. The resource and availability of the team appear to be good.

Firm Name:	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

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

PM is qualified and has extensive transportation related experience. His demonstrated PM experience lists multiple projects of which all were performed by consultants with consultant Project Managers. Roadway lead is qualified and has suitable transportation related experience and some experience with similar type projects. Bridge lead is qualified and has suitable experience, however, primarily the projects listed were interchange projects not similar to the proposed work. The key team members have experience with GDOT practices. Based on the team and prime's demonstrated project experience the team appears adequate.

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

The team resources appear to be suitable. The resources did not clearly show who will perform the Bridge Hydraulics work. The availability of the team appears generally adequate, however the Environmental lead appears to have limited availability. The resource and availability of the team appear to be adequate.

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

PM is qualified and has suitable relevant transportation experience as well as PM experience. Roadway lead is qualified and has suitable transportation experience. Bridge lead is qualified and has extensive relevant experience and experience. The Prime's experience and that of the key team leads is good. The key team members have suitable experience with GDOT practices. The team qualifications and experience appears to be good.

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

The team resources for the proposed project appear to be limited showing primarily the key team members and does not list various aspect necessary for environmental. The key team members appear to have adequate capacity to perform the work. The overall resources and availability for the team is adequate.

Firm Name:	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

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

PM is qualified and has suitable transportation related experience as well as PM experience. Roadway lead is qualified and has suitable transportation related experience. PM and Roadway Lead list experience the conflict with Prime's demonstrated experience. Bridge lead is qualified and has suitable relevant experience. The key team members have experience with GDOT practices. Based on the team and prime's demonstrated project experience the team appears adequate.

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

The resources did not clearly show who will perform the Bridge Hydraulics work and the environmental roles are not specifically shown. The availability of the key team members appears adequate. The resource and availability of the team appear to be marginal.

Firm Name:	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates

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

PM is qualified and has extensive transportation related experience as well as PM experience. She was Roadway lead on 10 bridge replacement projects. Roadway lead is qualified and has moderate transportation related experience and some experience with similar type projects. Bridge lead is qualified but experience demonstrated appear to be limited. The key team members have experience with GDOT practices. The Prime's demonstrated project experience the team appears suitable but the key team members did not have a significant role in the work. Based on this the team appears marginal.

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

The resources did not clearly show who will perform the Bridge Hydraulics work. The availability of the team appears generally adequate, however the Bridge lead appears to have limited availability and does not appear that he will contribute to the work. The resource and availability of the team appear to be marginal.

Firm Name:	TranSystems Corporation

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

PM is qualified and has extensive transportation related experience as well as PM experience. He was Roadway lead on 7 bridge replacement projects. Although the Roadway lead has a significant amount of transportation experience he does not have an engineering degree nor is he a professional engineer. Bridge lead is qualified and has suitable experience. The key team members have experience with GDOT practices. The Prime's demonstrated project experience and the team appears marginal primarily based on Roadway lead.

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

The team resources appear to be suitable with the exception of the Roadway lead. The availability of the team appears generally adequate, however the Environmental lead appears to have limited availability. The resource and availability of the team appear to be adequate.

Firm Name:	T.Y. Lin International

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

PM is qualified and has extensive relevant transportation experience however the PM experience is not clearly defined where he states for all projects that he was Principal-in-charge. Roadway lead is qualified and has suitable transportation experience. Bridge lead is qualified and has suitable experience. The Prime's experience and that of the key team leads is adequate. The Bridge lead has limited experience with GDOT practices but the other key team members have suitable experience with GDOT practices. The team qualifications and experience appears to be adequate.

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

The team resources for the proposed project appear to be suitable however it is unclear what roles of environmental, bridge design and bridge hydraulics will be performed by which individual. The Roadway lead appears to have limited availability but the other key team members appear to have adequate capacity to perform the work. The overall resources and availability for the team is marginal.

Firm Name:	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.

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

PM is qualified and has suitable relevant transportation experience as well as PM experience. Roadway lead is a sub-consultant who is qualified and has suitable transportation experience. Bridge lead is qualified and has suitable experience. The Prime's experience and that of the key team leads is adequate. The Bridge lead has limited experience with GDOT practices but the other key team members have suitable experience with GDOT practices. The team qualifications and experience appears to be adequate.

