

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

December 18, 2014

RFQ #: RFQ-484-101414TIA
RFQ Title: TIA Design Services
Contract No.: B3-2
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 Summary Comments for Top Respondents – Phase I
- Selection Committee Scoring and Overall Ranking 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. American Consulting Professionals, LLC
2. Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC
3. TranSystems Corporation
4. Qk4, Inc.
5. Pond & Company

The Selection Committee recommends the selection of the top ranked firm, **American Consulting Professionals, LLC.**

Concurrence with Award:

Certification Procurement Requirements Met:



Mike Dover, TIA Administrator



Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator

RTA:ba

Attachments



Georgia Department of Transportation

Request for Qualifications

To Provide

Engineering Design Services for TIA Projects

RFQ-484-101414TIA

Qualifications Due: October 14, 2014

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

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

484-101414TIA

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	0012575	Widen SR 56 fm US 25 Bypass to Cates Mead Rd
1	Burke	0012576	Widen SR 56 fm Cates Mead Rd to Sr 80
2	Burke	0011372	Westside Truck Route - Waynesboro
3	Muscogee	0012577	Buena Vista Road Interchange
4	Macon	0011431	SR 224 Passing Lanes
5	Sumter	0011439	District Line Rd Improvements

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. Selection Method

A. Method of Communication

All general communication of relevant information regarding this solicitation will be made via the Georgia Procurement Registry (GPR) under RFQ-484-101414TIA. 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 -484-101414TIA	9/12/2014	-----
b. Deadline for submission of written questions and requests for clarification	9/22/2014	2:00 PM
c. Deadline for submission of Statements of Qualifications	10/14/2014	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
- Workload capacity of Key Team Leader(s)
- Resources dedicated to delivering project
- Ability to Meet Project Schedule

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.)

This information is limited to two pages maximum

2. **Key Team Leaders** - Provide experience of Key Team Leaders (defined as those individuals who oversee project areas determined as particularly important to each specific project) (refer to the Project Description in Exhibit I, specifically Section 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.

3. **Prime Experience** - Provide information on the prime's experience and ability in delivering effective services for projects of similar complexity, size, scope, and function for the previous five (5) years. Describe no more than five (5) projects, in order of most relevant to least relevant, which demonstrate the firm's capabilities to provide services for GDOT. For each project, the following information should be provided:
 - a. **Client name, project location and dates** during which services were performed.
 - b. **Description of overall project and services performed** by your firm.
 - c. **Duration of project services provided** by your firm, and overall project budget.
 - d. **Experience utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance** (PDP, Design Policy, Environmental Procedures Manual, etc.)
 - e. **Client(s) current contact information** including contact names and telephone numbers.
 - f. **Involvement of Key Team Leaders** on the projects.

This information is limited to two pages maximum.

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

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

C. Resources/Workload Capacity

1. **Overall Resources** - Provide information regarding the overall resources dedicated to delivering the specific project, including:
 - a. **Organizational chart** which identifies the project manager, prime, Key Team Leaders, support personnel, and reporting structure.
 - b. **Primary Office** - Identify and discuss the primary office which will be responsible for handling the specific project and the number and types of staff within the office and how this office could benefit the project and promote efficiency.
 - c. **Narrative on Additional Resource Areas and Ability** – Respondents are also allowed one page to provide information regarding additional resource areas identified as important to the project, to discuss how the key areas will integrate and work together on the project, to discuss any information which is pertinent to these areas, to provide a narrative regarding how the organization of the team, including the PM and Key Team Leaders can deliver the project on schedule given their workload capacity. (GDOT recognizes that some individuals may be able to meet the schedule while carrying heavier project loads.) Respondents may discuss the advantages of your team and the abilities of the team members which will enable the project to meet the proposed schedule as identified in **Exhibit I** (where applicable). If there is no proposed schedule, discuss the advantages of the team and the abilities of the team members which will enable the project to move as expeditiously as possible. **Respondents submitting more than the one additional page allowed, will be subject to disqualification.**
2. **Project Manager Commitment Table** - Provide a list of ALL projects (GDOT, other governments and private contracts – Information may be validated and any firm determined not to be listing all projects may be subject

to disqualification) on which the proposed project manager is currently committed, to enable the Department to ascertain the project manager’s availability. Utilize a table similar to the following format with a minimum of all criteria indicated to provide the requested information:

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

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

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

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

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 484-101414TIA 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) submittals required. Submittal #1 must follow the format and meet the content requirements identified in **Section VII, entitled Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response – Phase II Response**. Respondents must submit one original and five identical copies for the project for which they have been identified as a Finalist. Submittal #2 is an electronic version of Submittal #1 which allows for GDOT to maintain the files electronically. The original and each copy of each Submittal #1 should be stapled separately. For each project/contract response, the original and each copy of Submittal #1 should be bound together using a binder clip or other similar fashion which allows the individual copies to be separated and distributed easily to Selection Committee Members. In the event that the firm has been identified as a Finalist on more than one project/contract, and the due date and time for the Phase II response is the same and a firm is responding to multiple projects/contracts, each separately bound project/contract may be submitted in a single package (boxed, enveloped, or other.)
- B. Submittals must be typed on standard (8½” x 11”) paper. The pages should be numbered, however, submittal pages will be counted by section to determine compliance with page limits. Responses are limited to the page counts indicated in each section and should be double-sided using a minimum of size 11 font. Page counts will be determined by pages with print on them, not by the physical piece of paper. For example, a piece of paper which has print on both sides, shall be considered two pages while a piece of paper with print on only one side would be considered a single page. Each Statement of Qualifications shall be prepared simply and economically as indicated above. Fancy bindings, colored displays, and promotional materials are not desired. Emphasis must be on completeness, relevance, and clarity of content.

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

- C. Submittals must be sealed in an opaque envelope or box, and reference **RFQ 484-101414TIA 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 B3-1

1. Project Information

Project No.: 0012575	PI No.: 0012575	TIA Project No.: RC07-000002
County: Burke	Description: Widen SR 56 from US 25 Bypass to Cates Mead Road	
Project No.: 0012576	PI No.: 0012576	TIA Project No.: RC07-000003
County: Burke	Description: Widen SR 56 from Cates Mead Road to SR 80	

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 SR 56 from US 25 Bypass to Cates Mead Road (PI 0012575) and from Cates Mead Road to SR 80 (P.I. 0012576.)

3. Budget:

The total available budget for P.I. 0012575 is \$12,444,000 and for P.I. 0012576 is \$3,543,795. As part of negotiations, the specific phase breakdowns (PE, R/W, Utility, and Construction) will be agreed upon by GDOT and the selected Consultant. The total of all phases must be less than or equal to the total available budget for each project.

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
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Survey
1.10	Traffic Studies
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01	Minor Bridges Design
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
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
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

5. Related Key Team Leaders:

- A. 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 Transportation Services Procurement/TIA/RFQ-484-101414TIA/Contract B3-1 – PI 0012575, 0012576.

EXHIBIT I-2
CONTRACT B3-2

1. Project Information

Project No.: 0011372
County: Burke

PI No.: 0011372 TIA Project No.: RC07-000009
Description: Westside Truck Route - Waynesboro

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.

The project is to construct a truck route from the west side of Waynesboro that will connect SR 56 with US 25 on the north side of Waynesboro and then on to SR 56 on the north side of Waynesboro.

3. Budget:

The total available budget for P.I. 0011372 is \$4,091,143. As part of negotiations, the specific phase breakdowns (PE, R/W, Utility, and Construction) will be agreed upon by GDOT and the selected Consultant. The total of all phases must be less than or equal to the total available budget.

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
3.12	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 Transportation Services Procurement/TIA/RFQ-484-101414TIA/Contract B3-2 – PI 0011372.

EXHIBIT I-3
CONTRACT B3-3

1. Project Information

Project No.: 0012577 PI No.: 0012577 TIA Project No.: RC08-000052
County: Muscogee Description: Buena Vista Road Interchange

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 is to reconstruct the interchange at I-185 and Buena Vista Road.

3. Budget:

The total available budget for P.I. 0012577 is \$45,048,150. As part of negotiations, the specific phase breakdowns (PE, R/W, Utility, and Construction) will be agreed upon by GDOT and the selected Consultant. The total of all phases must be less than or equal to the total available budget.

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
3.02	Two-lane or Multi-lane Urban Roadway Design
3.05	Multi-lane Urban Interstate Highway 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
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, & Community Value Studies
1.10	Traffic Studies
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01	Minor Bridges Design
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

5. Related Key Team Leaders:

- A. Roadway Design
- B. Bridge Design
- C. Traffic Engineering

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 Transportation Services Procurement/TIA/RFQ-484-101414TIA/Contract B3-3 – PI 0012577.

