DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

June 17, 2014

RFQ #: **RFQ**-484-040417TIA
RFQ Title: TIA Design Services
Contract No.: B2-2

FROM: Robert T. (Bobby) Adams, P.E., TIA Procurement Administrator

TO: Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator

SUBJECT: **Ranking Approval**

The TIA Procurement Section has reviewed and evaluated Statements of Qualifications, Technical Approach, and Past Performance for the above referenced project.

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

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

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

1. **T Y Lin International**
2. **CH2M Hill, Inc.**
2. **Columbia Engineering & Services, Inc.**
3. **Lowe Engineering, LLC**
4. **CHA Consulting, Inc.**

The Selection Committee recommends the selection of the top ranked firm **T.Y. Lin International**.

Concurrence with Award:

Mike Dover, TIA Administrator

Certification Procurement Requirements Met:

Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator

RTA:ba

Attachments

Date Posted: March 17, 2014

Georgia Department of Transportation

Request for Qualifications

To Provide

Engineering Design Services for TIA Projects

RFQ-484-040714TIA
Qualifications Due: April 7, 2014

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

v. 3-12-14

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS
484-040714TIA

Engineering Design Services for TIA Projects

I. General Project Information

A. Overview

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

Contract	County	PI #	Project Description
1	Burke	0012574	Widen SR 56
2	Harris/Muscogee	0001812	SR 219 Passing Lanes
3	Harris	0011430	SR 103 Passing Lanes
4	Crisp/Sumter	0012578	US 280 Bridge over Lake Blackshear
5	Washington	245090-	Sandersville Bypass

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

The Georgia Department of Transportation Board (State Transportation Board) issued a Resolution in May of 2012 encouraging and promoting the participation of groups such as small businesses and DBE's (including minority and women owned businesses, and veteran owned business) in projects funded by TIA. The State Transportation Board TIA Resolution may be viewed on the TIA website:

http://www.ga-tia.com/Images/FactSheets/TransportationReferendum.pdf

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 Board Resolution.

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. History and Purpose

Pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 48-8-240 et. seq., TIA provides a legal mechanism in which the special districts by a referendum may vote to impose a 1% sales tax to fund needed transportation improvements within their special districts. TIA established twelve (12) transportation special districts throughout Georgia that correspond to state designated Regional Commission (RC) boundaries. Additionally, the law established Regional Transportation Roundtables (RTR) consisting of elected officials from the counties and cities within each special district. An Executive Committee of five members, supplemented with three non voting members of the Georgia General Assembly, is also required for each RTR. Each RTR was charged with approving a financially constrained draft investment list of transportation projects for their special district. These lists were approved by the full RTR on October 15, 2011 (Approved Investment Lists). Three (3) special districts voted to approve to levy the special district transportation sales and use tax: River Valley, Heart of Georgia Altamaha, and Central Savannah River Valley.

E. Scope of Services

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

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

F. Contract Term and Type

GDOT anticipates one (1) Multi-Phase, Project Specific contract to be awarded to one (1) firm, for each project/contract identified. GDOT anticipates that the Contract Type will be paid via Firm Fixed Price and/or Cost Plus Fixed Fee methodology. As Project Specific contracts, it is the Department's intention that the Agreements will remain in effect until successful completion of the preliminary engineering phase of the projects, and may choose to utilize the selected consultant for use on construction revisions as necessary.

G. Contract Amount

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

II. <u>Selection Method</u>

A. Method of Communication

All general communication of relevant information regarding this solicitation will be made via the Georgia Procurement Registry (GPR) under RFQ-484-040714TIA. 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**, 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 -484-040714TIA**	3/17/2014	----------
b. Deadline for submission of written questions and requests for clarification	3/24/2014	2:00 PM
c. Deadline for submission of Statements of Qualifications	4/7/2014	2:00 PM
d. GDOT completes evaluation and issues notification and other information to finalist firms	TBD	
PHASE II		
e. Deadline for submission of written questions from finalists	TBD	2:00 PM
f. Phase II Response of Finalist firms due	TBD	TBA

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

A. Area Class Requirements and Certification

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

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

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

The Selection Committee will evaluate all firms on their Experience and Qualifications, which shall account for a total of twenty percent (20%) 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 – 25%

The Selection Committee will evaluate all firms on their Resources availability and Workload Capacity which shall account for a total of twenty-five percent (25%) 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
Resources dedicated to delivering project
Workload capacity of Key Team Leader(s)

D. Work Previously Awarded – 5%

Firms will be assigned scores equivalent to five percent (5%) of the total evaluation based on the dollar amount of GDOT Contracts and Task Orders awarded to the Prime Consultant during the last eighteen (18) months. Scores indicated below are based on a total available score of 1000 points for all Phase I and Phase II criteria.

$0.00 to $1,000,000.00 awarded =	50 points
$1,000,000.00 to $1,999,999.99 awarded =	37.5 Points
$2,000,000.00 to $2,999,999.99 awarded =	25 Points
$3,000,000.00 to $3,999,999.99 awarded =	12.5 Point
$4,000,000.00 or greater awarded =	0 Points

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 percent (40%). The Selection Committee shall utilize the following additional criteria for scoring Phase II of the evaluation to determine the highest ranked/most qualified **(NOTE: Scores from Phase I will be carried forward and combined with the scores from the Phase II to determine the final ranking of Finalists)**:

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

B. Past Performance – 10%

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

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

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

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

A. Administrative Requirements

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

1. Basic company information:

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

2. Certification Form - Complete the Certification Form (*Exhibit "II" enclosed with RFQ*), and provide a notarized original within the firm's Statement of Qualifications. This is to be submitted for the Prime **ONLY**.

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

B. Experience and Qualifications

1. Project Manager - Provide information pertaining to the project manager including but not limited to:

   a. Education.
   b. Registration (if necessary and applicable.)
   c. Relevant engineering experience.
   d. Relevant project management experience for projects of similar complexity, size, scope, and function (no more than five (5) projects).
   e. Relevant experience utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance (Plan Development Process, Design Policy, Environmental Procedures Manual, etc.)
   f. Project Commitment Table - Provide a list of ALL projects 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

This information is limited to two pages maximum (excluding the table).

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 5 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 5 of each Exhibit I. Respondents submitting more than one page for each Key Team Leader identified will be subject to disqualification.

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, or to discuss any information which is pertinent to these areas. Respondents submitting more than the one additional page allowed, will be subject to disqualification.

3. Prime Experience - Provide information on the prime's experience and ability in delivering effective services for projects of similar complexity, size, scope, and function for the previous five (5) years. Describe no more than five (5) projects, in order of most relevant to least relevant, which demonstrate the firm's capabilities to provide services for GDOT. For each project, the following information should be provided:

   a. Client name, project location and dates during which services were performed.
   b. Description of overall project and services performed by your firm.
   c. Duration of project services provided by your firm, and overall project budget.
   d. Experience utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance (PDP, Design Policy, Environmental Procedures Manual, etc.)
   e. Client(s) current contact information including contact names and telephone numbers.
   f. Involvement of Key Team Leaders on the projects.

   This information is limited to two pages maximum.

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

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

C. Resources/Workload Capacity

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

   a. Organizational chart which identifies the project manager, prime, Key Team Leaders, support personnel, and reporting structure.
   b. Primary Office - Identify and discuss the primary office which will be responsible for handling the specific project and the number and types of staff within the office and how this office could benefit the project and promote efficiency.

2. 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 5** 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

This information is limited to the organization chart, one page of text, and the table.

D. Work Previously Awarded

Provide information regarding GDOT contracts awarded to the prime firm during the 18 months prior to the submittal deadline for this RFQ. Information should be provided by completing the table in **Exhibit VI**. For the convenience of responders, this form is provided in Excel format on the Georgia Procurement Registry under this RFQ advertisement.

This information is limited to Exhibit VI.

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

The following information will only be requested of the shortlisted firms. The Selection Committee will evaluate the shortlisted firms using the information provided as requested below (NOTE: Scores from Phase I will be carried forward to Phase II). Please note that each project/contract will follow an individual schedule which meets the availability of each Selection Committee. For this reason, the Notice to Finalists and resulting Phase II responses may be on different schedules for each project/contract. If a firm is a Finalist on multiple projects/contracts, the Phase II responses should be considered as separate responses which shall be prepared and submitted separately.

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

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

A. Technical Approach

Provide any unique technical approaches your firm offers relative to addressing anticipated design concepts, use of any alternative methods for delivery (if applicable), and/or management of the project. Identify any unique challenges of the project and how your firm intends to mitigate these challenges, including quality control, quality assurance procedures. Provide any specific qualifications, skills, knowledge of the project and project area which may uniquely benefit the firm and project. Demonstrate Prime Consultant's understanding of the TIA program. Discuss service delivery strategies within the constraints of the TIA program. Discuss compliance with GDOT's TIA conflict of interest policy (See **Exhibit IV**). Provide a description of Prime Consultant's non-discrimination and equal employment opportunities policies and explain plans for Utilization of Small Businesses, DBE and Veteran Owned Businesses.

