DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

June 15, 2015

RFQ #: 484-040915
RFQ Title: Corridor Study for Tara Boulevard, P.I. No. 0013210, Cobb, Douglas, Fulton Counties, Contract# 2

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)
- 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 six (6) highest firms in order of ranking are as follows:

1. **Arcadis U.S., Inc.**
2. **HNTB Corporation**
3. **Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.**
4. **Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.**
5. **RS&H, Inc.**
6. **Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.**

The Selection Committee recommends the selection of the top ranked firm, Arcadis U.S., Inc.

Concurrence with Award from Responsible Division Director:

Jay Roberts, Division of Planning

Certification Procurement Requirements Met:

Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator

DJP:rl

Attachments

Date Posted 3/9/2015

Georgia Department of Transportation

Request for Qualifications

To Provide

Corridor Studies for Tara Boulevard and Downtown Connector Services

RFQ-484-040915
Qualifications Due: April 9, 2015

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

v. 7-14-14 (revised 3-09-15)

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS
484-040915

Corridor Studies for Tara Boulevard and Downtown Connector Services

I. General Project Information

A. Overview

The Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) is soliciting Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) from qualified firm(s) or organization(s) to provide Consultant Services for Corridor Studies for Tara Boulevard and Downtown Connector.

Contract	County(ies)	PI/Project #	Project Description
1	CLAYTON	0013206	TARA BLVD CORRIDOR STUDY 2015
2	COBB, DOUGLAS, FULTON	0013210	DOWNTOWN CONNECTOR STUDY FY 2015

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

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

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

C. The Georgia Department of Transportation Board has adopted a 15% overall annual goal for DBE participation on all federally funded projects. This goal is not to be considered as a fixed quota, set aside or preference. The DBE goal can be met by prime contracting, sub-contracting, joint-venture or mentor/ protégé relationship.

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

For more information on the GDOT DBE Program please contact:

Georgia Department of Transportation
Equal Opportunity Division
One Georgia Center, 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 Corridor Studies for Tara Boulevard and Downtown Connector services, for the GDOT Project identified. The anticipated scope of work for the project/contracts is included in **Exhibit I**.

E. Contract Term and Types

GDOT anticipates two (2) contracts: one (1) Project Specific contract to be awarded to one (1) firm, for the project identified in Exhibit 1; Projects/Contract #1 for **Tara Boulevard Corridor Study.** GDOT anticipates that the Contract Type will be paid via Firm Fixed Price and/or Cost Plus Fixed Fee methodology.

One (1) Multi-Phase, Project Specific contract to be awarded to one (1) firm, for the project identified in Exhibit 1; Projects/Contract #2 for **Downtown Connector Corridor Study.** GDOT anticipates that the Contract Type will be paid via Firm Fixed Price and/or Cost Plus Fixed Fee methodology. As a Project Specific contract, it is the Department's intention that the agreement will remain in effect until successful completion of the project.

F. Contract Amount

The Project Specific contract identified in Exhibit 1; Project/Contract #1 for **Tara Boulevard Corridor Study** amount will be determined via negotiations with the Department. If the Department is unable to reach a satisfactory agreement and at reasonable rates to be paid for the services to be provided, the Department reserves the right to terminate negotiations with the highest scoring finalist and begin negotiations with the next highest scoring finalist.

The Multi-Phase, Project Specific contract identified in Exhibit 1; Project/Contract #2 for **Downtown Connector Corridor Study** will have a minimum of $25,000.00 and a maximum of $4,000,000.00. If the Department is unable to reach a satisfactory agreement and at reasonable rates to be paid for the services to be provided, the Department reserves the right to terminate negotiations with the highest scoring finalist and begin negotiations with the next highest scoring finalist.

II. Selection Method

A. Method of Communication

All general communication of relevant information regarding this solicitation will be made via the Georgia Procurement Registry (GPR) under RFQ-484-040915. All firms are responsible for checking the GPR on a regular basis for updates, clarifications, and announcements. GDOT reserves the right to communicate via electronic-mail with the primary contact listed in the Statements of Qualifications. Other specific communications will be made as indicated in the remainder of this RFQ.

B. Phase I - Selection of Finalists

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

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

C. Finalist Notification for Phase II

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

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

GDOT will request a 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-484-040915**	3/09/2015	---------
b. Deadline for submission of written questions and requests for clarification	3/27/2015	2:00 PM
c. Deadline for submission of Statements of Qualifications	4/09/2015	2:00 PM
d. GDOT completes evaluation and issues notification and other information to finalist firms	TBD	
PHASE II		
e. Deadline for submission of written questions from finalists	TBD	2:00 PM
f. Phase II Response of Finalist firms due	TBD	TBA

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

A. Area Class Requirements and Certification

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

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

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

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

- Project Manager education, registration, relevant engineering experience, relevant project management experience, experience in utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance.

- Key Team Leaders' education, registration, relevant technical experience, and relevant experience in utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance.

- Prime Consultant's experience for the previous five (5) years in delivering projects of similar complexity, size, scope, and function.

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

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

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

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

A. Technical Approach – 40%

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

- Technical approach to delivering the project (including design concepts and use of alternative methods).
- Provide any specific qualifications, skills, or knowledge which your firm has which could benefit the project, and your ability and willingness to meet time requirements.

B. Past Performance – 10%

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

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

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

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

A. Administrative Requirements

It is required to submit the information below for each copy of each submittal. This is general information and will not be scored but may be used to determine eligibility for selection.

1. Basic company information:

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

2. Certification Form - Complete the Certification Form (*Exhibit "II" enclosed with RFQ*), and provide a notarized original within the firm's Statement of Qualifications. This is to be submitted for the Prime **ONLY**.
3. Georgia Security and Immigration Compliance Act Affidavit – Complete the form *(Exhibit "III" enclosed with RFQ),* and provide a notarized original within the firm's Statement of Qualifications. This is to be submitted for the Prime **ONLY**.
4. Addenda - Signed cover page of any Addenda issued for the Prime **ONLY**.

B. <u>Experience and Qualifications</u>

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

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

C. Resources/Workload Capacity

1. Overall Resources - Provide information regarding the overall resources dedicated to delivering the specific project, including:

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

2. Project Manager Commitment Table - Provide a list of ALL projects (GDOT, other governments and private contracts – Information may be validated and any firm determined not to be listing all projects may be subject to disqualification) on which the proposed project manager is currently committed, to enable the Department

to ascertain the project manager's availability. Utilize a table similar to the following format with a minimum of all criteria indicated to provide the requested information:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A. Technical Approach

Provide any unique technical approaches your firm offers relative to addressing management of the project. Identify any unique challenges of the project and how your firm intends to mitigate these challenges, including quality control, quality assurance procedures. Provide any specific qualifications, skills, knowledge of the project and project area which may uniquely benefit the firm and project.

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

B. Past Performance

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

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

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

A. There are two (2) submittals required. Submittal #1 must follow the format and meet the content requirements identified in **Section VI**, entitled **Instructions for Content and Preparation of Statements of Qualifications – Phase I Response.** Respondents must submit one original and five identical copies. Submittal #2 is an electronic version of Submittal #1 which allows for GDOT to maintain the files electronically. The original and each copy of Submittal #1 should be stapled separately. The original and each copy of Submittal #1 should be bound together using a binder clip or other similar fashion which allows the individual copies to be separated and distributed easily to Selection Committee Members. See **Attachment 1** for a summary of how the submittals should be prepared.

B. Submittals must be typed on standard (8½" x 11") paper. The pages should be numbered, however, submittal pages will be counted by section to determine compliance with page limits. Responses are limited to the page counts indicated in each section and should be double-sided using a minimum of size 11 font. Page counts will be determined by pages with print on them, not by the physical piece of paper. For example, a piece of paper which has print on both sides, shall be considered two pages while a piece of paper with print on only one side would be considered a single page. Each Statement of Qualifications shall be prepared simply and economically as indicated above. Fancy bindings, colored displays, and promotional materials are not desired. Emphasis must be on completeness, relevance, and clarity of content.

NOTE: Additional pages other than what has been specified above in each section **should not be included and will be grounds for disqualification**.

Submittals must be sealed in an opaque envelope or box, and reference **RFQ-484-040915 and the words "STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS"** must be clearly indicated on the outside of all of the envelopes or boxes. Statements of Qualifications **must be physically received by GDOT** prior to the deadline indicated in the Schedule of Events (*Section III of RFQ*) at the exact address below:

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

No submittals will be accepted after the time and date set for receipt.
Statements of Qualifications submitted via facsimile or e-mail will be rejected. All expenses for preparing and submitting responses are the sole cost of the party submitting the response. GDOT is not obligated to any party to reimburse such expenses. All submittals upon receipt become the property of GDOT. Labeling information provided in submittals "proprietary" or "confidential", or any other designation of restricted use will not protect the information from public view. Subject to the provisions of the Open Records Act, the details of the proposal documents will remain confidential until final award.