EXHIBIT I-4
CONTRACT B3-4

1. Project Information

Project No.: 0011431 PI No.: 0011431 TIA Project No.: RC08-000032
County: Macon Description: SR 224 Passing Lanes

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 is to construct passing lanes on SR 224 from SR 26 to the Houston County line.

3. Budget:

The total available budget for P.I. 0011431 is \$6,290,625. As part of negotiations, the specific phase breakdowns (PE, R/W, Utility, and Construction) will be agreed upon by GDOT and the selected Consultant. The total of all phases must be less than or equal to the total available budget.

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
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 Transportation Services Procurement/TIA/RFQ-484-101414TIA/Contract B3-4 – PI 0011431.

EXHIBIT I-5
CONTRACT B3-5

1. Project Information

Project No.: 0011439 PI No.: 0011439 TIA Project No.: RC08-000091
County: Sumter Description: District Line Road Improvements

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 is to make improvements to District Line Road from US 280 to SR 49.

3. Budget:

The total available budget for P.I. 0011439 is \$9,450,000. As part of negotiations, the specific phase breakdowns (PE, R/W, Utility, and Construction) will be agreed upon by GDOT and the selected Consultant. The total of all phases must be less than or equal to the total available budget.

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

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)
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
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 Transportation Services Procurement/TIA/RFQ-484-101414TIA/Contract B3-5 – PI 0011439.

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-484-101414TIA**

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.G.A. § 13-10-91(b).

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

E-Verify/Company Identification Number

Date of Authorization

Signature of Authorized Officer or Agent
(Contractor Name)

Date

Title of Authorized Officer or Agent of Consultant

Printed Name of Authorized Officer or Agent

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN
BEFORE ME ON THIS THE

____ DAY OF _____, 201_

[NOTARY 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 than 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.

Submittal Formats for GDOT Engineering Projects

	->	# of Pages Allowed
Cover Page	->	1
A. Administrative Requirements		
1. Basic Company Information		
a. Company name		
b. Company Headquarter Address		
c. Contact Information		
d. Company Website		
e. Georgia Addresses		
f. Staff		
g. Ownership		
		Excluded
2. Notarized Certification Form (Exhibit II) for Prime	->	1
3. Notarized Georgia Security and Immigration Compliance Act Affidavit (Exhibit III)	->	1
4. Signed Cover Page of any Addenda Issued	->	1 (each addenda)
B. Experience and Qualifications		
1. Project Manager		
a. Education		
b. Registration		
c. Relevant engineering experience		
d. Relevant project management experience		
e. Relevant experience using GDOT specific processes, etc.		
f. Project Manager Commitment Table	->	Excluded
		2
2. Key Team Leader Experience		
a. Education		
b. Registration		
c. Relevant experience in applicable resource area		
d. Relevant experience using GDOT specific processes, etc.		
e. Additional Page for Discussion on key resources	->	1
		1 (each)
3. Prime's Experience		
a. Client name, project location, and dates		
b. Description of overall project and services performed		
c. Duration of project services provided		
d. Experience using GDOT specific processes, etc.		
e. Clients current contact information		
f. Involvement of Key Team Leaders		
		2
4. Area Class Table and Notice of Professional Consultant Qualifications for Prime and Sub-Consultants	->	Excluded
C. Resources/Workload Capacity		
1. Overall Resources		
a. Organization chart	->	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: September 23, 2014

RFQ 484-101414TIA: 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	Relating to the I-185 @ Buena Vista Rd interchange project, it was mentioned at the Industry Forum that no discussions have occurred, to-date, with FHWA regarding their expected role/oversight on this project. Can we assume that the project will require an Interchange Modification Report (IMR) and require the standard review /signatures even with 100% TIA funding?	The final concept will determine whether an IMR will be required and what the level of Federal Highway involvement will be. It is expected that a qualified firm would present this understanding.
2	Our firm has been selected for a GDOT project under a different RFQ but we have not started Man-hour/Fee submission to GDOT Procurement or have a signed contract. We will not know contract value at time of submission of Phase I for RFQ-484-101414TIA on October 14, 2014. How should we complete the Section D form (Exhibit VI)?	Only contracts or task orders that have been executed 18 or less months prior to the RFQ due date should be reported. Since the referenced contract will not be executed, it should not be reported.
3	On page 8 of RFQ under Item C-Resources/Workload Capacity subsection 1C allows for one page. On the Submittal Format page (page 27) item C1c is not listed.	One page is allowed for the Primary Office and Narrative on Ability Discussion. All other required pages from Section VI.C are excluded from the page count. Attachment 1, Page 27 is being replaced as part of this Addendum to clarify.