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 Selecton Committee has pertaining to the past performance of the firm on any project.

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

A. For each project/contract which is being sought by the firm, there are two (2) submittals required. Submittal #1 must follow the format and meet the content requirements identified in **Section VI**, entitled **Instructions for Content and Preparation of Statements of Qualifications – Phase I Response.** Respondents must submit one original and five identical copies for all projects being sought. Submittal #2 is an electronic version of Submittal #1 which allows for GDOT to maintain the files electronically. The original and each copy of each Submittal #1 should be stapled separately. For each project/contract response, the original and each copy of Submittal #1 should be bound together using a binder clip or other similar fashion which allows the individual copies to be separated and distributed easily to Selection Committee Members. If a firm is responding to multiple projects/contracts, each separately bound project/contract may be submitted in a single package (boxed, enveloped, or other). See **Attachment 1** for a summary of how the submittals should be prepared.

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

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

Submittals must be sealed in an opaque envelope or box, and reference **RFQ 484-040714TIA 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 III. Schedule of Events at the exact address below:

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

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

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

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

A. There are two (2) submitals required. Submittal #1 must follow the format and meet the content requirements identified in **Section VII**, entitled **Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response – Phase II Response.** Respondents must submit one original and five identical copies for the project for which they have been identified as a Finalist. Submittal #2 is an electronic version of Submittal #1 which allows for GDOT to maintain the files electronically. The original and each copy of each Submittal #1 should be stapled separately. For each project/contract response, the original and each copy of Submittal #1 should be bound together using a binder clip or other similar fashion which allows the individual copies to be separated and distributed easily to Selection Committee Members. In the event that the firm has been identified as a Finalist on more than one project/contract, and the due date and time for the Phase II response is the same and a firm is responding to multiple projects/contracts, each separately bound project/contract may be submitted in a single package (boxed, enveloped, or other.)

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

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

C. Submittals must be sealed in an opaque envelope or box, and reference **RFQ 484-040714TIA 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: Bobby Adams
TIA 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: Bobby Adams, e-mail: badams@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

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.

D. Audit and Accounting System Requirements

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

1. Firm(s) should have an accounting system in place to meet requirements of 48 CFR Part 31 and, in the case of non-profit organizations, OMB Circular A-122.
2. Any firm that currently has an aggregate contract amount exceeding $250,000 should have submitted their yearly CPA overhead audit **no later than June 30 of each year**.
3. Firm(s) should have no significant outstanding deficient audit findings from previous contracts with GDOT that have not been resolved.
4. The prime is responsible for being reasonably assured that all sub-consultant(s) presented as a part of the proposed team are similarly in compliance with the above requirements.

E. Submittal Costs and Confidentiality

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

F. Award Conditions

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

G. Debriefings

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

H. Right to Cancel or Change RFQ

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

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

I. Substitutions, Alternates, Exceptions, and Extensions

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

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

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

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

CONTRACT B2-1

1. Project Information

Project No.: 0012574 PI No.: 0012574 TIA Project No.: RC07-000005
County: Burke Description: Widen SR 56 from Burke County Line to SR 23 – PHASE I – TIA

2. Scope

The Consultant shall provide all anticipated services to accomplish a design for the indicated project(s), meeting the benefits stated for the project(s) in the Final Investment List Report TIA 2010 and accomplishing said design in a manner to enable construction of the project within the available budget set forth below.

Widen 1.35 miles of Highway 56 to four lanes from the Richmond/Burke County Line to SR 23.

3. Budget:

PE:	$425,000
R/W	$850,000
Utility:	$0
Construction:	$4,930,000
Total Available Budget:	$6,205,000

4. RequiredArea Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 4.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 4.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in **Exhibit IV**) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint-venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

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

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

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.10	Traffic Studies
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.10	Utility Coordination
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
5.04	Aerial Photography
5.05	Photogrammetry
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

5. Related Key Team Leaders:

   A. Roadway Design
   B. Environmental

6. Additional Project Information:

Information relative to this project may be found and downloaded from:

http://mydocs.dot.ga.gov/info/publicdownloads/Downloads/Forms/AllItems.aspx

and located in the folder TIA Projects/RFQ-484-040714TIA Projects/Contract 1 – PI 0012574.

EXHIBIT I-2

CONTRACT B2-2

1. Project Information

Project No.: STP00-0001-00(812) PI No.: 0001812 TIA Project No.: RC08-000060
County: Harris/Muscogee SR 219 Passing Lanes from Luther Land Bridge to Happy Hollow Road

2. Scope

The Consultant shall provide all anticipated services to accomplish a design for the indicated project(s), meeting the benefits stated for the project(s) in the Final Investment List Report TIA 2010 and accomplishing said design in a manner to enable construction of the project within the available budget set forth below.

A passing lane will be constructed along SR 219 from Luther Land Bridge to Happy Hollow Road.

3. Budget:

PE:	$1,358,075
R/W	$342,913
Utility:	$1,276,561
Construction:	$12,059,322
Total Available Budget:	$15,036,871

4. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 4.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 4.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in Exhibit IV) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint-venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

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

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

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.10	Traffic Studies
3.10	Utility Coordination
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
5.04	Aerial Photography
5.05	Photogrammetry
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

5. Related Key Team Leaders:

   A. Roadway Design
   B. Environmental

6. Additional Project Information:

Information relative to this project may be found and downloaded from:

http://mydocs.dot.ga.gov/info/publicdownloads/Downloads/Forms/AllItems.aspx

and located in the folder TIA Projects/RFQ-484-040714TIA Projects/Contract 2 – PI 0001812.

EXHIBIT I-3

CONTRACT B2-3

1. Project Information

Project No.: 0011430 PI No.: 0011430 TIA Project No.: RC08-000022
County: Harris Description: SR 103 Passing Lanes from MP 11.8 to Troup County Line

2. Scope

The Consultant shall provide all anticipated services to accomplish a design for the indicated project(s), meeting the benefits stated for the project(s) in the Final Investment List Report TIA 2010 and accomplishing said design in a manner to enable construction of the project within the available budget set forth below.

This project begins at a small creek crossing just south of South Progress Parkway at approximate MP 11.8 and goes north to the Troup County Line. The project would be approximately 1.3 miles in length. The project consists of the addition of a northbound passing lane. There would be right of way needed for this project.

3. Budget:

PE:	$280,160
R/W	$25,500
Utility:	$0
Construction:	$3,501,998
Total Available Budget:	$3,807,658

4. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 4.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 4.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in Exhibit IV) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint-venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

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

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

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.10	Traffic Studies
3.10	Utility Coordination
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
5.04	Aerial Photography
5.05	Photogrammetry
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

5. Related Key Team Leaders:

   A. Roadway Design
   B. Environmental

6. Additional Project Information:

Information relative to this project may be found and downloaded from:

http://mydocs.dot.ga.gov/info/publicdownloads/Downloads/Forms/AllItems.aspx

and located in the folder TIA Projects/RFQ-484-040714TIA Projects/Contract 3 – PI 0011430.

EXHIBIT I-4

CONTRACT B2-4

1. Project Information

Project No.: 0012578 PI No.: 0012578 TIA Project No.: RC08-000012
County: Crisp/Sumter Description: US 280 Bridge Reconstruction over Lake Blackshear

2. Scope

The Consultant shall provide all anticipated services to accomplish a design for the indicated project(s), meeting the benefits stated for the project(s) in the Final Investment List Report TIA 2010 and accomplishing said design in a manner to enable construction of the project within the available budget set forth below.

Project components include construction of a new parallel 27 span prestressed concrete girder type bridge over Lake Blackshear. The existing bridge is 2243` x 40`, with a sufficiency rating of 87. This project is part of the GRIP; it is on the east end of STP -030-2(30) and ties into STP -030-2(29)

3. Budget:

PE:	$1,275,000
R/W	$425,000
Utility:	$0
Construction:	$23,800,000
Total Available Budget:	$25,500,000

4. Required Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 4.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 4.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in Exhibit IV) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint-venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

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

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

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Survey
3.10	Utility Coordination
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

5. Related Key Team Leaders:

   A. Bridge Design
   B. Environmental

6. Additional Project Information:

Information relative to this project may be found and downloaded from:

http://mydocs.dot.ga.gov/info/publicdownloads/Downloads/Forms/AllItems.aspx

and located in the folder TIA Projects/RFQ-484-040714TIA Projects/Contract 4 – PI 0012578.