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

C. **Questions and Requests for Clarification**

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

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

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

A. There are two (2) submittals required. Submittal #1 must follow the format and meet the content requirements identified in **Section VII**, entitled **Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response – Phase II Response.** Respondents must submit one original and five identical copies. Submittal #2 is an electronic version of Submittal #1 which allows for GDOT to maintain the files electronically. The original and each copy of Submittal #1 should be stapled separately. The original and each copy of Submittal #1 should be bound together using a binder clip or other similar fashion which allows the individual copies to be separated and distributed easily to Selection Committee Members.

B. Submittals must be typed on standard (8½" x 11") paper. The pages should be numbered, however, submittal pages will be counted by section to determine compliance with page limits. Responses are limited to the page counts indicated in each section and should be double-sided using a minimum of size 11 font. Page counts will be determined by pages with print on them, not by the physical piece of paper. For example, a piece of paper which has print on both sides, shall be considered two pages while a piece of paper with print on only one side would be considered a single page. Each Statement of Qualifications shall be prepared simply and economically as indicated above. Fancy bindings, colored displays, and promotional materials are not desired. Emphasis must be on completeness, relevance, and clarity of content.

NOTE: Additional pages other than what has been specified above in each section **should not be included and will be grounds for disqualification**.

C. Submittals must be sealed in an opaque envelope or box, and reference **RFQ 484-040915 and the words "PHASE II RESPONSE"** must be clearly indicated on the outside of all of the envelopes or boxes. Statements of Qualifications **must be physically received by GDOT** prior to the deadline indicated in the Notice to Finalists at the exact address below:

Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT)
Attention: Rhonda Ligon
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: **Rhonda Ligon, e-mail: rligon@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.
3. Firm(s) should have no significant outstanding deficient audit findings from previous contracts with GDOT that have not been resolved.
4. The prime is responsible for being reasonably assured that all sub-consultant(s) presented as a part of the proposed team are similarly in compliance with the above requirements.

E. Submittal Costs and Confidentiality

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

F. Award Conditions

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

G. Debriefings

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

H. Right to Cancel or Change RFQ

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

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

I. Substitutions, Alternates, Exceptions, and Extensions

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

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

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

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

EXHIBIT I-1

Project/Contract #1

1. Project Number(s): N/A
2. PI Number(s): 0013206
3. County(ies): CLAYTON
4. Description: TARA BLVD CORRIDOR STUDY 2015

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.

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

Number	Area Class
1.01	Statewide Systems Planning
1.02	Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning

2. 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
1.05	Alternate Systems Planning
1.06(a)	NEPA
1.11	Traffic and Toll Revenue Studies
1.12	Major Investment Studies
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies

6. Background and Scope:

A. Background:

To conduct a planning study analyzing alternatives that will ensure the efficient operation of Tara Boulevard (SR 3, US 19, US 41) from I-75 to Jonesboro given current and future demand along the corridor, taking into consideration all users of the corridor, including commuters, freight traffic, local businesses, residents, and existing and future transit service. Building on work previously conducted on the study corridor, the CONSULTANT will:

1. Identify a range of improvement options, resulting in approximately three (3) alternatives, and determine a preferred alternative for managing congestion and improving operations on Tara Boulevard. One of the three alternatives may examine keeping Tara Boulevard at grade. Another alternative may examine a super arterial concept with local access roads. Where relevant, the study should incorporate options such as operational improvements and other improvements that could be achievable in the near term.

2. Produce a traffic and revenue study. Due to funding limitations and GDOT Board policy, it is likely that an alternative that would require extensive reconstructing and added capacity to Tara Boulevard would require user fees.

3. Produce a Tara Boulevard study document as the final product that includes an analysis of each alternative for addressing congestion and improving operations on Tara Boulevard and a list of recommended projects. This analysis will include (for each alternative):

   a. Cost estimates.
   b. Analysis and thorough discussion of costs, benefits, and impacts.
   c. Some early project development work including preliminary environmental analysis and logical termini review.
   d. Visualizations (simulations, renderings, etc.).

   For projects not recommended to move forward, the document will detail reasons for eliminating those ideas based on technical analysis, costs, and impacts.

   This study will answer the following questions:

   a. What options exist for addressing current and future demand on Tara Boulevard?
   b. What costs, benefits, challenges, and opportunities are associated with each option?
   c. What would the various options look like?
   d. What impacts would the various options have on the operations of Tara Boulevard, the conditions of other roads in the area, and the character of the surrounding areas (for example, compatibility with land use plans, businesses, and neighborhoods)?

B. Scope:

The study area will include Tara Boulevard (SR 3, US 19, US 41) from I-75 to Jonesboro and all interchange ramps, cross streets, and potential parallel routes, such as SR 85 and SR 54.

The CONSULTANT shall provide:

1. **Data Collection:**

   The objective of this task is to consolidate all existing traffic data (traffic counts, travel speeds, bridge data, crash data, etc.), roadway geometry, environmental data, and land use data (current and future) along Tara Boulevard and relevant interstates, interchange ramps, cross streets, and current and proposed transit routes in the study area. The examination of previous studies and planned and programmed projects will also be included in this effort. Existing data sources will be used wherever possible. It is envisioned that a majority of the traffic data will come from the Atlanta Regional travel demand model, Georgia Electronic Accident Reporting System (GEARS), Georgia's Advanced Traffic Management System (NaviGAtor), Regional Transportation Operations Program, GDOT's annual traffic count program, information from transit providers, Georgia's Natural, Archeological, and Historic Resources Geographic Information Systems (GNAHRGIS), and others as appropriate.

   Work Tasks:

   a. Collect, and assemble all existing available data sets and process collected data using Geographic Information Systems (GIS).
   b. Collect and review all relevant previous studies.
   c. Obtain Atlanta Regional Commission's (ARC's) PLAN 2040 travel demand forecasting model for the years 2020, 2030, and 2040.
   d. Conduct site visits to the study area.
   e. Meeting with GDOT to discuss the need for additional data collection activities, such as traffic counts, turning movement counts, and / or origin-destination surveys.

   Deliverables - Data Collection Tech Memo.

2. **Existing & Future Condition Analysis and Needs Assessment:**

   The CONSULTANT will conduct analysis of existing and futures (no-build) conditions within the study area and develop a report detailing existing travel conditions as well as future growth/anticipated changes, and identify existing & future needs. In this analysis, consideration should be given to regional

travel patterns, major trip generators, and activity centers, reoccurring congestion as well as weaving & operational issues, safety, and all users of the roadway (commuters, freight, pedestrians, bicyclist, and transit). Future needs may be categorized using these topic areas, or as appropriate.

Work Tasks:

a. Conduct analysis of existing & future no-build conditions within the study area.
b. Conduct a needs assessment of the corridor based on existing & future no-build conditions.
c. Develop an existing & future no-build conditions report and needs assessment.

Deliverables – Report detailing Existing & future no-build conditions and needs assessment.

3. **Development of Improvement Options:**

Based on needs identified in the Needs Assessment and ideas generated by GDOT and stakeholders, the CONSULTANT will identify possible options for improving Tara Boulevard. The CONSULTANT will then develop approximately three (3) alternatives based on the possible options identified.

Deliverables – Improvement Development Process Tech Memo, including a summary of each proposed improvement alternative.

4. **Evaluation of Potential Improvement Options:**

Alternatives will be evaluated in terms of:

a. Benefits to various users of the roadway include:

   1) Freight.
   2) Commuters.
   3) Local traffic.
   4) Transit.
   5) Pedestrians and Bicyclist.

b. Safety benefits.
c. Cost.
d. Stakeholders support.
e. Environmental and community impacts.
f. Deliverability and potential risks.

Work Tasks:

a. Analyze each alternative according to, but not limited to, the criteria listed above.
b. Provide visuals, such as operational layouts of each alternative, and renderings of preferred alternatives, as needed.
c. Evaluate alternatives.

5. **Traffic and Revenue Study:**

A Level 1 traffic and revenue study will be conducted, preferably concurrently with Task 4 – Evaluation of Alternatives. The traffic and revenue study will examine the revenue potential and implementation opportunities.

Work Tasks:

a. Collect and assemble all relevant data.
b. Use the Atlanta Regional travel demand model as needed.
c. Provide traffic and revenue projections.
d. Document basic assumptions.

Deliverables – A detailed Traffic and Revenue report summarizing the data collected, basic assumptions, the analysis, and findings.

6. **Recommendations:**

After evaluating the alternatives, GDOT and the CONSULTANT will work to select a preferred alternative.

Work Tasks include assisting in selecting a preferred alternative.

Deliverables – The recommended alternative should have pre-implementation information for the project(s) it proposes, such as:

a. Detailed cost information.
b. Thorough phasing, i.e. timing, information for individual projects within the preferred alternative.
c. Thorough scheduling information by project phase.
d. Identified project sponsor and likely funding sources.
e. Logical termini information.
f. Preliminary environmental information/documentation and understanding of which level of environmental document would be required Categorical Exclusion (CE), Environmental Assessment (EA), etc.), types of resources potentially impacted, and anticipated length of environmental process.
g. Other Concept Report type information, as needed.