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

The team resources for the proposed project appear to be good. The key team members have adequate capacity to perform the work. The overall resources and availability for the team is good.

Firm Name:	Volkert, Inc.

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

PM is qualified and has a wide range of experience not necessarily similar in scope and he has limited PM experience. Roadway lead is qualified but demonstrated experience is not similar in scope. Bridge lead is qualified and has limited experience. The key team members have very limited experience with GDOT practices. The Prime's demonstrated project experience and the team appears marginal.

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

The resources did not clearly show who will perform the Bridge Hydraulics nor who will conduct QC/QA. The availability of the key team members appears adequate. The resource and availability of the team appear to be marginal.

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND RANKING OF SUBMITTALS - PHASE I

RFQ 484-071514, Contract 8, P.I. No. 0007055, Evaluator 2

	Evaluation Criteria	Experience and Qualification	Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Individual Total Score	Individual Rank
		Evaluator			
	SUBMITTING FIRMS	Categories			
1	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	8
2	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
3	CDM Smith Inc	Adequate	Good	325	4
4	CHA Consulting, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	8
5	Gresham, Smith and Partners	Adequate	Good	325	4
6	Hatch Mott MacDonald, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
7	Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC	Adequate	Good	325	4
8	KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
9	Long Engineering, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
10	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	4
11	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
12	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Good	Good	375	1
13	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	8
14	Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
15	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	8
16	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
17	TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
18	T.Y. Lin International	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
19	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	12
20	Volkert, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	12

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 - Engineering Design Services, Contract 8, P.I. No. 0007055	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: AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

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

The PM, Key Team Leaders and Prime appear to have the experience and qualifications to perform the task.

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

All team members appear to have the necessary availability with the exception of the PM. The PM has less than 50

Firm Name: American Consulting Professionals, LLC

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

The PM appears to have adequate experience. The project experience is weighted more toward design than enviro

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

The PM has adequate availability. The other key team members have less than 50% availability although these men

Firm Name: CDM Smith Inc

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

The PM appears to have adequate experience. The project experience is weighted more toward design than enviro

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

The PM and Key Team Leaders all appear to have sufficient availability.

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

The PM, Key Team Leaders and Prime appear to have the experience and qualifications to perform the task. The pr

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

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have adequeate workload capacity; however, the bridge engineer appears

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

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have the necessary experience. The NEPA team lead has only been with t

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

The PM and Key Team Leaders all appear to have sufficient availability.

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

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient experience and qualifications in engineering. The Prime or

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

It's very difficult to tell from the information provided the precise availability of the team other than their assurance

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

THe PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have the necessary experience and qualifications in the area of engineeri

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

Thee PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient availability. The roadway team leader will have less than

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

The Project Manager and Key Team Leaders for design appear to have sufficient experience and qualifications. Th

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

The PM and design leads appear to have adequate availability. The NEPA lead will have less than 50% availability.

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

The Project Manager and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient experience and qualifications. The Prime has

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

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have adequate resources and workload capacity for the contract.

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

THe PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient experience and qualifications in the area of engineering. T

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

The Project Manager and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient resources and capacity to perform the task. T

Firm Name:	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating → Good

PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient experience. The Prime has project experience in both enginee

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

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient availability--over 50% availability in all areas.

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

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient experience and qualifications. The PM has both engineerir

	Assigned Rating → Good

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have the necessary availability. All leadership services can be handled by

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

The PM and Team Leaders appear to have sufficient experience in both engineering services and environmental services. The Prime provided 3 of 5 projects reflecting environmental experience.

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

The PM and Key Team members (engineering) appear to have sufficient availability. The NEPA lead has less than 5(

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

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient experience. Only one of the 5 projects provided by the Pri

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

The PM and Key Team members (engineering) appear to have sufficient availability. The NEPA lead has less than 5(

Firm Name:	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating → Good

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient experience and qualifications. All projects provided as exa

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

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient capacity. The PM and NEPA lead have less than 50% avail

Firm Name:	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating → Adequate

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient experience and qualifications. The project examples provi

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

The PM and Bridge and NEPA Team Leaders have sufficient capacity. The Road Design Team Leader has less than

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

The Project Manger and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient experience and qualifications. None of the proj

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

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient capacity to peform the work. The NEPA lead has less than

Firm Name:	T.Y. Lin International
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating → Adequate

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient experience and qualifications. The PMs experience does n

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

The PM and Key Team Leaders for Bridge Design and NEPA appear to have sufficient capacity. They Road Design te

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

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient experience and qualifications. Environmental experience

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

The PM and Bridge Engineer have sufficient availability. The other key team members have less than 50% availabili

Firm Name:	Volkert, Inc.