EXHIBIT I-5

CONTRACT B2-5

1. Project Information

Project No.: STP00-2992-00(003) PI No.: 245090- TIA Project No.: RC07-000168
County: Washington Description: Sandersville Bypass

2. Scope

The Consultant shall provide all anticipated services to accomplish a design for the indicated project(s), meeting the benefits stated for the project(s) in the Final Investment List Report TIA 2010 and accomplishing said design in a manner to enable construction of the project within the available budget set forth below.

Construct a four lane truck route around the cities of Sandersville and Tennille

3. Budget:

PE:	$637,500
R/W	$4,250,000
Utility:	$234,090
Construction:	$26,595,941
Total Available Budget:	$32,107,531

4. Area Classes:

Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their subconsultants, who are considered team members. The Prime Consultant must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 4.A. The Prime Consultant or subconsultant team members must be prequalified in the Area Classes identified below in Section 4.B. Respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in Exhibit IV) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all subconsultants or joint-venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. The Prequalification Expiration Date must be current by the deadline stated for this RFQ.

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

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

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.10	Traffic Studies
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.10	Utility Coordination
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
5.04	Aerial Photography
5.05	Photogrammetry
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

5. Related Key Team Leaders:

   A. Roadway Design
   B. Environmental

6. Additional Project Information:

Information relative to this project may be found and downloaded from:

http://mydocs.dot.ga.gov/info/publicdownloads/Downloads/Forms/AllItems.aspx

and located in the folder TIA Projects/RFQ-484-040714TIA Projects/Contract 5 – PI 245090-.

EXHIBIT II
CERTIFICATION FORM

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sworn and subscribed before me

This _____ day of _____, 20___.

_____
Signature

_____
NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires: _____

_____
NOTARY SEAL

EXHIBIT III

GEORGIA SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION COMPLIANCE ACT AFFIDAVIT

Contracting Entity/Respondent: _____

Address: _____

Solicitation No./Contract No. : **RFQ-484-040714TIA**

Solicitation/Contract Name: Engineering Design Services for TIA Projects

By executing this affidavit, the undersigned person or entity verifies its compliance with O.C.G.A. § 13-10-91, stating affirmatively that the individual, firm, or entity which is contracting with the Georgia Department of Transportation has registered with, is authorized to participate in, and is participating in the federal work authorization program commonly known as E-Verify, or any subsequent replacement program, in accordance with the applicable provisions and deadlines established in O.C.G.A. § 13-10-91.

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

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

_____ _____
E-Verify/Company Identification Number Date of Authorization

_____ _____
Signature of Authorized Officer or Agent Date
(Contractor Name)

_____
Title of Authorized Officer or Agent of Consultant

_____
Printed Name of Authorized Officer or Agent

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN
BEFORE ME ON THIS THE

_____ DAY OF _____, 201_

_____ [NOTARY SEAL]
Notary Public

My Commission Expires: _____

EXHIBIT IV

Transportation Investment Act of 2010
Consultant Services Conflict of Interest Policy

Background/ Purpose

The Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) shall be employing services from qualified firm(s) or organization(s) for the implementation of the Transportation Investment Act of 2010 (TIA). The TIA program includes numerous projects to be designed and built in designated special districts under a management structure that involves the use of multiple private consulting firms in a variety of management and project delivery positions. Much of the work to be performed by the private consulting firms may extend into coordination, reporting, oversight and management of fiscal, technical, real estate, third party coordination, and other disciplines with varying levels of assistance from GDOT and other local agencies. The size of the program makes it more likely that individual firms will work in multiple special districts and may have preexisting work, local knowledge, or complex relationships that could appear to be prejudicial to their ability to act in an impartial manner. The activity level of the work in the TIA program may be on a large scale at particular times, making coincidental and inadvertent conflicts more likely.

While there are existing statutory and administrative regulations for State agencies regarding conflicts of interest which shall continue to govern the actions of GDOT (*a non exclusion list of key regulations are listed below*), the importance of the State's need to effectively manage and implement the TIA program necessitates that all parties recognize that conflicts may be more likely in this program, and that there be increased reasonable efforts to prevent, mitigate and, where feasible, remedy conflicts to the fullest extent possible.

Non-Exclusive List of Regulations and Other Prescriptive Information regarding Conflict of Interest

- O.C.G.A 45-10-(1 through 24)
- FTA Procurement Circular 4220.1F
- 49 CFR 18.36(b)(3)
- 24 CFR Part 85, Section 85.36(b)(3)

GDOT Policy in Soliciting and Administering Consulting Services for TIA

1. In soliciting consulting services, a responsibility shall be placed on the firm by the State to proactively identify and divulge to the State any known or discovered potential conflicts, both direct and indirect, and/or appearances of conflicts. The same responsibility shall carry forward, contractually, throughout the services provided to the State and/or local government. The State may take actions up to and including rendering firms non-responsive, and/or dismissal or disqualification when it determines firms have not been forthcoming. Upon being selected for services, consulting firms will be required to complete a Conflict of Interest Disclosure form prior to execution of the contract.

2. The State shall at all times reserve the right to judge/declare conflicts of interest in the program, and may take actions that it deems appropriate to eliminate conflicts of interest, to the extent allowable by law. For the TIA program, these actions may include warning to firms prior to services, interaction with firm and allowance of remedy, and/or immediate dismissal of the firm's services. At no time shall a firm be allowed to continue services when known conflicts are present, without such actions being taken.

3. The State shall endeavor, in its actions concerning firm conflicts of interest, to be reasonable, consistent, and act in good faith in issuing notices, warnings, allowances of remedy, disqualifications, dismissals, and declarations of conflict of interest. Where a conflict(s) is identified by a firm, or where the State becomes aware of a conflict, it should be immediately reported and the firm must submit by affidavit a detail course of action that it shall take to remedy any identified conflict(s). A Conflict Committee of qualified persons shall be established, with members designated by the GDOT Commissioner, which will include appropriate State legal staff. The Conflict Committee will then determine whether the firm's proposed course of action for remedy is accepted or rejected or may cause actions resulting in dismissal in services currently being performed. In their evaluation of services being procured, Selection Committees for the procurements may make determinations in clear conflict cases, however they will be instructed to forward these

determinations and any discovered “apparent” conflicts or questionable areas to the Conflict Committee for judgment and record.

Requirements concerning Conflict of Interest

1. The requirement that no contracting agency employee who participates in the procurement, management, or administration of contracts or subcontracts shall have, directly or indirectly, any financial or other personal interest in connection with such contract or subcontract.
2. The requirement that no person or entity performing services for a contracting agency in connection with a project shall have, directly or indirectly, any financial or other personal interest, other that employment or retention by the contracting agency, in any contract or subcontract in connection with such project.
3. The requirement that no person or entity performing services for a contracting agency in connection with a project shall have, directly or indirectly, any financial or other personal interest in any real property acquired for the project.
4. The requirement for appropriate organizational conflicts of interest provisions which address allowable roles and responsibilities associated with the procurement, management, and administration of contracts.

Areas of Potential Conflicts

1. Persons (officers or employees of private consulting firms) having a position of influence, financial interest or other interest in any other private business that provides goods or services for projects where that interest may be in direct conflict with the best interest of the project.

2. Persons associated with officers or employees of private consulting firms as described in subparagraph (1) above that may have a position of influence, financial or other interest in any other private business that provides goods or services. Such persons may be relatives, partners or those having a position of influence, financial or other interest in the private engineering firm. Employees and their immediate family members of GDOT or impacted local government who are in a position of influence for a project may not have any such a relationship with a participating firm.

3. Real Estate Conflicts relating to TIA projects that fall under the umbrella of the particular contract under procurement.

4. Impartiality of the Program Manager in administering the work. The Program Manager (Lead firm) shall have no position of influence, or financial or other interest in any consulting firm employed by the State or local government for the implementation or execution of any phase of any TIA project(s) on the Approved Investment List(s) within a special district.

5. Impartiality of any other team member (sub-consultant). The program management team shall maintain the highest level of transparency and accountability; therefore, at GDOT’s discretion, sub consultants may be excluded from participation on any team for future TIA projects on the Approved Investment List(s) within a special district during the life of this contract. Such exclusions may be warranted in the event the presence of the contracted team member might provide an unfair advantage to a proposing team or teams for an advertised TIA project on the Approved Investment List(s) within a special district contract or present other conflicts.

6. Procurement activities. The Program Manager and their sub-consultants will not be allowed to be voting members of any qualifications-based evaluations and selection of project delivery activities for the TIA projects on the Approved Investment List(s) within a special district, other than to provide impartial assistance and facilitation of the procurement process.

EXHIBIT V
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. Particular attention should be paid to the date that consultant’s prequalification certificate expires.