7. **Coordination and Documentation:**

In coordination with GDOT, the CONSULTANT will develop a Stakeholder/Working Group to identify and evaluate options. There may be a core working group as well a larger stakeholder group. Potential stakeholders include representatives from:

a. Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC).
b. Relevant Cities.
c. Clayton County.
d. Hartsfield-Jackson International Airport.
e. Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA).
f. State Road and Tollway Authority (SRTA).
g. Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA).

Each task in this scope will be documented with a Technical Memorandum submitted in electronic format at the completion of the task. Comments received from GDOT on each Technical Memorandum will be stored in a project database and incorporated in the Final Report. In addition to the Final Report, a stand-alone Executive Summaries will be prepared which will summarize the major points of the study.

The CONSULTANT will also develop fact sheets for each of the project recommendations. These fact sheets will contain detailed scope information to prepare the project for engineering and design. This fact sheets will provide project location, project description and justification (Need & Purpose), detailed cost estimates, potential fund sources, initial right-of-way and utility information, potential schedule information, and an environmental screening to determine potential impacts and the type of environmental document expected. Furthermore, any operations and maintenance issues that should be considered once implemented will also be included.

Work Tasks:

a. Conduct a Kick-Off Meeting with the project team and additional GDOT offices as appropriate.
b. Conduct biweekly meetings with GDOT Planning staff over the course of the project, with special-called meetings with others as needed.
c. Conduct up to five (5) meetings with the Stakeholder Working Group.
d. Develop Draft and Final Technical Reports.
e. Develop an Executive Summary.

f. Develop project recommendation fact sheets, including Need & Purpose statements.
g. Develop draft and final presentation materials, handouts, maps, and other displays needed for the Stakeholder Working Group, meetings, and the public website.
h. Conduct meetings with the public and other interested groups as needed.

Deliverables:

a. Draft and Final Technical Reports.
b. Executive Summary.
c. Project recommendation fact sheets, including Need & Purpose statements.
d. Presentation materials, handouts, maps, and displays, as needed.

Available Information:

This section is intended to show the types of GDOT data that may be needed and that the consultant may be expected to use for this study. Since it is not yet determined what exact data would be needed, the list is intended to present the range of possible types of data GDOT has available and could access (and provide to the consultant) for this study. The DEPARTMENT shall provide data from the following GDOT sources as needed for this study:

a. Bridge data.
b. Traffic and speed data by lane from NaviGAtor.
c. Traffic and classification counts.
d. Roadway characteristic data.
e. Crash data from Georgia Electronic Accident Reporting System (GEARS) and other data as needed.

Deliverables:

The following items shall be completed by the CONSULTANT and delivered to the DEPARTMENT during the term of this task order as specified by the Project Manager:

a. Data Collection – Data Collection Tech Memo.
b. Needs Assessment – Needs Assessment Tech Memo.
c. Development of Improvement Options – Improvement Development Process Tech Memo, including a summary of each proposed improvement option.
d. Evaluation of Potential Improvement Alternatives – Report summarizing the evaluated alternatives in terms of the agreed upon criteria.
e. Traffic and Revenue Study:

    1) Traffic and Revenue Tech Memo.
    2) Report summarizing the data collected, basic assumptions, the analysis, and findings.

f. Recommendations – Report summarizing the preferred alternative recommendation.
g. Coordination and Documentation:

    1) Draft and Final Technical Reports.
    2) Executive Summary.
    3) Project recommendation fact sheets, including Need & Purpose statements.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

A. Data Collection Specialist – manages data collection needs and ensures quality and accuracy of relevant data.
B. Traffic Modeling Specialist – has expertise in traffic modeling software and experience with travel demand.
C. Outreach Specialist – handles communication with the stakeholder groups.
D. Economic Impact Specialist – has expertise with economic modeling such as Regional Economic Models, Inc. (REMI) or other comparable tools and has experience generating long-term economic impact forecasts for transportation.
E. Finance Specialist – has experience in developing traffic and revenue studies for tolling projects and expertise in innovative financing methods such as Private Public Partnership (P3).

F. Environmental Screening/ National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Specialist – identifies environmental resources.
G. Traffic Operations Specialist – has engineering skills and can generate preliminary engineering and feasibility work.

EXHIBIT I-2

Project/Contract #2

1. Project Number(s): N/A
2. PI Number(s): 0013210
3. County(ies): COBB, DOUGLAS, FULTON
4. Description: DOWNTOWN CONNECTOR STUDY FY 2015

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.

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

Number	Area Class
1.01	Statewide Systems Planning
1.02	Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning

4. 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
1.05	Alternate Systems Planning
1.06(a)	NEPA
1.12	Major Investment Studies
3.05	Multi-lane Urban Interstate Limited Access Design
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design

6. Background and Scope:

A. Background:

Examine a wide variety of options for reducing congestion and improving operations on the Downtown Connector. The range of possible options will include but is not limited to:

1. Very large-scale, innovative, or unconventional ideas, intended to explore these concepts and respond to various inquiries GDOT has received over the years but with recognition that they may not be implementable.

   Examples: additional lanes, new collector-distributer lanes, tunnels (under or parallel to the connector), new location surface roadway parallel to the connector, double-decked roadway, theoretical policy changes such as tolling or implementing occupancy requirements on existing capacity, etc.

2. Large-scale ideas that are practical, have been shown to be effective elsewhere, and are financially Realistic.

   Examples: alternate routes (and improvements to alternate routes such as widening I-285 E and W policy changes such as tolls, occupancy requirements, consideration of some type of commuter credits program-which could be used for encouraging the avoidance of trips in the peak periods and the shifting of trips to transit, etc.

Specifically, a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) interchange on the Connector at 15th Street will be evaluated to explore the possible effects on traffic on the Connector (the mainline and at existing Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) interchanges and on the surface streets leading to the existing interchange access points.

3. Smaller-scale operational improvements that could be implemented in a shorter timeframe.

   Examples: re-striping, ramps meters, etc.

   In addition, the CONSULTANT will model the effects of closing the Downtown Connector entirely and in one direction at a time, as might be necessary during a major construction or maintenance project on the Connector. To explore and evaluate this possibility, the CONSULTANT will meet with GDOT maintenance staff to discuss the possible eventual need for closing the Connector for maintenance purposes. The CONSULTANT will then evaluate potential effects on the surrounding road network, regional transit, and I-285. Examples of possible options for addressing travel needs during closure of the Connector may include temporarily assisting regional transit providers with funding for increased frequency or temporarily opening the shoulders on I-285 to traffic.

4. Produce a Downtown Connector study document as the final product that includes analysis of each possible option for addressing congestion and improving operations on the connector and a list of projects, including long range and/or aspirations projects and short-term projects and with widespread support. This analysis will include (for each option):

   a. Cost estimates.
   b. Analysis and thorough discussion of costs, benefits, and impacts.
   c. Examples of similar existing projects for innovative/unconventional projects.
   d. Some early project development work including preliminary environmental analysis and engineering for some near-term recommendations, as needed.
   e. Visualizations (simulations, renderings, etc.).

   For projects not recommended to move forward, the document will detail reasons for eliminating those ideas based on technical analysis, costs, and impacts.

   This study will answer the following questions:

   a. What options exist for addressing congestion on the Downtown Connector?
   b. What costs, benefits, challenges, and opportunities are associated with each option?
   c. What would the various options look like?
   d. What impact would the various options have on the operations of the Downtown Connector, the conditions of other roads in the area, the character of the surrounding areas?

B. Scope:

The study area will include I-75, I-85, and I-20 inside I-285; I-285; and all interchange ramps, cross streets, and potential parallel routes in metro Atlanta, which may include some local roads. The primary focus will be on the Downtown Connector portion where I-75 and I-85 converge, but the entire area within I-285 will be included in the study area.

The CONSULTANT shall provide the following scope of services:

1. **Data Collection:**

   The objective of this task is to consolidate all existing traffic data (traffic counts, travel speeds, aerial surveys, bridge data, etc.) along the interstates, interchange ramps, and cross streets in metro Atlanta. The examination of previous studies and planned and programmed projects will also be included in this effort. Existing data sources will be used wherever possible. It is envisioned that a majority of the data will come from NaviGAtor and GDOT's annual traffic count program, including observed volumes and congested speeds by hour of the day and individual lane, at a minimum.

Work Tasks:

a. Collect all existing available data sets and process collected data using Geographic Information Systems (GIS).
b. Collect and review all relevant previous studies.
c. Compile all information into GIS.
d. Obtain Atlanta Regional Commission's (ARC's) PLAN 2040 travel demand forecasting model for the years 2020, 2030, and 2040.
e. Purchase commercially available Global Positioning System (GPS) peak period travel time data and/or use existing travel time data, depending on data needs.
f. Conduct site visits to the study area.
g. Meet with GDOT to discuss the need for additional data collection activities, such as traffic counts, turning movement counts, and / or origin-destination surveys. Any additional data collection activities will be collected as part of this contract.