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

The PM and Key Team Leaders appear to have sufficient experience and qualifications. The PMs experience does n

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

The Key Team Leaders have sufficient capacity. The PM has less than 50% capacity and several of those projects a

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND RANKING OF SUBMITTALS - PHASE I

RFQ 484-071514, Contract 8, P.I. No. 0007055, Evaluator 3

	Evaluation Criteria	Experience and Qualification	Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Individual Total Score	Individual Rank
		Evaluator			
	SUBMITTING FIRMS	Categories			
1	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
2	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Good	Good	375	1
3	CDM Smith Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
4	CHA Consulting, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	17
5	Gresham, Smith and Partners	Good	Good	375	1
6	Hatch Mott MacDonald, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
7	Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
8	KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
9	Long Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
10	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
11	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
12	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
13	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
14	Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
15	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	4
16	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates	Marginal	Adequate	200	17
17	TranSystems Corporation	Good	Adequate	300	4
18	T.Y. Lin International	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
19	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Marginal	175	20
20	Volkert, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	17

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ 484-071514 - Engineering Design Services, Contract 8, P.I. No. 0007055	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #:			

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: AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

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

Key team leads listed all relevant GDOT projects. Prime experience lists all relevant GDOT projects. Area class exceeds by being qualified in all fields of key team leads.

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

All key team leads under prime. Adequate availability.

Firm Name: American Consulting Professionals, LLC

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

PM experience listed all relevant GDOT projects. Key team leads listed relevant projects. Area class exceeds by being qualified in all fields of key team leads. Projects listed appear to lack GDOT experience.

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

All key team leads under prime. Adequate availability.

Firm Name: CDM Smith Inc

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

PM projects listed appear to reflect PM as not PM for all. NEPA projects listed do not reflect experience with relevant projects.

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

Appear to have adequate resources.

Firm Name:	CHA Consulting, Inc.		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating →	Marginal

PM lists projects not related in scope. Primes projects listed are not all related to scope.

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

Appear to have adequate resources.

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

Key team leads listed all relevant GDOT projects. Prime experience lists all relevant GDOT projects. Area class exceeds by being qualified in all fields of key team leads.

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

All key team leads under prime. Adequate availability.

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

Appear to have adequate experience to complete the project

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

Appear to have adequate resources.

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

Projects listed for PM appear to show him as not PM for all projects. PM lists relevant projects in scope. Projects listed not all GDOT projects. Primes project all relevant to scope. Projects do not demonstrate knowledge of GDOT practices.

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

Appear to have adequate resources.

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

Bridge Lead's projects indicate lack of experience related to scope of this project. NEPA experience appears limited based on listed projects.

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

Appears to have adequate resource & availability.

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

PM projects listed are not all of similar scope. Prime lists projects of similar scope. Area class meets min requirements.

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

Org chart lacks clarity of roles. Appear to have adequate availability.

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

PM projects listed are not all of similar scope. NEPA lead appears to not be lead on 2 of 3 projects. Prime projects listed are of relevancy

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

Appears to have adequate resource & availability.

Firm Name:	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating →	Adequate

PM projects, key team lead, and prime projects listed not of similar scope.

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

Appear to have adequate resources.

Firm Name:	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants

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

PM has both environmental and engineering experience with some relevant projects listed. NEPA projects listed questionable if lead and

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

Bridge lead not in prime. Adequate resource availability.

Firm Name:	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

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

Bridge lead listed projects not related in scope. Prime listed relevant projects to scope. NEPA lists projects that indicated relevant experience.

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

Appear to have adequate resources.

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

Not clear if PM was PM of all projects listed. Key team leads listed some projects relevant to scope. Prime listed projects relevant to scope. Area class sufficient

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

Appear to have adequate resources.