Firm Name	Prequalification Expiration Date	1.06(a)	1.06(b)	1.06(c)	1.06(e)	1.06(f)	1.06(g)	1.10	3.01	3.06	3.07	3.12	4.01	4.04	5.01	5.02	5.03	5.04	5.05	5.06	5.08	6.01(a)	6.02	6.05	9.01							
Enter Prime Here																																

EXHIBIT VI

Work Previously Awarded by GDOT to Prime for Previous 18 months prior to month of RFQ Due Date

RFQ #: RFQ-484-040714TIA **RFQ Due Date:** 04/07/2014

INSTRUCTIONS: List all contracts, including task orders, awarded within the last 18 months. Fill in the execution dates and columns A through C for each contract. For IDIQ Contracts (task orders), list the contract once and provide the total amount awarded via all task orders. Insert rows as necessary in order to list all contracts awarded to Firm for last 18 months.

Prime Consultant:	

GDOT Contract #	Execution Date	Contract Award Amount (A)	Amount of Contract Performed by Sub-Consultants (B)	Net Prime Award Amount (C = A - B)

ATTACHMENT 1

Submittal Formats for GDOT Engineering Projects

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

ADDENDUM NO. 1

ISSUE DATE: March 24, 2014

RFQ 484-040714TIA: Engineering Design Services for TIA Projects

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 _____

This Addendum, including all questions and answers, shall become and form a part of the original RFQ package and shall be taken into account when preparing your proposal.

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

I. Questions and Answers:

	Questions	Answers
1	The budgeted amounts shown for PE do not seem to accurately reflect the amount of work needed to complete the anticipated scope of work for some of the contracts, based on the project information provided in the electronic TIA folder. Can you please provide clarification on the actual scope of work required for each contract and/or what work has already been completed to date on the projects, if any?	The scope for each project is to meet the stated benefits indicated in the final investment report within the overall budget set for the project. It is GDOT's obligation to design and build these projects under these parameters. Further GDOT expects firms to demonstrate, as part of their qualifications, their ability to accomplish a design within the total project budget.
2	Previous TIA projects have capped the consultant firms overhead rate at 150%. Will the overhead rate be capped at 150% for these five projects	Yes. Overhead for both Prime and Sub-Consultants will be capped at 150%.
3	Would you please provide Exhibit VI/Page 30 of RFQ in Excel format. It is not posted with advertisement.	EXHIBIT VI in Excel format has been posted to the Georgia Procurement Registry.
4	During the pre-proposal meeting they mentioned that on project 4 they had preliminary bridge plans, are they going to make those and any environmental documents available to the consultant? Any previous information on either project would be beneficial to us.	All available information, including a preliminary layout for the bridge, has been provided on the GDOT Public Download site as indicated in the RFQ.
5	On page 6 of the RFQ, VI. Instructions for Content ..., first sentence: when you say "must be organized, categorized using the same headings (in red,)" do you mean we have to go by the red headings in the RFP, OR do you mean that when we include these headings in our submittal they have to be in red – just like in the RFQ?	You should organize as indicated by the red headings. You do not have to use red headings in the RFQ itself.

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ-484-040714TIA
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Design Services for TIA Projects
CONTRACT #:	Contract 2
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	April 7, 2014
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Exhibit II - Certification	Exhibit III - GSICAA	Signed Addendum If Applicable	Compliant with Page # Limitations	Compliant with Required Format	Meets Required Area Classes	Comments
1	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	4/7/2014	10:30 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	via FedEx
2	CDM Smith	4/3/2014	1:01 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
3	CH2M Hill, Inc.	4/7/2014	10:26 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
4	CHA Consulting, Inc.	4/7/2014	12:46 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
5	Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.	4/7/2014	12:06 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
6	Croy Engineering, LLC	4/7/2014	12:00 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
7	Gresham Smith and Partners	4/7/2014	9:29 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
8	Hatch Mott MacDonald, LLC	4/7/2014	9:08 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
9	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	4/7/2014	11:48 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
10	IDS Global, Inc.	4/7/2014	1:16 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
11	KCI Technologies, Inc.	4/7/2014	12:35 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
12	Keck & Wood, Inc.	4/7/2014	10:30 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	via FedEx
13	Lowe Engineers, LLC	4/7/2014	11:12 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
14	McGee Parners, Inc.	4/7/2014	12:20 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
15	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	4/7/2014	1:09 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
16	Mulkey, Inc.	4/7/2014	10:47 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
17	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	4/7/2014	8:19 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
18	Qk4, Inc,	4/7/2014	9:52 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
19	R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	4/7/2014	11:08 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
20	STV Incorporated	4/7/2014	10:25 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
21	TranSystems Corporation	4/7/2014	11:23 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
22	TY Lin International	4/7/2014	1:49 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X	
23	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	4/7/2014	10:30 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X	via UPS

GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS
RFQ 484-040714TIA
Engineering Design Services for TIA Projects
Contract #2

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

Coordination and Communication

Bobby Adams 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 – (25% or 250 Points)**
- **Work Previously Awarded – (5% or 50 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.

Evaluation Meeting:

All completed Scoring Forms with the preliminary scores and comments for each criteria of each firm, must be submitted to Facilitator by Thursday, April 17, 2014 in order for the Facilitator to prepare for the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Friday, April 18, 2014. The Committee's completed forms must be turned in at the conclusion of the meeting.

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

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

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

Phase II

Evaluation of Technical Approach and Past Performance

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

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

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

Evaluation Meeting:

All notes must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Friday, May 30, 2014. The Selection Committee will discuss and determine a final committee rating for each criteria and will provide summary comments as to why the Committee feels the rating is warranted. The Committee will assign the following ratings:

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

FINAL SCORING AND SELECTION

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

GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

RFQ 484-040714TIA Contract B2-2

Design Services for TIA Projects

PHASE II

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

Coordination and Communication

TIA Procurement 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, verifiable information. IMPORTANT- A RESTRICTION OF COMMUNICATION IS IN EFFECT. Proposing firms are not allowed to discuss this project with selection committee members during evaluation period.

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 for 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 – (25% or 250 Points)**
- **Work Previously Awarded – (5% or 50 Points)**

Phase II

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

Phase II

Evaluation of Technical Approach and Past Performance

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

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

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

Evaluation Meeting:

All notes must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Friday, June 06, 2014. The Selection Committee will discuss and determine a final committee rating for each criteria and will provide summary comments as to why the Committee feels the rating is warranted. The Committee will assign the following ratings:

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

FINAL SCORING AND SELECTION

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

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects
Evaluator # 1	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: American Consulting Professionals, LLC

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

Comments:
19 years exp with PM, several project listed, PE
Roadway - 18 years, PE, relevant exp.
NEPA - 14 years, listed county and FL exp.
Prime listed relative project exp. in FLA

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: adequate

Comments:

Firm Name: CDM Smith

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

Comments:
PM - 20 years, PE,
Roadway Lead - 6 years exp, PE
NEPA - 16 years, PE

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: adequate

Comments:

Firm Name: CH2M Hill, Inc.

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

Comments:
PM - 20 years exp, PE, listed several widening projects
Roadway - 25 years exp, PE, listed eg. FDOT auth.
NEPA - 14 years, listed preparation of several documents
Prime - listed several passing the projects

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: adequate

Comments:
NEPA - has eight projects - look over book

Firm Name: CHA Consulting, Inc.

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

Comments:
PM - 24 years exp PE,
Roadway - 22 years, PE,
NEPA - 24 years

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: adequate

Comments:

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects
Evaluator # 1	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.

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

Comments:
PM - 22 years exp, PE, Listed tunnels, Grade Separation, Bypass.
Roadway - 18 years exp, PE, listed eq. project exp.
NEPA - 15 years exp.
Prime S -

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ~~adequate~~ marginal

Comments:
NEPA lead appears over booked 8 active projects.

Firm Name: Croy Engineering, LLC

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

Comments:
PM - 25 years of exp., PE, interchange,
Roadway - 14 years exp, PE
NEPA - 13 years.
Prime S - interchange, overpasses,

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Good

Comments:
~~did not list all projects designated on bypass~~ ~~marginal~~ adequate

Firm Name: Gresham Smith and Partners

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

Comments:
PM - 20 years exp., PE
Roadway - 16 years exp. PE,
NEPA - 11 years -
Prime - has adequate exp.

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: adequate

Comments:

Firm Name: Hatch Mott MacDonald, LLC

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

Comments:
PM - 25 years, PE, relative exp.
Roadway - 25 years exp. PE - Interstate, bridge exp.
NEPA - 28 years exp.
Prime - Not a lot of recent exp.

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: adequate

Comments:

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects
Evaluator # 1	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.

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

Comments:
PM - 21 years exp. PE, bridge, widening
Roadway - 25 years exp. listed similar projects
Nepa - 15 years, widen projects
Prime - listed widening, intersection improvements, b

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: adequate

Comments:

Firm Name: IDS Global, Inc.

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

Comments:
PM, PE, not sure of years exp. listed projects from 2004-2008
Roadway - is PM cand.
Nepa - 23 years -
Prime - exp is listed mostly as support and coordination

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Marginal

Comments:

Firm Name: KCI Technologies, Inc.