Deliverables - Data Collection Tech Memo.

2. **Existing & Future Condition Analysis and Needs Assessment:**

The CONSULTANT will conduct analysis of existing and futures (no-build) conditions within the study area and develop a report detailing existing travel conditions as well as future growth/anticipated changes, and identify existing & future needs. In this analysis, consideration should be given to regional travel patterns, major trip generators, and activity centers, reoccurring congestion as well as the impact of special events, weaving & operational issues, safety, and all users of the Interstate system (commuters, freight, and transit). Future needs may be categorized using these topic areas, or as appropriate.

Work Tasks:

a. Conduct analysis of existing & future no-build conditions within the study area.
b. Develop an existing & future no-build conditions report.

Deliverables – Existing & future no-build conditions report document including Needs assessment.

3. **Development of Improvement Options:**

Based on needs identified in the Needs Assessment and ideas generated by GDOT and stakeholders, the CONSULTANT will identify a wide range of possible solutions for improving the Downtown Connector.

Work Tasks - Identify a wide range of possible solutions for improving the Downtown Connector.

Deliverables – Improvement Development Process Tech Memo, including a summary of each proposed improvement option.

4. **Evaluation of Potential Improvement Options:**

Potential improvements will be evaluated in terms of:

a. Congestion relief.
b. Impacts of traffic diversions to/from local parallel roadways and the impact of latent demand.
c. Evaluation of long term economic benefits of individual projects.
d. Benefit/cost.
e. Stakeholder support.
f. Environmental & community impacts.

Work Tasks:

a. Analyze each option according to the criteria listed above.
b. Identify and propose methodology for evaluating long-term economic benefits (beyond jobs added during design and construction). Ideally, the CONSULTANT would have expertise with Regional Economic Models, Inc.(REMI), could identify methodology for using REMI in conjunction with the Georgia statewide transportation demand model, and could incorporate output from the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) travel demand model to feed into REMI (or propose alternative methodology for performing similar long-term economic benefit evaluation). Use of REMI software may require the CONSULTANT to physically go to GDOT's General Office in Atlanta periodically to access the software from GDOT computers.
c. Evaluate and model the effects of closing the Downtown Connector entirely and in one direction at a time, as might be necessary during a major construction or maintenance project on the Connector.
d. Provide visuals, such as operational layouts and renderings of each option.

Deliverables:

a. Report analyzing each option a according to the criteria listed above.
b. Report describing the effects of temporarily closing the Downtown Connector entirely and in one direction at a time.

5. **Recommendations:**

After evaluating the full range of options, GDOT and the CONSULTANT will work to develop a list of recommended projects. The recommendations will include some larger-scale and potentially longer-term improvements and a list of smaller-scale projects that could be implemented in the near term.

Work Tasks:

a. Evaluate projects.
b. Generate a list of recommended projects.

Deliverables:

a. Recommended projects should have pre-implementation information, such as:

    1) Description of project need and scope.
    2) Detailed cost info (beyond "planning level").
    3) Anticipated project phasing.
    4) Identified project sponsor and likely funding sources.

b. And the following additional deliverables for short-term recommendations:

    1) Preliminary environmental information/documentation and understanding of which level of environmental document would be required Categorical Exclusion (CE), Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), etc.), types of resources potentially impacted, and anticipated length of environmental process.
    2) Other Concept Report type information, as needed.
    3) Some preliminary engineering and/or engineering feasibility work, as needed.

6. **Coordination and Documentation:**

In coordination with GDOT, the CONSULTANT will develop a Stakeholder/Working Group to identify and evaluate options. There may be a core working group as well a larger stakeholder group. Potential stakeholders include representatives from:

a. Central Atlanta Progress.
b. Midtown Alliance.
c. Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC).
d. City of Atlanta.

e. Fulton County.
f. DeKalb County.
g. Metro Atlanta Regional Transit Authority (MARTA).
h. State Road and Toll Authority (SRTA).
i. Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA).
j. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).
k. Federal Transit Administration (FTA).
l. Others, as identified during development of the study.

Each task in this scope will be documented with a Technical Memorandum submitted in electronic format at the completion of the task. Comments received from GDOT on each Technical Memorandum will be stored in a project database and incorporated in the Final Report. In addition to the Final Report, a stand-alone Executive Summaries will be prepared which will summarize the major points of the study.

The CONSULTANT will also develop fact sheets for each of the project recommendations. These fact sheets will provide project location, project description and justification (Project Justification Statement), other alternatives considered and why they were not advanced, timing of project implementation, exploration of logical termini issues, and cost estimates. Furthermore, any operations and maintenance issues that should be considered once implemented will also be included. For near-term project recommendations, these fact sheets will contain more detailed scope information to prepare the project for engineering and design. This may include more detailed cost estimates, potential fund sources, initial right-of-way and utility information, potential schedule information, and an environmental screening to determine potential impacts and the type of environmental document expected.

The CONSULTANT will develop a work plan including dates for all deliverables. The CONSULTANT will provide agendas prior to each meeting and meeting minutes, including a summary of topics discussed and action items.

The CONSULTANT should have excellent communication skills and must be able to clearly and concisely explain complex, technical material in writing and in presentations.

Work Tasks:

a. Conduct a Kick-Off Meeting.
b. Develop a work plan.
c. Conduct biweekly meetings with GDOT Planning staff over the course of the project, with special-called meetings with others as needed.
d. Conduct approximately 15-20 meetings with various stakeholder groups and possibly more with individual agencies, as needed.
e. Develop a Draft and Final Technical Reports.
f. Develop an Executive Summary.
g. Develop project recommendation fact sheets, including Project Justification Statements, with a heavy focus on exploring logical termini.
h. Develop a draft and final presentation materials, handouts, maps, and other displays needed for the Working Group, meetings, and the public website.
i. Conduct meetings with the public and other interested groups as needed.

Deliverables – Project recommendation fact sheets, including Need & Purpose statements.

Available Information:

This section is intended to show the types of GDOT data that may be needed and that the consultant may be expected to use for this study. Since it is not yet determined what exact data would be needed, the list is intended to present the range of possible types of data GDOT has available and could access (and

provide to the consultant) for this study. The DEPARTMENT shall provide data from the following GDOT sources as needed for this study:

a. Aerial congestion survey data.
b. Bridge data.
c. Traffic and speed data by lane from NaviGAtor.
d. Traffic and classification counts.
e. Roadway characteristic data.
f. Crash data.

Study Deliverables:

The following items shall be completed by the CONSULTANT and delivered to the DEPARTMENT during the term of this task order as specified by the Project Manager:

a. Data Collection – Data Collection Tech Memo.
b. Needs Assessment – Needs Assessment Tech Memo.
c. Development of Improvement Options – Improvement Development Process Tech Memo, including a summary of each proposed improvement option.
d. Evaluation of Potential Improvement Options – Report summarizing the evaluated options in terms of:

    1) Congestion benefits.
    2) Impacts of traffic diversions to/from local parallel roadways and the impact of latent demand.
    3) Financial feasibility.
    4) Stakeholder support.

e. Recommendation – Report summarizing the project recommendations.
f. Coordination and Documentation:

    1) Draft and Final Technical Reports.
    2) Executive Summary.
    3) Project recommendation fact sheets, including Need & Purpose statements.

Work Schedule:

The Consultant must complete all work between the date of the notice to proceed and the completion date specified. In no instance shall any work be authorized beyond the completion date specified unless specifically authorized in writing as evidenced by a task order time extension letter. No work shall be authorized or payment made for work performed beyond the termination date of the master professional services agreement. All work specified in this task order shall be completed in accordance with the below schedule and/or no later than the completion date specified.

All work of this task order will be completed within 36 months of the Notice to Proceed date.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

A. Data Collection Specialist – manages data collection needs and ensures quality and accuracy of relevant data.
B. Traffic Modeling Specialist – has expertise in traffic modeling software and experience with travel demand modeling (examples include CORSIM, VISSIM, Highway Capacity Software (HCS), SYNCHRO, etc.)
C. Outreach Specialist – handles communication with the stakeholders groups and the public.
D. Economic Impact Analysis Specialist – has expertise with economic modeling (such as REMI or comparable models) and experience generating long-term economic impact forecasts for transportation projects.
E. Environmental Screening/ National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Specialist – identifies environmental resources
F. Traffic Operations Specialist – has engineering skills and can generate preliminary engineering and feasibility work.
G. Graphics Specialist – has design skills as needed for visualization purposes including graphics, maps, renderings, video/visual simulations, etc.

EXHIBIT II
CERTIFICATION FORM

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sworn and subscribed before me

This _____ day of _____, 20___.