Firm Name:	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

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

PM appears to have limited PM experience based on listed projects. Key team leads projects indicate some projects relevant to scope. Prime listed all projects relevant to scope. Area class exceeds minimum.

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

Appear to have adequate resources.

Firm Name:	STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating → Marginal

PM list no projects relevant with scope. Unclear based on projects listed of bridge leads experience. Roadway lead lists no relevant projects.

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

Appear to have adequate resources.

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

PM and key team leads lists projects related to scope. All prime's projects listed relevant in scope.

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

Appear to have adequate resources.

Firm Name:	T.Y. Lin International
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating → Adequate

PM lists projects with title as principle in charge not PM. Bridge lead lists projects that don't reflect knowledge of GDOT processes. Area class meets minimum requirements.

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

Appear to have adequate resources.

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

Appear to have adequate experience to complete the project

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

Appear to have adequate resources.

Firm Name:	Volkert, Inc.		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating →	Marginal

PM list no projects relevant with scope. Unclear based on projects listed of bridge leads experience. Roadway lead lists no relevant projects.

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

Appear to have adequate resources.

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

Solicitation Title:	***Engineering Design Services, Contract 8***	1	Gresham, Smith and Partners
Solicitation #:	***RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055***	1	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants
PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria FOR TOP TEN SUBITTALS		1	Long Engineering, Inc.
(This Page For GDOT Use)		4	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
		4	CDM Smith Inc
	(RANKING)	6	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
		7	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.
	Group	7	American Consulting Professionals, LLC
SUBMITTING FIRMS	Score / Ranking	7	Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC
		7	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
		7	Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)
		7	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.
Gresham, Smith and Partners	375 / 1	7	KCI Technologies, Inc.
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	250 / 7	14	TranSystems Corporation
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	300 / 6	15	T.Y. Lin International
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	325 / 4		
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	375 / 1		
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	250 / 7		
Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC	250 / 7		
Long Engineering, Inc.	375 / 1		
CDM Smith Inc	325 / 4		
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	250 / 7		
Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	250 / 7		
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	250 / 7		
KCI Technologies, Inc.	250 / 7		
TranSystems Corporation	200 / 14		
T.Y. Lin International	175 / 15		

Evaluation Criteria →

	Experience and Qualifications	Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Scores and Group Ranking	
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***		
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
Gresham, Smith and Partners	Good	Good	375	1
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	6
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	4
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Good	Good	375	1
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Long Engineering, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
CDM Smith Inc	Adequate	Good	325	4
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
TranSystems Corporation	Marginal	Adequate	200	14
T.Y. Lin International	Adequate	Marginal	175	15
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***	***500***	*%

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Gresham, Smith and Partners	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

Project Manager (PM) and Bridge Lead had extensive experience with relevant GDOT projects of similar scope. The key team leaders have experience with GDOT policies and practices. The National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) team lead is new to the company.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The key team leads are employed by the Prime Consultant. The PM as well as key team leads have sufficient workload capacity and availability. The resources listed on the organization chart appear sufficient to meet the project needs. Organization chart was detailed for personnel listed.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The team did not list relevant projects of similar scope. The PM listed a project as a Design Team Leader, not as a Project Manager. The firm demonstrated that they have environmental experience, but did not list Bridge Replacement over Waterways. The Bridge Lead has extensive experience with bridge related projects.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

The firm appeared to have 50% availability. The resources for the proposed project appeared to be suitable. The organization chart had detailed information.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

The PM had extensive transportation experience. The Bridge Lead is qualified and has extensive relative experience. All team members are knowledgeable of GDOT practices. The firm listed projects of similar scope. The Area Class summary chart exceeded the minimum required categories. The NEPA lead has relevant experience and provided project examples with environmental documents.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

It appears that the PM has less than 50% availability. All the key team leaders were employed by the Prime. The resources for the proposed project appeared to be suitable. The organization chart had detailed information for the team.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM had suitable transportation experience. Most of the listed projects were not similar in scope. The specific experience for the team demonstrated lack of environmental projects.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The resources listed on the organization chart appear sufficient to meet the project needs. Organization chart was detailed for personnel listed.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

The PM has experience which is relevant to the scope of work. The Roadway Lead is qualified and has suitable transportation experience with similar type projects. Roadway Lead also mentioned his experience with two widening projects. The key team members have experience with GDOT's practices except for the Bridge team lead.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