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

Comments:
PM - 35 years exp. relative exp
Roadway - 8 year exp.
NEPA - listed Dr Zyed and GA-400
Prime - lists similar exp.

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Marginal

Comments:
Nepa cand looks over booked

Firm Name: Keck & Wood, Inc.

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

Comments:
PM - 29 years exp w/ company
Roadway - only 7 years exp., exp. LCI's, operation exp., sidewalks
Nepa - 15 years, lists widening exp, LCI's
Prime - Lists adequate exp. on similar projects

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: adequate marginal

Comments:
Nepa cand has 8 projects

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects	
Evaluator # 1	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: Lowe Engineers, LLC

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

Comments: PM - Listed applicable exp, PE
Roadway - 14 years exp.
NEPA - 18 years exp.,
Prime - 4 11 Contractor, SB 20

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: adequate

Comments:

Firm Name: McGee Parners, Inc.

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

Comments: PM - 26 years exp.
Roadway - 8 years exp.
NEPA - 12 years exp. widening projects
Prime -

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: adequate

Comments:

Firm Name: Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.

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

Comments: PM - 25 years exp. PE, overpass & widening
Roadway, PE, 13 years, bridge, overpass
NEPA - several related project type exp
Prime - listed more than adequate exp.

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: good

Comments:

Firm Name: Mulkey, Inc.

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

Comments: PM - 23 years exp., PE, several widening projects as PM
Roadway 17 years exp - several roadway widening projects
NEPA - 15 years -
Prime - roadway widening

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: good

Comments:

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects	
Evaluator # 1	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

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

Comments:
PM - PE, 27 years, listed multiple passing lane projects
Roadway Lead - 12 years
NEPA 25 years
Prime

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: adequate

Comments:

Firm Name: Qk4, Inc,

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

Comments:
PM - 23 years exp. No recent PM exp. listed, with exception of Eastbound and Westbound
Roadway - 32 years exp., PE, listed Roadway widening.
NEPA - 23 years exp
Prime -

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: adequate

Comments:
P

Firm Name: R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.

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

Comments:
PM - 38 years exp., widening,
Roadway - 18 years exp. widening, op. imp.
NEPA - 14 years, prepared docs for widening projects
Prime - Interstate, arterial widening exp

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: adequate marginal

Comments:
Nepa Lead has 8 projects

Firm Name: STV Incorporated

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

Comments:
PM - 23 years, no project related exp.
Roadway - 20 years exp.
Nepa - 15 years
Prime - Listed several widening, Interchange,

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: adequate marginal

Comments:
Nepa Lead has 8 active projects

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects
Evaluator # 1	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: TranSystems Corporation

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

Comments: PM - 19 years exp. Roadway - 30 years

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%	Assigned Rating	~~adequate~~ marginal

Comments: NEPA Lead has 8 projects

Firm Name: TY Lin International

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

Comments: PM - 30 years exp. Roadway - 14 years NEPA - 15 years Prime

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%	Assigned Rating	adequate

Comments:

Firm Name: Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.

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

Comments: PM - 27 years Roadway - 16 years exp. Prime - passing lanes

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%	Assigned Rating	adequate marginal

Comments: NEPA Lead - 8 projects listed

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects	GDOT
Evaluator # 2	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: American Consulting Professionals, LLC

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

Comments:
~~- NO EXPERIENCE LISTED FOR GDOT SPECIFIC~~
NO DISCUSSION OF TIA MANUAL IN MANUALS/guidance FOR PM OR KEY MEMBERS
PREVIOUS WORK IS RELEVANT

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM HAS TIME AVAILABLE
- KEY TEAM LEADERS SERVING MULTIPLE ROLES

Firm Name: CDM Smith

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

Comments:
- DESIGN ENGINEER ONLY 7 YEARS EXP - PM W/ PHD, PE + MBA
- NO DISCUSSION OF TIA MANUEL
- PREVIOUS WORK IS RELEVANT

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM IS AVAILABLE
- KEY TEAM MEMBERS HAVE SEVERAL commitments
-

Firm Name: CH2M Hill, Inc.

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

Comments:
- PM IS FAMILIAR W/ TIA MANUAL
- PREVIOUS WORK IS RELEVANT

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM HAS 5 PROJECTS AS PM
- ENV HAS SEVERAL ONGOING PROJECTS

Firm Name: CHA Consulting, Inc.

GOOD

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

Comments:
- NO DISCUSSION OF FAMILIARITY W/ TIA MANUAL FOR PM OR KEY MEMBERS
- TIA MANUAL DISCUSSED IN EXP + QUAL SECTION → DISCUSSION OF TIA SCOPE + BUDGET FOR DESIGN

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM LISTED ON 7 PROJECTS
- CO-LOCATED W/ ENV TEAM

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects	
Evaluator # 2	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.

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

Comments:
- DISCUSSION OF TIA MANUAL FOR DESIGN PROCESS
- GOOD DISCUSSION OF THE ACTUAL PROJECT NEEDS

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM HAS AVAILABILITY
- ENV LEAD HAS SEVERAL PROJECTS

Firm Name: Croy Engineering, LLC

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

Comments:
- NO DISCUSSION OF TIA MANUAL

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: GOOD

Comments:
- PM IS AVAILABLE
- TEAM LEADERS AVAILABLE
- SMALL BUSINESS/DBE USAGE

Firm Name: Gresham Smith and Partners

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

Comments:
- PM FAMILIAR WITH TIA PROCESS
- ROADWAY DESIGN ENGINEER FAMILIAR W/ TIA + THE PROJECT AREA

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM IS AVAILABLE
- KEY TEAM LEADERS AVAIL

Firm Name: Hatch Mott MacDonald, LLC

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

Comments:
- NO DISCUSSION OF UNDERSTANDING OF TIA MANUAL FOR PM OR KEY TEAM LEADERS

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM IS AVAILABLE
- WBE FIRM ON TEAM

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects	
Evaluator # 2	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.

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

Comments:
- GOOD DISCUSSION OF TIA REQUIREMENTS

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM IS AVAILABLE
- KEY TEAM LEADERS ARE AVAILABLE

Firm Name: IDS Global, Inc.

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

Comments:
- PM EXPERIENCE IS UTILITY COORDINATION ON TWO PROJECTS LISTED AND QA/QC ON ANOTHER
- PM IS SAME AS ROADWAY DESIGN TEAM LEADER / NO DISCUSSION OF TIA

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: MARGINAL

Comments:
- PM HAS 4 PROJECTS LISTED UNDER 50% COMPLETE
- VERY LIMITED INFO ON RESOURCES

Firm Name: KCI Technologies, Inc.

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

Comments:
- NO DISCUSSION OF TIA

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM IS AVAILABLE
- ENV LEAD IS LISTED ON MULTIPLE PROJECTS

Firm Name: Keck & Wood, Inc.

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

Comments:
- ONLY 7 YRS EXP FOR LEAD DESIGNER
- SOME DISCUSSION OF THE TIA PROGRAM

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM IS AVAILABLE
- KEY TEAM LEADERS HAVE LOTS OF EXISTING WORK

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects
Evaluator # 2	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: Lowe Engineers, LLC

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

Comments:
- PM UNDERSTANDING OF TIA + ALSO KEY TEAM LEADERS

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM APPEARS TO BE AVAILABLE
- TEAM LEADERS AVAILABLE

Firm Name: McGee Parners, Inc.

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

Comments:
- NO DISCUSSION OF TIA
- LEAD DESIGN ONLY 8 YEARS EXP

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- ROAD WAY TEAM LEADERS + PM AVAILABLE
- ENV LEADER HAS 5 PROJECTS LISTED

Firm Name: Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.

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

Comments:
- STATES THE SCOPE OF WORK "IS TO WIDEN FROM EXISTING 2 LANES TO 4 LANES" — NO
- NO DISCUSSION OF TIA

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM + TEAM LEADERS AVAILABLE
- RESOURCES ADEQUATE

Firm Name: Mulkey, Inc.

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

Comments:
- GOOD DISCUSSION OF TIA
- SIMILIAR PRIME EXPERIENCE

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM AVAILABLE
- KEY TEAM LEADERS AVAILABLE

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects
Evaluator # 2	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

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

Comments
- DISCUSSION OF TIA IS GOOD

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%	Assigned Rating	ADEQUATE

Comments
- PM + KEY TEAM LEADS AVAILABLE
- ADEQUATE RESOURCES

Firm Name: Qk4, Inc,

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

Comments
- NO DISCUSSION OF TIA PROCEDURES/MANUAL ETC..

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%	Assigned Rating	ADEQUATE

Comments
- PM AVAILABLE
- KEY RESOURCES AVAILABLE

Firm Name: R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.