_____
Signature

_____
NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires: _____

_____
NOTARY SEAL

EXHIBIT III

GEORGIA SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION COMPLIANCE ACT AFFIDAVIT

GEORGIA SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION COMPLIANCE ACT AFFIDAVIT

Contracting Entity/Respondent: _____

Address: _____

Solicitation No./Contract No. : **RFQ-484-040915**

Solicitation/Contract Name: **Corridor Studies for Tara Boulevard and Downtown Connector Services**

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 sub-consultants. The below table is a full listing of all area classes. Since no single advertisement would require every area class, Respondents should delete all the area classes which are not applicable to the project they are pursuing and only include the ones applicable. Particular attention should be paid to the date that consultants certificate expires.

Area Class #	Area Class Description	Prime Consultant Name	Sub-Consultant #1 Name	Sub-Consultant #2 Name	Sub-Consultant #3 Name	Sub-Consultant #4 Name	Sub-Consultant #5 Name	Sub-Consultant #6 Name
	DBE – Yes/No ->							
	Prequalification Expiration Date							
1.01	Statewide Systems Planning							
1.02	Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning							
1.03	Aviation Systems Planning							
1.04	Mass and Rapid Transportation Planning							
1.05	Alternate Systems Planning							
1.06(a)	NEPA							
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							

Submittal Formats for Corridor Studies for Tara Boulevard and Downtown Connector Services
GDOT Engineering Projects

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

ADDENDUM NO. 1

ISSUE DATE: April 1, 2015

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

RFQ-484-040915: Corridor Studies for Tara Boulevard and Downtown Connector Services

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.

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 Question and Answer:

	Question	Answer
1.	The bolded language on page 7 in B.4 is missing text/language. Does the prime and sub-consultants need to submit the Notice of Professional Consultant Qualifications?	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.
2.	For the Tara Blvd study: a. Area Class 1.11 - what level of traffic and toll revenue study(s) is anticipated for the Tara Blvd. study?	"Level 1" toll and revenue study is anticipated for Tara Boulevard study.

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ-484-040915
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Corridor Study for Downtown Connector Services, Contract #2
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	April 9, 2015
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Exhibit II - Certification	Exhibit III - GSICAA	Signed Addendum If Applicable	Compliant with Page # Limitations	Compliant with Required Format	Meets Required Area Classes
1	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	4/9/2015	1:21 P.M.	X	X	X	X	X	X
2	Arcadis U.S., Inc.	4/9/2015	10:33 A.M.	X	X	X	X	X	X
3	HNTB Corporation	4/9/2015	10:41 A.M.	X	X	X	X	X	X
4	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	4/8/2015	11:39 A.M.	X	X	X	X	X	X
5	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	4/9/2015	11:41 A.M.	X	X	X	X	X	X
6	RS&H, Inc.	4/8/2015	3:16 P.M.	X	X	X	X	X	X
7	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	4/8/2015	11:44 A.M.	X	X	X	X	X	X

SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST

Solicitation #: RFQ-484-040915

Solicitation Title: Corridor Studies for Tara Boulevard and Downtown Connector Services, Contract #2

Primes and Subconsultants	1.01	1.02	1.05	1.06(a)	1.12	3.05	3.06	3.07	Certificate Expires
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	2/28/2018
URS Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	6/30/2015
Arcadis U.S., Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	6/30/2017
Pond & Company	X	X	X			X	X	X	1/31/2018
Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.				X					5/31/2017
GMB Engineers & Planners, Inc.	X	X	X				X		8/31/2016
HNTB Corporation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9/10/2017
Corporate Environmental Risk Management, L									5/31/2016
GMR Aerial Surveys Inc. d/b/a Photo Science									7/31/2016
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americ	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	11/30/2017
Cambridge Systematics Inc.	X	X	X		X		X		4/30/2017
GMB Engineers & Planners, Inc. (VHB)	X	X	X				X		8/30/2016
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	1/31/2018
Gresham Smith and Partners	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8/31/2017
GT Hill Planners Corporation				X					11/30/2015
Sycamore Consulting, Inc.									8/31/2017
RS&H, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	11/30/2016
Atkins North America, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	6/30/2017
Kimely-Horn and Associates, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9/30/2015
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	2/28/2018
J.R. Wilburn and Associates	X	X	X		X				1/31/2018
GMB Engineers & Planners, Inc.	X	X	X				X		8/31/2016
McGee Partners, Inc.						X	X	X	6/30/2017
Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.				X					5/31/2017

GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS
RFQ 484-040915
Corridor Study for Tara Boulevard and Downtown Connector Services
Contract#2, Cobb, Douglas, Fulton Counties
P.I. 0013210

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

Coordination and Communication

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

Evaluation Process

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

Phase I

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

Phase II

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

Phase I
Evaluation of Statements of Qualifications

Evaluation of Eligible Submittals

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

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

Directions for use of the Evaluation Preliminary Scoring Forms:

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

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

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

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATING AVAILABILITY

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

Evaluation Meeting:

All completed Scoring Forms with the preliminary scores and comments for each criteria of each firm, must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Wednesday, April 22, 2015. The completed forms must be turned in at the conclusion of the meeting.

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

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

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

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

Solicitation Title:	***Corridor Study for Downtown Connector Services, Contract #2***	1	Arcadis U.S., Inc.
Solicitation #:	***RFQ-484-040915***	2	HNTB Corporation
PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria FOR TOP TEN SUBITTALS		2	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)
(This Page For GDOT Use)		4	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.
		5	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
		5	RS&H, Inc.
		7	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING) Score	Group Ranking
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	**125**	**7**
Arcadis U.S., Inc.	**425**	**1**
HNTB Corporation	**375**	**2**
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	**375**	**2**
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	**200**	**5**
RS&H, Inc.	**200**	**5**
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	**250**	**4**

Evaluation Criteria →	Experience and Qualifications	Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Scores and Group Ranking	
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***		
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	Marginal	Marginal	125	7
Arcadis U.S., Inc.	Excellent	Good	425	1
HNTB Corporation	Good	Good	375	2
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	Good	Good	375	2
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	5
RS&H, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	5
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	4
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***300***	***500***	*%*

RFQ	RFQ-484-040915	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Marginal

There were very little specifics and/or details provided for project manager (PM) for each project listed. The PM's experience is more transit focused instead of planning. The Data Collection Specialist participated in and provided support, but there was no indication of a lead role. For the Traffic Operations Specialist, there was a need of more specifics, such as what type of microsimulation tools and methods were used. The prime's experience did not demonstrate on page B3-1 how the Benning Road Corridor Environmental Assessment project is similar to the proposed Downtown Connector study. The relevancy of the Tysons Circulation Plan project is in question as it does not appear any of the proposed team members worked on it. Overall, there was very little major interstate/freeway work.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Marginal

The team's workload appears suitable and the time is available to work on this study. Also, it appears that several key team leaders hours of commitment were more than 75%, but there was no Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) listed.

RFQ	RFQ-484-040915	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Arcadis U.S., Inc.	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Excellent

The PM listed specific analysis tools that are relevant to this study. The Data Collection Specialist listed a wide range of analysis tools, specifying how they were used and their relevancy to the proposed study. The work experience identified on page B-3 lists Revive 285 Top End which is very similar to the proposed Downtown Connector study and the Data Collections Specialist was directly involved in the Revive 285 Top End work that included hands on experience leading the effort. The Economic Impact Analysis Specialist has documented experience with REMI (Regional Economic Model, Inc.) and relevant experience with economic modeling. The Graphics Specialist provided a good example of the type of graphics they are capable of producing. The prime's experience on page B-10 is highly relevant to I-7/85 SB Analysis; I-285/SR 400 interchange/I-20 EB CD project/Revive 285/I-20 at SR 5 interchange analysis. The team has a very good blend of planning, engineering, operations, modeling activities for the PM; with a focus on interstate/freeway type work. Overall, the prime has in-depth experience with similarity in the types of studies.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The team has an acceptable workload capacity and they identified resources in organizational chart. The team provided essential information in the narrative in additional resources section on I-285/SR 400 Interchange Modification Report (IMR) timeframe.

RFQ	RFQ-484-040915	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	HNTB Corporation	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

The team has a good balance of planning and engineering experience with PM even though it could have used more detail. The Data Collection Specialist has acceptable experience and listed traffic forecasting, which is important to this project. There was a lot of really good tolling and freeway analysis experience. But, the need of more identification of other types of projects were necessary that provided more data-given specifics. There was great experience documented with Public Outreach efforts. The Traffic Modeling Specialist listed relevant experience with CORSIM/Synchro, SimTraffic and Highway Capacity Software (HCS) simulation programs. Overall, the team has strong experience in Managed Lane Implementation Plan (MLIP) and Operational Planning Study (OPS) work with Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), but they should have listed more specifics on the PM's role with each of these studies.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The team appears to have time available to work on this project. Liked the narrative section overview including the relationship/experience working together with some of their key personnel. There was a clear understanding of the team's availability.