It appears that they have sufficient availability and overall availability appears good. The Roadway Lead has prior commitments that may interfere with the project if they are delayed.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM is qualified and has relevant project experience. The Roadway Lead has suitable experience. All the projects listed were similar in scope to the project. The specific listed project experience for the team lacks environmental examples. It was not clear what the NEPA lead's experience entailed. The Area Class summary chart exceeded the minimum required categories.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

The team's availability appeared to be 50%. They did have adequate resources for this project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM is qualified and has extensive transportation related experience but lacks GDOT procedures. The Roadway Lead also has relevant experience. The Bridge Lead has suitable experience. All five team project examples do not mention environmental experience. It was not clear if the PM managed the listed projects.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

Currently, the team has less than 50% availability. The Prime anticipated that they will have full availability by May, 2015. It is unclear from the resources who will be responsible for the Bridge Hydraulics Study.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Long Engineering, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

The key team leaders have sufficient experience and qualifications. The Prime and the PM have engineering and environmental experience.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The team displayed more than 50% availability. Would have liked a little more detail in the organization chart but appeared adequate to meet the needs of this project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	CDM Smith Inc	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM has suitable experience in bridge hydraulics. There were a lot of grammatical errors in their statement of qualifications. The Bridge lead is qualified but he has limited experience with GDOT practices. The NEPA lead does not indicate relevant project experience.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The team was very diverse. All the key team leaders were employed by the Prime. The resources for the proposed project appeared to be suitable. The organization chart had detailed information.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The firm has adequate experience in environmental projects. The firm submitted three of five examples demonstrating environmental documentation preparation experience. The Bridge Lead has experience, but projects listed were not similar in scope, primarily grade separations.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

The NEPA team lead has less than 50% availability. The team showed adequate resources.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Reynolds, Smith and Hills, Inc. (RS&H)	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM has relevant transportation experience. The Bridge lead has extensive relevant experience. The key team leads has suitable experience with GDOT practices. The projects listed were consistent but were limited in scope of work. Only one of five projects provided by the firm demonstrates environmental experience. It is unclear if two of the projects listed by the PM were managed by him.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

The team resources appear limited primarily showing only the NEPA lead's various aspects in environmental. The NEPA lead has less than 50% availability.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

All the projects for the Prime were relevant to the scope of work. The project examples demonstrated environmental experience for the team. PM appears to have limited Project Management experience based on the list of projects submitted. The Bridge Lead appears to have limited relevant experience for projects similar to scope.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

The NEPA lead has less than 50% availability. The resources did not clearly show the environment or the bridge hydraulic roles. The other team resources appear adequate for the scope of work.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS

Firm	KCI Technologies, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM is qualified and has transportation and PM experience; however, the Bridge and Road Leads indicate limited experience similar in scope. The NEPA lead's experience is not evident from the project examples. The Bridge Lead appears to have limited experience with GDOT's practices.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

The team resources appeared sufficient to do the work. The NEPA lead has less than 50% availability. The team did not account for Quality Control/Quality Assurance (QC/QA) in their resources area. The organization chart was unclear and not detailed.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	TranSystems Corporation	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Marginal

The PM has relevant Project Management experience. The Roadway lead has experience with several Bridge Replacement projects, but is not a Professional Engineer. The Bridge Lead's experience is suitable. None of the project examples provided included environmental experience. The projects listed were relevant.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

The NEPA lead has less than 50% availability. The team appears to have adequate resources.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	T.Y. Lin International	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM is qualified and has suitable experience; however, his Project Management experience is not clear, he is generally listed as Principal In Charge and his role is not demonstrated. The Bridge Lead has limited experience with GDOT practices. The firm's environmental experience is limited.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Marginal

The Roadway Design Lead's availability is less than 50%. It was unclear the roles of the Bridge Design, Bridge Hydraulics and Environmental team members.