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

Comments
- NO DISCUSSION OF TIA

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%	Assigned Rating	ADEQUATE

Comments
- PM LISTED ON 4 PROJECTS
- ENV LEAD LISTED ON 7 PROJECTS

Firm Name: STV Incorporated

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

Comments
- PM EXPERIENCE IS WITH MAINTENANCE & PAVEMENT

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%	Assigned Rating	ADEQUATE

Comments
- KEY TEAM LEADERS HAVE SEVERAL PROJECTS EACH
- PM IS AVAILABLE
- USE OF DBE'S

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects
Evaluator # 2	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: TranSystems Corporation

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

Comments:
- DESIGN LEAD IS NOT A PE
- PAGE 10 SAYS "Pleased to present qualifications FOR THE BRIDGE Replacement PROJECT" —NO—

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM IS AVAILABLE
- ADEQUATE RESOURCES
- ENV LEAD HAS SEVERAL PROJECTS LISTED

Firm Name: TY Lin International

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

Comments:
- PM MANAGED DESIGN OF CONCEPT REPORT FOR THIS PROJECT
- DISCUSSION OF PM IS GOOD
- FAMILIAR W/ PROJECT + LOCATION/AREA
- IDENTIFIED SPECIAL PROJECT NEEDS - BIKE LAN

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ~~GOOD~~ ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM LISTED ON 6 PROJECTS
- KEY TEAM LEADERS ON SEVERAL PROJECTS
- USE OF DBE'S

Firm Name: Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.

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

Comments:
- PM IS NOT A P.E.
- Lead DESIGNER HAS NO PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE W/ GDOT

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: ADEQUATE

Comments:
- PM IS AVAILABLE
- LOCAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE AREA
- ENV LEADER IS LISTED ON MULTIPLE PROJECTS

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects	GDOT
Evaluator # 3	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: American Consulting Professionals, LLC

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

Comments: Experience includes work to be finished, Discussion included Typos, Experience w/different phases of plan development (Concept, prelim plans, final plans), Refers to "Environmental permitting" which concerns me.

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Adequate

Comments: Experience w/ design of projects in GA with Key leader, but extensive exp. of team in FLA. NEPA lead didn't discuss GEPA experience, or [illegible]

Firm Name: CDM Smith

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

Comments: Exp w/different phases of plan development. Good discussion of Project Manager experience.

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20% — Assigned Rating: Marginal

Comments: Experienced designing projects in GA. Didn't discuss GEPA or [illegible] Submittal contained numerous typos.

Firm Name: CH2M Hill, Inc.

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

Comments: Good discussion of PM experience & design experience. Familiar w/ TIA manual Exp. in different phases of plan development

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Good

Comments: Exp. designing projects in FLA. Exp w/ NEPA & GEPA documents includes QC/QA discussion.
The Key leaders were not involved in 3 of the 5 projects listed.

Firm Name: CHA Consulting, Inc.

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

Comments: List 7 project completed by CHA but do not mention if Team leader is the PM. PM is experienced in (Concept Approval), managing the ROW process & design development. Exp w/protected species

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Good

Comments: Exp designing projects in GA, Exp. w/ NEPA. Discusses GEPA among other areas (i.e. SUE, traffic, ROW). Sub rents space from prime & works closely w/ Prime

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects
Evaluator # 3	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.

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

Comments: Good discussion of PM Experience, Exp using various manuals but doesn't discuss TIA or GEPA.
Refers to Gwinnett County Projects

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Good

Comments: Good discussion of TIAs Exp w/ GEPA & NEPA. Exp. Team

Firm Name: Croy Engineering, LLC

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

Comments: Good Discussion of PM Experience. Also has design exp. in GA.
Doesn't mention TIA or GEPA.

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Adequate ?

Comments: Experienced designing projects in GA Exp w/ NEPA
Doesn't mention TIA or GEPA
Contracts Prequal Expired 3/31/14

Firm Name: Gresham Smith and Partners

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

Comments: Exp. PM w/design experience. Completed Federally funded as well as locally funded projects
Completed PM training

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Adequate

Comments: Exp. Designing a TIA project, Familiar w/ TIA but don't mention GEPA
Included Costing aspect to insure project delivered w/in budget
Key leader has NEPA & Eco experience, Doesn't mention GEPA

Firm Name: Hatch Mott MacDonald, LLC

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

Comments: Certified PM. Discussion says that he supervised the completion of work. Does this mean he was the PM? PM has design experience.

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Good ?

Comments: Exp. designing projects in GA. Exp. w/ complex NEPA documents as well as "GEPA Reports"
Hmm prequal expired 3/31/14

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects
Evaluator # 3	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.

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

Comments: Good discussion of PM Experience & design experience. Exp working on prelim. design of a TIA project

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Good

Comments: Exp. designing complex projects in GA, Worked w/ subs in past. Exp in NEPA. Currently working on 2 TIA projects. Discussed Budget requirements & QC/QA

Firm Name: IDS Global, Inc.

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

Comments: Experience w/ different phases of plan Development. No mention of TIA or GEPA

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Marginal

Comments: NEPA LEAD has experience w/ complex NEPA documents
Doesn't Discuss TIA or GEPA
No discussion of other staff or team members

Firm Name: KCI Technologies, Inc.

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

Comments: Exp. in program management, Exp in design & NEPA, Familiar w/ GDOT & Processes
Doesn't, Mention TIA or GEPA

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Adequate

Comments: Design. exp in GA, NEPA exp.
ISO 9001:2008 certified - QAQC
Doesn't mention TIA or GEPA

Firm Name: Keck & Wood, Inc.

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

Comments: Extensive experience as PM, served as Eng of Record on projects. Didn't mention TIA or GEPA

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Good

Comments: Exp. designing minor projects, Prepared variety of NEPA documents. Experienced working on confined budgets, References the TIA Manual.

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects
Evaluator # 3	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: Lowe Engineers, LLC

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

Comments: Currently working on a TIA project. Trained as a PM. Exp. working on complex projects

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: good

Comments: Exp. designing complex plans. Completed complex NEPA documents. Key leaders have experience working on a TIA project. Discusses QCQA. Exp. working on locally funded projects. Drew or Heather as NEPA/GEPA Lead

Firm Name: McGee Parners, Inc.

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

Comments: Extensive Design & PM experience on GDOT Projects, Familiar w GDOT & processes
Discusses VE/Cost Control & QCQA processes

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Good

Comments: Team mates have extensive exp. working together, Exp w/ GEPA Doc. Exp w/ locally funded projects.

Firm Name: Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.

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

Comments: Experience managing complex state funded projects, Exp. Designing projects & Reviewing projects for Field Plan Reviews

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Good

Comments: Team has exper ience working together, NEPA lead has exp working on complex project. Exp designing projects in GA. No mention of TIA

Firm Name: Mulkey, Inc.

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

Comments: Good discussion of PM exp. Design exp in GA, Exp. w/ diff phases of project development.

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Good

Comments: Exp. working in GA. NEPA lead has good exp leading team
Familiar w/ TIA Manual, Exp working on TIA Project

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects
Evaluator # 3	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

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

Comments: PM has exp working with TIA program, Exp designing projects w/ GDOT. Exp managing multiple projects w/ GDOT

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Excellent

Comments: exp designing projects in GA. NEPA lead has experience w/ very complex projects. Discusses GEPA requirements, QCQA

Firm Name: CH4, Inc.

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

Comments: Experience managing & designing projects in GA. Doesnt Discuss TIA or GEPA requirements

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Good

Comments: Design exp. on GDOT Projects. NEPA lead has exp. w/ complex NEPA Documents & Experience working on Locally funded projects. Dont mention GEPA

Firm Name: R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.

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

Comments: Extensive design experience in GA. Exp managing projects for GDOT sub to TIA program Management prime but doesn't discuss exp.

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Adequate

Comments: Exp. designing projects for GDOT. Discussed locally funded project Didn't Discuss TIA or GEPA

Firm Name: STV Incorporated

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

Comments: PM has Construction & Maintenance exp in GA. Familiar w/ GDOT

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25% — Assigned Rating: Adequate

Comments: NEPA lead has extensive NEPA EXP, well rounded team. Has Project Managers Manual to follow. Design exp in GA. Good discussion of TIA but not GEPA

Contract 2	RFQ-484-040714TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects
Evaluator # 3	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings

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

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

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

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

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

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

Firm Name: TransSystems Corporation

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating: Good
Comments: Exp. managing projects for GDOT, Familiar w/ TIA Manual Exp. w/ splosts	

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%	Assigned Rating: Good
Comments: Design exp in GA. Designer familiar w/ TIA manual, NEPA Lead has exp. experience but doesn't mention GEPA.	

Firm Name: TY Lin International

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating: Good
Comments: PM has exp. managing projects for GDOT & locals, completed various tasks on other contracts.	