RFQ	RFQ-484-040915	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good

The Project Manager (PM) listed valuable experience on page B-1 which includes the Radial Freeway Plan which involves an in-depth analysis of the proposed Downtown Connector Study. The team has relevant modeling and alternative identification evaluation experience. The Project Manager (PM) listed great work experience on the original Managed Lanes Systems Plan. The Data Collection Specialist has outstanding experience which is valuable. They have great experience documented. For PM on page B1, listed significant experience with the Radial Freeway Plan which involved an in-depth analysis of the Downtown Connector. They presented relevant modeling and alternative identification evaluations. With Data Collection Specialist, there was significant experience on the Northwest Corridor which involved simulation modeling, developing an interchange modification/justification report that has many similar aspects to the proposed Downtown Connector Study. The Traffic Modeling Specialist has a significant experience with the meso and micro-scopic modeling on the Radial Freeway Study. The Outreach Specialist has similar outreach work with Midtown Alliance on a Downtown Connector Study done in the past. But, even though, this is a completely different type of study of the Connector, many (if not all) of the same individuals will be involved in both studies. The Traffic Operations Specialist has listed relevant experience on page B8 on analyzing I-20/I-59 in downtown Birmingham which explored lowering the currently elevated Interstate into a trench. The Graphics Specialist has relevant experience with the I-595 Public Hearing video.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good

The PM is 70% available and the overall team members were also available. Overall, the team members (especially PM) appear to have more than enough time available to work on this study. On page C2, the Traffic Operations Specialist's prior experience on a feasibility study of the Atlanta North-South Tunnel allows for a familiar background to some of the issues to the proposed Downtown Connector Study will explore.

RFQ	RFQ-484-040915	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Marginal

The PM should have listed more specifics as it relates to the proposed Downtown Connector project and there was not a need to demonstrate engineering and planning experience. The I-75 South Managed Lanes project listed was relevant experience and closely related to the proposed study, but the key team leads could have provided more details on the work done to include the PM's involvement. Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Hwy Plan does not appear to be similar to the proposed study. The Traffic Modeling Specialist provided a nice range of micro and meso level analysis but we would like to see some experience with regional travel demand model also. The Northwest Corridor work seemed very relevant to this project, but there should have been more discussion of the work of this project. Overall, there was a lack of information specifics.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM listed detailed hours for the project which provides a clear understanding of their commitment house. The team overall has available time to work on this study.

RFQ	RFQ-484-040915	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	RS&H, Inc.	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Marginal

The team has demonstrated relevant experience with I-75 south study but nowhere near the magnitude of the Downtown Connector Study. The Data Collection Specialist listed relevant experience and especially on the I-277/I-77 study in North Carolina. The prime appears to lack experience similar to the proposed study. The PM does not bring the necessary skillset needed for this project. The Outreach Specialist did not provide relevant key experience with this project. The Traffic Operations Specialist does not list any innovative experience that would relate to this project. Overall, a few members of the team seem to have sufficient experience but there are others that are lacking in experience for the scale and scope of this study.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

Overall, the firm has sufficient availability, but the firm's narrative section and organizational chart did not provide much detail and specifics

RFQ	RFQ-484-040915	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	# of Evaluators	3
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate

The PM has relevant experience with a mix of planning and engineering tasks on the same project examples of OPS Study/I-85 at SR 400 ramps/SR 316 Plan. There was acceptable experience with I-26 Corridor Analysis on page B9. The Data Collection Lead experience listed seemed very high level and not relevant to the scale of work on our study. Modeling has sufficient experience and the outreach section seemed to have limited applicability to our study and more information on agency coordination with first example State Road Tollway Authority (SRTA) would have been helpful. The project listed under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Lead does not seem to function as the NEPA project. Overall, the team has acceptable experience but may be a little too heavy on the technical side.

Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate

The team appears to have sufficient time to work on this study, but they lacked in the narrative section which seemed basic and did not provide a lot of additional details.

Georgia Department of Transportation

REVISED SELECTION OF FINALISTS
ISSUE DATE: May 8, 2015

RFQ-484-040915 – Corridor Studies for Downtown Connector Services, Contract #2, P.I. 0013210, Cobb, Douglas Fulton Counties

Due to an administrative error, the Georgia Department of Transportation is pleased to announce a revised selection of the following firms as finalists regarding the above RFQ:

Arcardis U.S., Inc.
HNTB Corporation
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
RS&H, Inc.
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

Russell R. McMurry, P.E., Commissioner

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

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

May 8, 2015

REVISED NOTICE TO SELECTED FINALISTS

To: Arcadis U.S., Inc.; HNTB Corporation; Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.; Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.; RS&H, Inc.; and Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

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

Re: RFQ-484-040915 – Corridor Studies for Downtown Connector Services, Contract #2, P.I. 0013210, Cobb, Douglas, Fulton Counties

On behalf of the Selection Committee for the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) referenced above, we congratulate you and your firm on being selected as a finalist for further consideration. This notice shall serve as an official request for additional required information and action from finalists. **Please refer to the original solicitation (RFQ-484-040915), page 8, VII. Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response – Phase II Response, A&B and page 10, IX. Instructions for Submittal for Phase II – Technical Approach and Past Performance Response, A-E for instructions to submit your package.** As a finalist, your firm is required to comply with the written instructions and remaining schedule below:

A. Technical Approach - 40%

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

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

1. Technical approach to delivering the project (including design concepts and use of alternative methods).
2. 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%

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.

****THE SCHEDULE REMAINS THE SAME****

C. Finalist Selection

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

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

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

Rhonda Ligon
rligon@dot.ga.gov
404-631-1329

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ-484-040915
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Corridor Study for Downtown Connector Services, Contract #2
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	May 11, 2015
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Compliant with Page # Limitations
1	Arcadis U.S., Inc.	5/11/2015	01:40 P.M.	X
2	HNTB Corporation	5/11/2015	09:45 A.M.	X
3 *	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	5/18/2015	11:24 A.M.	X
4	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	5/11/2015	01:02 P.M.	X
5	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	5/11/2015	12:29 P.M.	X
6	RS&H, Inc.	5/11/2015	12:29 P.M.	X

* Due to an administrative error, consultant was allowed a different due date with the same timeframe as other consultants.

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF SUBMITTALS

Solicitation Title:	*Corridor Study for Downtown Connector Services, Contract #2*	1	Arcadis U.S., Inc.
Solicitation #:	*RFQ-484-040915*	2	HNTB Corporation
PHASE I AND PHASE II -Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overal Ranking based on Published Criteria		3	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)
		4	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
		5	RS&H, Inc.
		6	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

(This Page For GDOT Use)

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING) Sum of Total Score	Group Ranking
Arcadis U.S., Inc.	925	1
HNTB Corporation	775	2
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	750	3
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	400	6
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	450	4
RS&H, Inc.	450	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
Arcadis U.S., Inc.	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Excellent	925	1
HNTB Corporation	Good	Good	Good	Excellent	775	2
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)	Good	Good	Good	Good	750	3
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	Marginal	Adequate	400	6
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	450	4
RS&H, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	450	4
Maximum Points allowed =	*200*	*300*	*400*	*100*	*1000*	*%*

RFQ	RFQ-484-040915	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Arcadis U.S., Inc.		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Excellent

They presented an outstanding proposal with exceptional points related to preliminary analysis on page 1 (in blue box). Also, they presented a great understanding on issue(s) on page 1 and notable messaging approach with (D Adamo). They proposed a relevant presentation of step-by-step approach to evaluating the corridor/improvements/final recommendations. With similar experience listed on page 3, the Revive 285 and I-285/SR 400 Interchange with how they can identify/evaluate/rank alternatives. The tunnel expert seems to be a great resource.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Excellent

The ratings are excellent based on past performance and in-line with team's experience with the firm.

RFQ	RFQ-484-040915	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	HNTB Corporation		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good

The Project Manager (PM) has a depth of knowledge. They presented a relevant approach to using data collection techniques such as Bluetooth, license plate surveys and etc. They have past experience with studying a tunnel downtown and the acknowledgement of Advanced Traffic Management Systems (ATMS)/autonomous vehicles as a discussion point on page 2. The related experience with Multimodal Passenger Terminal (MMPT) microsimulation on various roads, north-south tunnel past evaluation. The use of large, local office is a benefit. Good understanding of innovative delivery and funding. The proposal could have focused more on stakeholder outreach.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Excellent

Their scores were excellent based on past performance and in-line with the evaluation team's experience with the firm.

RFQ	RFQ-484-040915	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate

In Table A, is not clear whether they listed out all possible tools, or if they thought about what is relevant for this study. On page 1, they listed significant successes with I-80 in California and Big Dig in Boston but it was unclear what their role was on these projects. They presented a relevant point on travel demand on page 2 (service demand, unment and latent demands) and also page 3 about SB ramp from Connector to I-20 EB.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Adequate

Their scores were adequate based on the past performance and in-line with the evaluation team's experience with the firm.