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST, PHASE II

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Engineering Design Services, Contract 8
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	August 20, 2014
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Compliant with Page # Limitations
1	Gresham, Smith and Partners	8/20/2014	11:26 AM	X
2	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	8/20/2014	10:20 AM	X
3	Long Engineering, Inc.	8/20/2014	12:55 PM	X
4	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	8/20/2014	10:34 AM	X
5	CDM Smith Inc	8/20/2014	1:21 PM	X

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF SUBMITTALS

Solicitation Title:	*Engineering Design Services, Contract 8*	1	Long Engineering, Inc.
Solicitation #:	*RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055*	2	Gresham, Smith and Partners
PHASE I AND PHASE II -Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overal Ranking based on Published Criteria		3	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
		4	CDM Smith Inc
		5	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants

(This Page For GDOT Use)

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING) Sum of Total Score	Group Ranking
Gresham, Smith and Partners	750	2
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	525	5
Long Engineering, Inc.	850	1
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	600	3
CDM Smith Inc	575	4

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
Gresham, Smith and Partners	Good	Good	Good	Good	750	2
Mulkey Engineers & Consultants	Good	Good	Marginal	Adequate	525	5
Long Engineering, Inc.	Good	Good	Excellent	Good	850	1
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Adequate	Good	Adequate	Good	600	3
CDM Smith Inc	Adequate	Good	Adequate	Adequate	575	4
Maximum Points allowed =	*200*	*300*	*400*	*100*	*1000*	*%*

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Gresham, Smith and Partners		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good

The Consultant visually showed the project for the technical approach. The firm was very detailed in their environmental portion. Also, they gave good details on all the other areas for this project. The team coordinated with the Forest Service. They spoke with the locals and actually did due diligence for this project. They discussed the utility coordination for this project. The graphics on their proposal indicates what the project entails. Did not go into details about the implications on presence of historic resources. The team did not demonstrate experience with Accelerated Bridge Construction (ABC) techniques mentioned in the proposals. The Proposal did not provide details for experience in the design structures and dams.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Good

According to one of the GDOT's Project Manager (PM) listed in the Statement of Qualifications (SOQ), the Consultant team was very responsive to the arising demands throughout the plan development process. Gwinnett County noted they did a good job; employs them quite a bit and will utilize them again. Another GDOT PM noted they were attentive and responsive to the needs of the project.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Mulkey Engineers & Consultants		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Marginal

The team mentioned utilizing the "ABC" techniques but did not demonstrate experience with similar projects. The Consultant had very limited details on designing bridges on dams. The firm mentioned matching existing span lengths without consideration of the construction removal of existing bents. When describing existing conditions and constructability, the team did not take environmental into account. There was limited discussion on design.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Adequate

The team noted comments on the past performance as follows: "They were able to get the logical termini reviewed and approved by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in less than 4 months." The Consultant is a very technically sound firm. They are responsive and proactive in their project management.

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Long Engineering, Inc.		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Excellent

The Consultant addressed the cultural resources issues very well in the proposal. The Project Manager has experience with Section 4(f) resources. Stakeholders were identified for this project. The firm mentioned they have a professional available with experience in "Georgia's Safe Dam Program". The team suggested options for maintenance of traffic. The team mentioned the possibility of constructing sections of the super structural on site

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Good

The evaluating team noted the comments on the past performance as follows: "The firm did a good job. They were really proactive in getting permits approved. Also, they had to produce reports and documents for the Corp of Engineer Reviews. The PM was very knowledgeable about GDOT's policies and standards. The firm was very responsive to the schedule and concerns with the project."

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The Consultant presented a unique approach to offset the alignment which removes most of the concerns with the dam and maintains traffic during construction. They did not indicate a clear understanding of the environmental concerns such as the specific historic resources. Did not consult the GA Historic Bridge Survey to determine the eligibility of the bridge. Did not fully explain why an Environmental Assessment (EA) may be required. Errors in the proposal raised concerns regarding their Quality Control/Quality Assurance (QC/QA) procedures. The environmental discussion was limited.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Good

The evaluating team noted the comments on past performance as follows: "Did a great job. Managed every aspect of project. They met the schedules in a timely manner. Easy to work with; no drama. Will work with them again."

RFQ	RFQ 484-071514, P.I. No. 0007055	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	CDM Smith Inc		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The Consultant's ecology aspect of the proposal was detailed. The team discussed the delivery of the bridge beams. The firm gave details with alternatives on construction by listing the pros and cons. The drainage was also discussed. Cultural resources were not specifically addressed nor Section 4(f). The team mentioned the use of modular components for the bridge but did not demonstrate likewise experience. The team did not mention experience constructing bridges on dams.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Adequate

The evaluating team noted comments on past performance as follows: "They are a technically sound firm. They lacked responsiveness towards the end of the project. The Consultant was late on a couple of submittals, but GDOT had them to redesign the staging plans at the last minute." The PM was very impressed how the consultant handled the redesign of the staging plans.