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%	Assigned Rating: Good
Comments: NEPA lead has ext exp. w/ complex NEPA documents, Discusses TIA & GEPA	

Firm Name: Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating: Good
Comments: PM has extensive exp. managing GDOT & Local projects, Familiar w/ project area	

Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%	Assigned Rating: Good
Comments: Design exp in other state DOTs, Understand ENV issues w/in ATE	

PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	RFQ-484-040714TIA

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm:	CH2M Hill, Inc.	Contract 2	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating:	Good
Comments	PM good experience. Appropriate projects. Familiar with TIA contract process and needs.		
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
Comments	Env has several ongoing projects.		

Firm:	CHA Consulting, Inc.	Contract 2	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating:	Good
Comments	Good experience with relevant projects. PM 27 yrs experience.		
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
Comments	PM on seven projects currently.		

Firm:	Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.	Contract 2	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating:	Good
Comments	Good PM experience. Relevant projects.		
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
Comments	Env has several ongoing projects. Roadway has good availability.		

Firm:	Gresham Smith and Partners	Contract 2	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating:	Good
Comments	20 yrs PM experience. Relevant projects for PM and Rdwy lead.		
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
Comments	Work loads appear to allow for adequate availability.		

Firm:	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Contract 2	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating:	Good
Comments	21 yrs PM exp. Rdwy 25 yrs exp. Listed several passing lane projects. Included locally funded projects.		
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
Comments	Env lead has numerous projects.		

PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	RFQ-484-040714TIA

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points

Firm:	Lowe Engineers, LLC	Contract 2	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating:	Good
Comments	Good widening project experience. Training as PM.		
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
Comments	Env lead has numerous projects.		

Firm:	Mulkey, Inc.	Contract 2	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
Comments	Prime has similar projects experience. Experience with TIA project.		
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating:	Good
Comments	PM and key team ldrs have good availability.		

Firm:	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Contract 2	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
Comments	PM has passing lane experience. Designer widening experience.		
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
Comments	Environmental not reflecting all work based on info provided in other submissions - inconsistent.		

Firm:	TY Lin International	Contract 2	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating:	Good
Comments	PM has actually worked on this project. Good experience.		
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
Comments	PM on six projects. Rdwy on 7 projects. Env on 8 projects.		

Firm:	0	Contract 2	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating:	
Comments			
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating:	
Comments			

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF TOP SUBMITTALS FOR PHASE I							
RFQ-484-040714TIA	*Design Services for TIA Projects*						*Contract 2*
Evaluation Criteria	**Experience and Qualifications**	**Resources availablility and Workload Capacity**	**Work Previously Awarded**				
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***250***	***50***	**Phase One Scores and Group Ranking**		**SUBMITTING FIRMS FINAL RANKING**	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking		
CH2M Hill, Inc.	Good	Adequate	50	325	1	**1**	CH2M Hill, Inc.
CHA Consulting, Inc.	Good	Adequate	50	325	1	**1**	CHA Consulting, Inc.
Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.	Good	Adequate	50	325	1	**1**	Columbia Engineering and Services, inc.
Gresham Smith and Partners	Good	Adequate	38	313	6	**1**	Lowe Engineers, LLC
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Good	Adequate	38	313	6	**1**	TY Lin International
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Adequate	50	325	1	**6**	Gresham Smith and Partners
Mulkey, Inc.	Adequate	Good	25	313	6	**6**	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	50	275	9	**6**	Mulkey, Inc.
TY Lin International	Good	Adequate	50	325	1	**9**	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
0							
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***250***	***50***	***500***			

Keith Golden, P.E., Commissioner

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

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

May 5, 2014

NOTICE TO SELECTED FINALISTS

To: Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.; CHA Consulting, Inc.; CH2M Hill, Inc.; Lowe Engineers, LLC; TY Lin International, Inc.

Re: RFQ-484-040714TIA
Engineering Design Services for TIA Projects
Contract B2-2

********RECEIPT CONFIRMATION REQUESTED VIA E-MAIL*********
Please send an e-mail confirming receipt of this notice to Bobby Adams (badams@dot.ga.gov).

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 from finalists. The Selection Committee desires to have additional information related to your firm's technical approach to this project and requests that you submit such information as detailed in **IV. Phase II Submittal Requirements**.

NOTE: Please be reminded that as a finalist for an open solicitation you are still under a restriction of communications for this project. 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 submission of questions as instructed in the RFQ or this Notice to Selected Finalists, 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.

I. Schedule of Events

The remaining Schedule of Events for this solicitation is as follows:

1. GDOT completes Phase I evaluation and issues notification to finalist firm(s)	5/5/2014	
2. Deadline for submission of written questions from finalists (e-mail)	5/12/2014	2:00 PM
3. Phase II Submittal due to GDOT	5/23/2014	2:00 PM
4. GDOT completes evaluation of Phase II submittal	6/25/2014	
5. GDOT announces apparent awardee	6/26/2014	

All times are prevailing times for Atlanta, GA.

II. Final Selection

In accordance with the original RFQ, as a finalist, your firm is required to furnish information that may serve to further demonstrate your firm's technical approach and past performance. Due to the unique provisions of the Transportation Investment Act of 2010, the approach to design must consider the scope, schedule and budget constraints for TIA transportation projects and deliver added value to the Department. GDOT desires and will evaluate competing firms not only on their pure technical design ability, but also on the demonstration of their understanding of innovative needs to meet TIA project objectives.

III. Selection Criteria for Phase II

As detailed in the original RFQ, scores from Phase I will be carried forward and combined with the scores from the Phase II to determine the final ranking of Finalists. The total weighting for the scoring will be as follows:

Experience and Qualifications (Phase I)	20%
Resources and Work Load Capacity (Phase I)	25%
Volume of Work Previously Awarded by GDOT (Phase I)	5%
Technical Approach (Phase II)	40%
Past Performance (Phase II)	10%

The following criteria for scoring Phase II of the evaluation will be utilized to determine which firms are selected:

A. Technical Approach – 40%

The firm's technical approach to delivering this specific project, including, but not limited to, the use of alternative methods and methods that deliver added value to the program.

The firm's apparent suitability for this particular project, including, but not limited to, any special or unique qualifications for the project, proposed quality control/quality assurance procedures, special or enhanced capabilities, the ability of the firm to gather resources in the project area, the apparent fit, and knowledge of the project, and any other service or relevant scope item offered by the firm which might be suitable for the project.

B. Past Performance – 10%

The Selection Committee may consider information provided via references provided for relevant projects submitted in Phase I, knowledge any selection committee member has of performance on relevant projects, and performance evaluations 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.

IV. Phase II Submittal Requirements

In order for GDOT to ensure compliance with required information and page limitations, Respondents must organize their submittal using the same headings that are numbered and lettered exactly as outlined below, must be responsive to all requested information, and must be submitted in accordance with the instructions provided in **V. Instructions for Phase II Submittal**. 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.

Cover Page:

Provide one cover page. No letter is required or desired. The cover page should list the RFQ number, project description, and should display it as a response to Phase II, as well as have the proposing firm's full legal name.

This requirement is limited to one page.

A. Technical Approach:

Provide your firm's technical approach for delivering this particular project. Include any unique challenges of the project and how your firm intends to mitigate these challenges. The Selection Committee is particularly interested in hearing any information regarding what you may be envisioning to better deliver this project within the parameters of the TIA program.

Furnish information that may serve to differentiate your firm from other firms and provide evidence of your firm's fit to the project and/or needs of GDOT, including specific qualifications, skills, and knowledge of the project area which may uniquely benefit the firm and project. Demonstrate Prime Consultant's understanding of the TIA program. Discuss compliance with GDOT's TIA conflict of interest policy (See Exhibit IV in the original RFQ.)

This requirement is limited to three pages.

B. Past Performance:

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

V. Instructions for Phase II Submittal

Submittals must follow the format and meet the content requirements identified above. Respondents must submit one original and five identical copies as well as a PDF version on CD which allows GDOT to maintain the files electronically. The original should be clearly identified as such on the cover page. The original and each copy should be stapled separately. The original and copies should be bound together using a binder clip or by 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. The file name of the document on the CD should be the Consultant Name, RFQ number, Contract Number, Phase II (Consultant Name RFQ-484-040714TIA B2-1 Phase II).

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. Double sided pages are encouraged in order to reduce the size of the submittals, but are not required. 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 response 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 484-040714TIA and the words "PHASE II RESPONSE" must be clearly indicated on the outside of the envelope or box. Responses must be physically received by GDOT at the exact address below prior to the deadline indicated in the **I. Schedule of Events**:

Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT)
Attention: Bobby Adams
TIA 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.