RFQ	RFQ-484-040915	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Marginal

Their proposal was not detailed. They did not present any steps on how to progress through their analysis and what tools specifically would be used and how would you decide which tool is appropriate for each type of analysis. There was a need for more details on outreach/messaging. They seem to place more focus on less important aspects (such as GIS database) and miss opportunities to detail important things (such as analysis tools).

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Adequate

Their scores were adequate based on the past performance and in-line with the evaluation team's experience with the firm.

RFQ	RFQ-484-040915	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	RS&H, Inc.		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate

They provided relevant points in data collection section and listed a lot (maybe too much) on traffic simulation. There were not enough details of identifying and performing engineering/design and the proposed analysis approach was generic.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Adequate

Their scores were adequate based on the past performance and in-line with the evaluation team's experience with the firm.

RFQ	RFQ-484-040915	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (f/k/a/PB Americas, Inc.)		
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good

There is a significant discussion and illustrations of potential ideas. The firm has great experience with Alaskan Way Viaduct and Presidio Pkwy. Overall good points on data collection and modeling ideas. They noted great past experience with GDOT's Radial Freeway Plan and tunneling study. They provided significant examples of potential solutions, but need to see more details on their process to identify and evaluate needs and solutions. There was not a strong stakeholder/messaging approach.

Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Good

Their scores were good based on the past performance and in-line with the evaluation team's experience with the firm.

RFQ 484-040915

Corridor Study for Downtown Connector Services, P.I. 0013210, Cobb, Douglas, Fulton Counties

Reference Check Scores for
Arcadis U.S., Inc.

Reference A

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation, Atlanta, Georgia		
Project Name	I-20 Eastbound Collector-Distributor System Improvement		
Project Manager	Marlo Clowers	Title	Senior Project Manager
Contact Information	404-631-1713		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.		10
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.		10
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		10
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		10
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		10
Comments	They did an excellent job in the delivery of the environmental document for the project.		

Reference B

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation, Atlanta, Georgia		
Project Name	I-285 at SR 400 Interchange Improvements		
Project Manager	Paul DeNard	Title	Executive Assistant to Chief Engineer
Contact Information	404-631-1927		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.		10
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.		10
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		10
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		10
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		10
Comments	They project was well executed they provided background data and research data that gave a comprehensive look in the connector study. Also, they were good with coordinating with the Project Manager and the Management for the work of this project.		

RFQ 484-040915

Corridor Study for Downtown Connector Services, P.I. 0013210, Cobb, Douglas, Fulton Counties

Reference Check Scores for
HNTB Corporation

Reference A

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation, Atlanta, Georgia		
Project Name	Georgia Multimodal Passenger Terminal EIS		
Project Manager	Derrick Cameron	Title	Assistant State Project Review Engineer
Contact Information	404-631-1223		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.		9
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.		10
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		10
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		9
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		9
Comments	They were very responsive and knowledgeable to the process team.		

Reference B

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation, Atlanta, Georgia		
Project Name	Metro Atlanta Operational Planning Study (OPS), Various Counties, Georgia		
Project Manager	Kyle Mote	Title	Branch Chief
Contact Information	404-631-1811		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.		10
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.		10
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		10
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		10
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		10
Comments	They were easily to work with and good wit the community and meet all deliverable goals and always on time.		

RFQ 484-040915

Corridor Study for Downtown Connector Services, P.I. 0013210, Cobb, Douglas, Fulton Counties

Reference Check Scores for
Parsons Transportation Group

Reference A

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation, Atlanta, Georgia		
Project Name	Northwest Corridor Project Cobb & Cherokee Counties, Georgia		
Project Manager	John Hancock	Title	Assistant State Innovative Delivery Engineer
Contact Information	404-631-1315		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.		8
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.		8
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		9
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		9
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		9
Comments	They were very responsive to the changing needs to the project and making sure the project deadlines were met.		

Reference B

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation, Atlanta, Georgia		
Project Name	I-75 South Managed Lanes Clayton and Henry Counties, Georgia		
Project Manager	Mike Dover	Title	TIA Administrator
Contact Information	404-631-1733		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.		8
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.		8
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		8
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		7
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		10
	Parsons Transportation performed preliminary engineering, environmental analysis, traffic analysis, and tolling coordination on the I-75 South Managed Lanes Project. Their work in these disciplines were excellent. Parsons traffic specialist provided excellent analysis in a very involved project. They coordinated well with other agencies and consultants on a very complicated project.		

RFQ 484-040915

Corridor Studies for Downtown Connector Services, P.I. 0013210, Cobb, Douglas, Fulton Counties

Reference Check Scores for
RS&H, Inc.

Reference A

Firm Name	North Carolina Department of Transportation, Charlotte, North Carolina		
Project Name	I-485 Managed Lanes, Charlotte, North Carolina		
Project Manager	Angela Sanderson	Title	Project Planning Engineer
Contact Information	919-707-6042		
	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.		10
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		10
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		7
Comments	They firm has done an excellent job with the technical information and with the deliverables. There have been delays due to our organizational unknown policy decisions that has affected the overall project, but they are very knowledgeable of the subject matter and they provided high quality reports and we are very happy with the firm.		

Reference B

Firm Name	Texas Department of Transportation		
Project Name	I-35/SH 130 Connector Feasibility Study, Austin, TX		
Project Manager	Roger Bell	Title	
Contact Information	512-486-5154		
	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.		6
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		5
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		6
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		5
Comments	Part of the problem with this project was the firm did not hit the target with moving so they did not grasp the big picture of the project. Secondly, technically wise the engineering and the environmental was good but more so, we had issues with the sub-consultant not being able to understand the demand modeling concept issues.		

RFQ 484-040915

Corridor Study for Downtown Connector Services, P.I. 0013210, Cobb, Douglas, Fulton Counties

Reference Check Scores for
Stantec Consulting Services Inc.

Reference A

Firm Name	South Carolina Department of Transpiration, South Carolina		
Project Name	I-526 Corridor Analysis		
Project Manager	Mike Dennis	Title	Technical Application Engineer
Contact Information	803-737-1445		
	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.		8
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		10
Comments	This project is completed and it was directly implemented. They have a great customer service level of consultant communicating with SCDOT as a client and public was very good and it has helped to jump start other projects.		

Reference B

Firm Name	South Carolina Department of Transportation, South Carolina		
Project Name	I-285 & I-385 Interchange Design-Build		
Project Manager	John Boylston	Title	Regional Production Engineer
Contact Information	803-737-2314		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.		8
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.		7
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		8
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		9
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		7
Comments	This project is still in the design phase and Stantec is not the lead consultant on this project. They are the sub-consultant to the Design Lead that will be doing the traffic engineering for this project. They have been responsible, knowledgeable, capable and good with client services.		

RFQ 484-040915

Corridor Study for Downtown Connector Services, P.I. 0013210, Cobb, Douglas, Fulton Counties

Reference Check Scores for
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.

Reference A

Firm Name	Georgia Department of Transportation, Atlanta, Georgia		
Project Name	I-75/I-575 Northwest Corridor Project, Cobb & Cherokee Counties, Georgia		
Project Manager	John Hancock	Title	Assistant State Innovative Delivery Engineer
Contact Information	404-631-1315		
	Reference Questions		**Score**
	1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management for your project.		8
	2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.		8
	3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.		9
	4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.		9
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		9
Comments	They were very responsive to the changing needs to the project and making sure the project deadlines were met.		

Reference B

Firm Name	North Carolina Department of Transportation, Charlotte, North Carolina		
Project Name	Charlotte Region Fast Lanes Study, Statewide, North Carolina		
Project Manager	Timothy Gibbs	Title	Transportation Planner 3
Contact Information	704-336-3917		
	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.		10
	5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.		10
Comments	Until this study in 2007, we had no managed lanes in our area and since that time we have three different (3) projects that are being let for construction. All three (3) projects are a total of 55 miles and this was a motivational study. They were very helpful, instrumental in all areas and answered all concerns.		