RFQ 484-071514
Engineering Design Services (B2-2014), Contract 8, PI #0007055

Reference Check Scores for
CDM Smith, Inc.

Reference A

Firm Name	**Georgia Department of Transportation**		
Project Name	State Route 225 Realighment		
Project Manager	Umit Seyhan	Title	Project Manager
Contact Information	Chandria Brown, P.E., 404-631-1580		
	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.		9
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		8
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		9
Comments	They are a technically sound firm. They lacked responsiveness towards the end of the project.		

Reference B

Firm Name	**Georgia Department of Transportation**		
Project Name	Interchange Reconstruction and Widening of SR 136 (10/2005 - 12/2013)		
Project Manager	Umit Seyhan	Title	Project Manager
Contact Information	Robert Murphy, 404-631-1586		
	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.		6
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		7
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		8
Comments	The Consultant was late on a couple of submittals, but GDOT had them to redesign the staging plans at the last minute. The PM was very impressed how the consultant handled the redesign of the staging plans.		

RFQ 484-071514
Engineering Design Services (B2-2014), Contract 8, PI #0007055

Reference Check Scores for
Gresham, Smith and Partners

Reference A

Firm Name	**Georgia Department of Transportation**		
Project Name	GDOT Bridge Replacement SR 81 over Apalachee River - Barrow/Walton County		
Project Manager	Tom Tran, P.E., Eric Ricket, P.E., Scott Shelton, P.E., Ted Kniazewycz, P.E.	Title	Project Managers
Contact Information	Charles Robinson, Project Manager, 404-631-1439		
	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.		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.		10
Comments	The Consultant team were very responsive to the arising demands thorughout the plan development proess.		

Reference B

Firm Name	Gwinnett County Department of Transportation		
Project Name	Gwinnett County DOT Bridge Replacement - SR 324 over I-85, Buford, GA		
Project Manager	Eric Rickert, Scott Shelton, P.E.	Title	Project Managers
Contact Information	John Ray, Gwinnett Co., Project Manager, 770-822-7480		
	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	Did a very good job. We use them quite a bit and will utilize them again.		

Reference C

Firm Name	**Georgia Department of Transportation**		
Project Name	GDOT Bridge Replacement SR 10/US 78 over Apalachee River		
Project Manager	Tom Tran, Eric Ricket, Scott Shelton	Title	Project Managers
Contact Information	Derick Brown, Project Manager, 404/631-1571		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for		9
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the		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.		10
Comments	Consultant was attentive and responsive to the needs of the GDOT Project Manager.		

RFQ 484-071514
Engineering Design Services (B2-2014), Contract 8, PI #0007055

Reference Check Scores for
Long Engineering, Inc.

Reference A

Firm Name	**Cobb County Department of Transportation**		
Project Name	Old Stilesboro Road over Little Allatoona Creek		
Project Manager	Ellen Long, P.E., Sammy Powell, P.E., David McFarlin, P.E., Tim Slaton, PLS, David Jackson, P.E.	Title	PIC, Bridge Design, Roadway Design, Survey and Traffic Engineering Project Managers
Contact Information	Mike Wright, Project Manager, 770-528-1622		
	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.		8
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		10
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		9
Comments	The firm done a good job. They were really proactive in getting permits approved. Also, they had to produce reports and documents for the Corp of Engineer Reviews. Mentioned that Mr. Sammy Powell was a good personal friend of his.		

Reference B

Firm Name	**GA Department of Transportation**		
Project Name	SR 17 over Hiawassee River		
Project Manager	Ellen Long, P.E., Sammy Powell, P.E., Tim Slaton, PLS, David Jackson, P.E.	Title	Project Managers
Contact Information	Hiral Patel, State Environmental Administrator , 404-631-1101		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.		8
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.		8
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		10
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		9
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		8
Comments	The PM was very knowledgeable about GDOT's policies and standards. The firm was very responsive to the schedule and concerns with the project.		