VI. Questions and Requests for Clarification

The designated contact for the remainder of the selection process is Bobby Adams. Please address any questions you may have, in writing, via e-mail, to the contact info listed below. Questions about any aspect of the Phase II Response for Finalists shall be submitted in writing via e-mail. The deadlines for submission of questions relating to the Phase II Response is as indicated in **I. Schedule of Events**.

Once again, congratulations to each of you!

Bobby Adams
badams@dot.ga.gov

ATTACHMENT 1

Submittal Format for Engineering Design Services for TIA Projects – Phase II

		# of Pages Allowed
	Cover Page	1
A.	Technical Approach	3
B.	Past Performance	None Required

Total pages submitted shall not exceed 4 pages.

Keith Golden, P.E., Commissioner

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

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

May 14, 2014

Answers to Questions Regarding Phase II Submittals Submitted by SELECTED FINALISTS in regard to RFQ-484-040714TIA Engineering Design Services for TIA Projects Contracts

********RECEIPT CONFIRMATION REQUESTED VIA E-MAIL*********
Please send an e-mail confirming receipt of this notice to Bobby Adams (badams@dot.ga.gov).

QUESTION:
In Section VII. Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response – Phase II Response (page 9) of the original RFQ, it states in the last sentence of Section VII.A Technical Approach that the proposer should 'Provide a description of Prime Consultant's non-discrimination and equal employment opportunities policies and explain plans for Utilization of Small Businesses, DBE and Veteran Owned Businesses'. However, this sentence is missing from the Phase II submittal instructions in the Notice to Selected Finalists letter, Section IV.A Phase II Submittal Requirements – Technical Approach.

Would you please clarify whether or not we should include a narrative about Small Businesses, DBE and Veteran Owned Businesses in our Phase II response?

ANSWER:
Please include a description of how the Prime Firm's policies of non-discrimination, equal employment opportunities, W/MBE-DBE, small businesses and veteran owned business relate to the GDOT Board Resolution. The Board Resolution may be viewed at:

http://www.ga-tia.com/Images/FactSheets/TransportationReferendum.pdf

PHASE II SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ-484-040714TIA
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Design Services for TIA Projects
CONTRACT #:	Contract 2
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	May 23, 2014
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00 PM

Consultants	Date	Time	Compliant with Page # Limitations
CH2M Hill, Inc.	5/22/2014	1:53 PM	X
CHA Consulting, Inc.	5/22/2014	10:20 AM	X
Columbia Engineering and Services, inc.	5/23/2014	12:42 PM	X
Lowe Engineers, LLC	5/23/2014	11:10 AM	X
TY Lin International	5/23/2014	1:45 PM	X

PHASE II SUMMARY COMMENTS		RFQ-484-040714TIA	
Firm:	CH2M Hill, Inc.	Contract 2	
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
Understanding of what's there. Identified 2 potential locations, but approved concept showed 3. No discussion for potential savings or innovations.			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating:	Excellent
Based on provided references.			
Firm:	CHA Consulting, Inc.	Contract 2	
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating:	Marginal
No QA/QC discussion. Talked more about other projects than this project. No specifics on their technical approach. Talked more about staff than project.			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating:	Good
Based on provided references.			
Firm:	Columbia Engineering and Services, inc.	Contract 2	
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
Discussed accidents on corridor and potential causes. Discussed alternative methods and how to save cost. Some concern that they were looking at improving corridor beyond actual scope of project.			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating:	Excellent
Based on provided references.			

PHASE II SUMMARY COMMENTS		RFQ-484-040714TIA	
Firm:	Lowe Engineers, LLC	Contract 2	
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
Decent discussion of project, but seemed to focus on improving corridor. Did discuss being flexible in design and reducing scope to budget. Communication with local government.			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating:	Good
Based on provided references.			
Firm:	TY Lin International	Contract 2	
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating:	Good
Knowledge of corridor and survey approach was good for this type project. Discussed geotech issues and possible need to adjust project limits to avoid. Look at all alternatives to economize project. Mentioned approved concept report.			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating:	Good
Based on provided references.			
Firm:	0	Contract 2	
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating:	
Past Performance		Assigned Rating:	

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF SUBMITTALS

RFQ-484-040714TIA	*Design Services for TIA Projects*						
Contract 2	*Final Committee Scoring*						
Evaluation Criteria:	**Experience and Qualifications**	**Resources availablility and Workload Capacity**	**Work Previously Awarded**	**Technical Approach - Suitablility**	**Past Performance**		
SUBMITTING FIRMS	**PHASE I**			**PHASE II**		**Total Score**	**Ranking**
CH2M Hill, Inc.	Good	Adequate	50.0	Adequate	Excellent	625.0	2
CHA Consulting, Inc.	Good	Adequate	50.0	Marginal	Good	500.0	5
Columbia Engineering and Services, inc.	Good	Adequate	50.0	Adequate	Excellent	625.0	2
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Adequate	50.0	Adequate	Good	600.0	4
TY Lin International	Good	Adequate	50.0	Good	Good	700.0	1
Maximum Points allowed =	***200***	***250***	***50.0***	***400***	***100***	***1000.0***	

Reference Check
RFQ-484-040714TIA - Contract B2-2
TIA Design Services

Questions to be answered on a 1-10 scale with 10 indicating the best.	Project	Columbia	CHA	CH2M Hill	Lowe Engineers	TY Lin
Rate the firm's quality of leadership in PM for your project.	a	9	8	9	8	6
	b	9	8	10	8	10
Section Average:		9	8	9.5	8	8
Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.	a	9	9	10	9	9
	b	10	8	10	9	10
Section Average:		9.5	8.5	10	9	9.5
Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.	a	9	9	9	9	8
	b	9	9	10	10	10
Section Average:		9	9	9.5	9.5	9
Rate the Firm's technical assistance in project management.	a	9	8	10	9	8
	b	9	9	9	8	10
Section Average:		9	8.5	9.5	8.5	9
Rate the overall success of the project thus far.	a	9	9	9	8	7
	b	10	9	10	9	10
Section Average:		9.5	9	9.5	8.5	8.5
Overall Average:		9.2	8.6	9.6	8.7	8.8

Reference Check
RFQ-484-040714TIA - Contract B2-2
TIA Design Services

Firm: Columbia
Project a: Gwinnett Co, Bennett Rd Widening and Improvements
Contact: David Tucker, Gwinnett Co. Dir. of Preconstruction 770-822-7484
Comments: Columbia has been with us for a long time and we are very happy with them.

Project b: GDOT, PI 431830, SR 135 Bypass from US 441 to SR 32, Douglas Co
Contact: Jeremy Busby, GDOT 404-631-1154
Comments:

Firm: CHA
Project a: GDOT SR 34 Newnan Bypass, Coweta
Contact: Adams Smith 706-646-6113
Comments:

Project b: Greentop Rd Bridge Replacement over CSX RR
Contact: Lyn Clements 404-631-1849
Comments: Firm easy to work with. Didn't complain when there had to be some redesign due to utility issues.

Firm: CH2M Hill
Project a: GDOT SR 53 Widening and Reconstruction, Pickens
Contact: Steve Adewale, 404-631-1578
Comments:

Project b: FDOT District 2, I-295 Express Lanes
Contact: Eric Shimer 904-360-5331
Comments: Did a really good job. Very responsive and technically savy. Would definitely recommend them, not something I would do for some other consultants

Firm: Lowe Engineers
Project a: GDOT US 411 Connector, Bartow
Contact: Albert Shelby, 404-631-1522
Comments:

Project b: Gwinnett Co., SR 20 Widening
Contact: Lewis Cooksey, 770-822-7428
Comments:

Firm: TY Lin
Project a: City of Macon Little Richard Penniman Connector
Contact: Clay Murphey 478-447-3263
Comments: At times hard to get them to listen - wanted to provide a showcase project when there was no budget for it. Just needed a simple, duplicatable design for a finite budget. They were receptive to input on the need for reigning in.

Project b: Evermore CID, Lilburn Old US 78 Extension
Contact: Jim Brooks, 770-979-5800
Comments: Most impressed with this firm due to coming in on the original budget proposed. Leadership at firm was very involved and hands on.

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : t.y.* lin*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY	T. Y. LIN INTERNATIONAL		Status:Active
DUNS: 115931552	+4:	CAGE Code: 3FNW9	DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: Apr 22, 2015	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Delinquent Federal Debt?: No	
Address: 2 HARRISON ST STE 500 City: SAN FRANCISCO ZIP Code: 94105-1672		State/Province: CALIFORNIA 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
T. Y. Lin International 260 Peachtree Street, Suite 900 Atlanta, GA 30303	5/9/13	2/28/15

SIGNATURE

1. Transporation Planning

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

2. Mass Transit Operations

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

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

4. Highway Structures

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

5. Topography

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

6. Soils, Foundation & Materials Testing

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

8. Construction

	8.01	Construction Supervision

9. Erosion and Sedimentation Control

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