Reference Check Summary for
RFQ 484-040915
Corridor Study for Downtown Connector Services, P.I. 0013210, Cobb, Douglas, Fulton Counties

Questions (to be answered on 1-10 scale, 10 indicates best)	Arcadis U.S., Inc.	HNTB Corporation	Parsons Transportation Group	RS&H, Inc.	Stantec Consulting Services Inc.	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.
1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in Project Management						
Reference A	10	9	8	9	9	8
Reference B	10	10	8	7	8	10
Section Average	10.00	9.50	8.00	8.00	8.50	9.00
2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of						
Reference A	10	10	8	10	9	8
Reference B	10	10	8	6	7	9
Section Average	10.00	10.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.50
3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.						
Reference A	10	10	9	10	9	9
Reference B	10	10	8	5	8	10
Section Average	10.00	10.00	8.50	7.50	8.50	9.50
4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program management.						
Reference A	10	9	9	10	8	9
Reference B	10	10	7	6	9	10
Section Average	10.00	9.50	8.00	8.00	8.50	9.50
5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.						
Reference A	10	9	9	7	10	9
Reference B	10	10	10	5	7	10
Section Average	10.00	9.50	9.50	6.00	8.50	9.50
Overall Average	**10.00**	**9.70**	**8.40**	**7.50**	**8.40**	**9.20**

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : Arcadis* U.S.* Inc.*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY ARCADIS U.S., INC. Status:Active

DUNS: 081509838 +4: CAGE Code: 005Q6 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: May 18, 2016 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 630 PLAZA DR STE 200
City: HIGHLANDS RANCH State/Province: COLORADO
ZIP Code: 80129-2379 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY ARCADIS U.S., INC. Status:Active

DUNS: 783194769 +4: CAGE Code: 6SR86 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: May 18, 2016 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 194 SEVEN FARMS DR STE F
City: CHARLESTON State/Province: SOUTH CAROLINA
ZIP Code: 29492-8509 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY ARCADIS U.S., INC. Status:Active

DUNS: 004037466 +4: CAGE Code: 6UXH5 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: May 18, 2016 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: Rosehill Offc Pk 1, 8725 Rosehill, STE 350
City: LENEXA State/Province: KANSAS
ZIP Code: 66215-4611 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY ARCADIS U.S., INC. Status:Active

DUNS: 143490659 +4: CAGE Code: 6SRJ2 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: May 18, 2016 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 1 SEAGATE STE 700
City: TOLEDO State/Province: OHIO
ZIP Code: 43604-1558 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY ARCADIS U.S., INC. Status:Active

DUNS: 022361518 +4: CAGE Code: 6UXD3 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Feb 18, 2016 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 1100 SUPERIOR AVE E STE 1250
City: CLEVELAND State/Province: OHIO
ZIP Code: 44114-2542 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY ARCADIS U.S., INC. Status:Active

DUNS: 809068732 +4: CAGE Code: 7C5K0 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Mar 11, 2016 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 111 Saunders Lane
City: BLUEFIELD State/Province: VIRGINIA
ZIP Code: 24605-9278 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY ARCADIS U.S., INC. Status:Active

DUNS: 784436532 +4: CAGE Code: 7C5P0 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Mar 11, 2016 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 9954 MAYLAND DR
City: RICHMOND State/Province: VIRGINIA
ZIP Code: 23233-1464 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY ARCADIS U.S., INC. Status:Active

DUNS: 783225816 +4: CAGE Code: 6UXD4 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Jan 26, 2016 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 1004 N BIG SPRING ST STE 300
City: MIDLAND State/Province: TEXAS
ZIP Code: 79701-3383 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY ARCADIS U.S., INC. Status:Active

DUNS: 800150930 +4: CAGE Code: 372P0 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: Feb 18, 2016 Has Active Exclusion?: No Delinquent Federal Debt?: No

Address: 2410 PACES FERRY RD SE STE 400
City: ATLANTA State/Province: GEORGIA
ZIP Code: 30339-3769 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY	ARCADIS U.S., INC.		Status:Active
DUNS: 147552561	+4:	CAGE Code: 5TN02	DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: Feb 18, 2016	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Delinquent Federal Debt?: No	
Address: 1210 PREMIER DRIVE STE 200 City: CHATTANOOGA ZIP Code: 37421-0000		State/Province: TENNESSEE Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY	ARCADIS U.S., INC.		Status:Active
DUNS: 108863192	+4:	CAGE Code: 0C0J9	DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: Jan 26, 2016	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Delinquent Federal Debt?: No	
Address: 2000 POWELL ST FL 7TH City: EMERYVILLE ZIP Code: 94608-1811		State/Province: CALIFORNIA Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY	ARCADIS U.S., INC.		Status:Active
DUNS: 057690414	+4:	CAGE Code: 6UXH6	DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: Jan 26, 2016	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Delinquent Federal Debt?: No	
Address: 10352 Plaza Americana Dr City: BATON ROUGE ZIP Code: 70816-8174		State/Province: LOUISIANA Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY	ARCADIS U.S., INC.		Status:Active
DUNS: 947473062	+4:	CAGE Code: 6UXD6	DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: Jan 26, 2016	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Delinquent Federal Debt?: No	
Address: 1114 BENFIELD BLVD Ste A City: MILLERSVILLE ZIP Code: 21108-2585		State/Province: MARYLAND 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
ARCADIS U.S., Inc. 2410 Paces Ferry Road, Suite 400 Atlanta, GA 30339	6/12/14	6/30/17

SIGNATURE

Russell R McMurry

1. Transporation Planning

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

2. Mass Transit Operations

	2.01	Mass Transit Program (Systems) Management
X	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
X	3.04	Multi-Lane, Limited Access Expressway Type Highway Design
X	3.05	Design of Urban Expressway and Interstate
X	3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
X	3.07	Traffic Operations Design
X	3.08	Landscape Architecture

3. Highway Design Roadway (Continued)

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

4. Highway Structures

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

5. Topography

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
X	5.07	Cartography
	5.08	Subsurface Utility Engineering

6. Soils, Foundation & Materials Testing

X	6.01a	Soil Surveys
X	6.01b	Geological and Geophysical Studies
X	6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
X	6.03	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Soils and Foundation)
	6.04a	Laboratory Materials Testing
	6.04b	Field Testing of Roadway Construction Materials
X	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
X	9.02	Rainfall and Runoff Reporting
X	9.03	Field Inspections for Compliance of Erosion and Sedimentation Control Devices Installations

View assistance for Search Results

Search Results

Current Search Terms: arcadis* U.S.* Inc.*

Your search for "Arcadis* U.S.* Inc.*" returned the following results...

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

Entity **ARCADIS U.S., INC.** Status: **Active**
DUNS: 081509838 **CAGE Code: 005Q6** View Details
Has Active Exclusion?: No **DoDAAC:**
Expiration Date: 05/18/2016 **Delinquent Federal Debt? No**
Purpose of Registration: All Awards

Entity **ARCADIS U.S., INC.** Status: **Active**
DUNS: 783194769 **CAGE Code: 6SR86** View Details
Has Active Exclusion?: No **DoDAAC:**
Expiration Date: 05/18/2016 **Delinquent Federal Debt? No**
Purpose of Registration: All Awards

Entity **ARCADIS U.S., INC.** Status: **Active**
DUNS: 004037466 **CAGE Code: 6UXH5** View Details
Has Active Exclusion?: No **DoDAAC:**
Expiration Date: 05/18/2016 **Delinquent Federal Debt? No**
Purpose of Registration: All Awards

Entity **ARCADIS U.S., INC.** Status: **Active**
DUNS: 143490659 **CAGE Code: 6SRJ2** View Details
Has Active Exclusion?: No **DoDAAC:**
Expiration Date: 05/18/2016 **Delinquent Federal Debt? No**
Purpose of Registration: All Awards

Entity **ARCADIS U.S., INC.** Status: **Active**
DUNS: 022361518 **CAGE Code: 6UXD3** View Details
Has Active Exclusion?: No **DoDAAC:**
Expiration Date: 02/18/2016 **Delinquent Federal Debt? No**
Purpose of Registration: All Awards

Entity **ARCADIS U.S., INC.** Status: **Active**
DUNS: 809068732 **CAGE Code: 7C5K0** View Details
Has Active Exclusion?: No **DoDAAC:**
Expiration Date: 03/11/2016 **Delinquent Federal Debt? No**
Purpose of Registration: All Awards

Entity **ARCADIS U.S., INC.** Status: **Active**
DUNS: 784436532 **CAGE Code: 7C5P0** View Details
Has Active Exclusion?: No **DoDAAC:**
Expiration Date: 03/11/2016 **Delinquent Federal Debt? No**
Purpose of Registration: All Awards

Entity **ARCADIS U.S., INC.** Status: **Active**
DUNS: 783225816 **CAGE Code: 6UXD4** View Details
Has Active Exclusion?: No **DoDAAC:**
Expiration Date: 01/26/2016 **Delinquent Federal Debt? No**
Purpose of Registration: All Awards

Entity **ARCADIS U.S., INC.** Status: **Active**
DUNS: 800150930 **CAGE Code: 372P0** View Details
Has Active Exclusion?: No **DoDAAC:**
Expiration Date: 02/18/2016 **Delinquent Federal Debt? No**
Purpose of Registration: All Awards

Entity **ARCADIS U.S., INC.** Status: **Active**
DUNS: 147552561 **CAGE Code: 5TN02** View Details
Has Active Exclusion?: No **DoDAAC:**
Expiration Date: 02/18/2016 **Delinquent Federal Debt? No**
Purpose of Registration: All Awards

Glossary

Search Results
Entity
Exclusion

Search Filters
By Record Status
By Functional Area - Entity Management
By Functional Area - Performance Information