Reference Check Scores for
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Reference A

Firm Name	**Georgia Department of Transporation**		
Project Name	"Big Bridge 2" - Bridge Replacements, State of Georgia		
Project Manager	Brad Gowen, P.E., Ashley Zellner, P.E.	Title	Roadway Design Lead & Bridge Design
Contact Information	Mr. Ted Cashin, Bridge Design Group Leader, 404-631-1910		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.		9
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.		10
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		9
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		10
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		10
Comments	Did a great job. Managed every aspect of project. They met the schedules in a timely manner.		

Reference B

Firm Name	**Gwinnett County Department of Transportation**		
Project Name	Killian Hill Road Over Yellow River, Gwinnett County, GA		
Project Manager	Brad Gowen, P.E., Ashley Zellner, P.E.	Title	Roadway Design Lead; Structural Engineer
Contact Information	John Ray, Gwinnett Co., Project Manager, 770-822-7480		
	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.		10
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		9
Comments	Easy to work with; no drama. Will work with them again.		

Reference Check Scores for
Mulkey Engineers and Consulting

Reference A

Firm Name	**Georgia Department of Transportation**		
Project Name	Old Alabama Road Improvement		
Project Manager	Ken McDuff, P.E., Britt Hennessey, P.E.	Title	Project Managers
Contact Information	Kimberly Nesbitt, Project Manager, 404-631-1575		
	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.		7
Comments	They were able to get the logical termini reviewed and approved by FHWA in less than 4 months.		

Reference B

Firm Name	**Georgia Department of Transportation**		
Project Name	SR 360 Widening and Reconstruction		
Project Manager	Ken McDuff, P.E., Britt Hennessey, P.E., Meredith Tredeau, AICP	Title	Project Managers
Contact Information	Chandria Brown, Senior Project Manager, 404-631-1580		
	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.		8
	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 very technically sound firm. They are reponsive and proactive in their project managemenent.		

Reference Check Summary for
RFQ 484-071514
Engineering Design Services (B2-2014), Contract 8, PI #0007055

Questions (to be answered on 1-10 scale, 10 indicates best)	CDM Smith, Inc.	Gresham, Smith and Partners	Long Engineering, Inc.	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	Mulkey Engineers and Consulting
1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.					
Reference A	7	10	9	9	9
Reference B	7	9	8	9	9
Section Average	7.00	9.50	8.50	9.00	9.00
2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.					
Reference A	7	9	9	10	9
Reference B	7	9	8	9	9
Section Average	7.00	9.00	8.50	9.50	9.00
3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.					
Reference A	9	10	8	9	9
Reference B	6	9	10	9	8
Section Average	7.50	9.50	9.00	9.00	8.50
4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.					
Reference A	8	9	10	10	9
Reference B	7	9	9	10	9
Section Average	7.50	9.00	9.50	10.00	9.00
5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.					
Reference A	9	10	9	10	7
Reference B	8	9	8	9	9
Section Average	8.50	9.50	8.50	9.50	8.00
Overall Average	**7.50**	**9.30**	**8.80**	**9.40**	**8.70**

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : Long* Engineering* Inc.*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY	LONG ENGINEERING, INC.		Status:Active
DUNS: 015783298	+4:	CAGE Code: 57G16	DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: Jun 19, 2015	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Delinquent Federal Debt?: No	
Address: 2550 HERITAGE CT SE STE 100 City: ATLANTA ZIP Code: 30339-3062		State/Province: GEORGIA 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
Long Engineering, Inc. 2550 Heritage Court, Suite 100 Atlanta, GA 30339	6/13/13	2/28/15

SIGNATURE

1. Transporation Planning

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

2. Mass Transit Operations

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

3. Highway Design Roadway

X	3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Rural Generally Free Access Highway Design
X	3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-Lane with Curb and Gutter Generally Free Access Highways Design Including Storm Sewers
X	3.03	Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Widening and Reconstruction, with Curb and Gutter and Storm Sewers in Heavily Developed Commercial, Industrial and Residential Urban Areas
___	3.04	Multi-Lane, Limited Access Expressway Type Highway Design
___	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)

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

5. Topography

X	5.01	Land Surveying
X	5.02	Engineering Surveying
X	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

X	8.01	Construction Supervision

9. Erosion and Sedimentation Control

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