Page 27 of RFQ-484-101414TIA is deleted and replaced by ATTACHMENT 1 on the following page:

ATTACHMENT 1

Submittal Formats for GDOT Engineering Projects

of Pages Allowed

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

GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

RFQ 484-101414TIA

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 Tuesday, October 28, 2014 in order for the Facilitator to prepare for the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Thursday, October 30, 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 Monday, December 08, 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 484-101414TIA Contract B3-2

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 Monday, December 08, 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.

10/4/14

Contract B3-2		RFQ-484,04074TIA - 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 Professional, LLC					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	GOOD
Comments	PM - 20 yrs exp. PE, AUS, Widening & Bypass shown. EM & PM exp. Design - 18 yrs exp - PE, widening projects shown. ENV - 14 yrs exp - LWG Prime - 4 widening shown.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	ADD/GOOD
Comments	PM - 45 hrs. Design - 80 hrs. ENV - 40 hrs. Prime - 10 add staff hrs/month with given resources.				
Firm Name: CHA Consulting, Inc.					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	ADD/GOOD
Comments	PM - 28 yrs exp - PE, AUS - 2 Bypass projects shown. Design - 22 yrs exp - PE - OR/RA - one bypass - one relocation - ENV - 24 yrs exp - PP - AICP - Bypass project shown. Prime - one bypass - one relocation -				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	ADD/GOOD
Comments	PM - 40 hrs. Design - 64 hrs. ENV - 54 hrs. Prime - 21 person staff - co located w/ GT Hill.				
Firm Name: Croy Engineering, LLC					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	MAR/ADD
Comments	PM - 25 yrs exp - PE - VE exp - OR/RA - Bypass, realignment. Design - 8 yrs exp - PE - only one widening shown - not sure what he did. limited exp shown. ENV - 13 yrs exp - Public Involvement - early concept - one CE approved. Prime - skip some project work - other projects OK.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	ADD
Comments	PM - 62 hrs Design - 50 hrs. ENV - 0 hrs. - NTP pending. Prime - work capacity as shown is good.				
Firm Name: Delon Hampton Associates					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	MAR.
Comments	PM - PE - NO DISCUSSION ON HIS PM EXP: SCHED BUDGET etc. ALL ENG OR. yrs exp 30 yrs. Design - NO PE - one bypass shown. 26 yrs exp - ENV - 17 yrs exp - no complete CE/EA DOC'S SHOWN Prime - OK exp - NOT SURE HOW YOU DESIGN BYPASS IN ONE YEAR @ 22 million				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	MAR/ADD
Comments	PM - 30 hrs Design - 20 hrs. ENV - 40 hrs. Prime - ONLY 4 STAFF MEMBERS IN OFFICE - NOT SURE HOW LONG TO MOBILIZE ADULT,				

10/17/14

Contract B3-2		RFQ-484-0407T4TIA - 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: EMC Engineering Services, Inc.					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	MARGINAL
Comments	PM - 34 yrs exp PE - NO explanation of roles on projects listed. Design - 20 yrs exp - PE - NO BYPASS BUT GOOD WIDENING SHOWN. ENV - 27 yrs exp - AICP - 2 B2 B4s ON WIDENING - HOW DID SHE GET TIA EXP? PRIME - GOOD PROJECT EXP SHOWN				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	ADQ/MARG
Comments	PM - LOOKS LIKE LOT OF WORK LOAD - NOT SURE HOW MANY HRS COMMITTED. DESIGN - > NOT SURE # HRS COMMITTED ENV - > PRIME - GOOD RESOURCES IN AREA.				
Firm Name: Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	MARG
Comments	PM - 25 yrs exp - PE - PM ON 2 OF PROJECTS LISTED - BYPASS - NEGOTIATION, DESIGN - 17 yr exp - PE - SHOWN AS PM NOT LEAD ENG ON PROJECTS LISTED. ENV - 20 yrs exp - Mixed - EA exp. TIA EXP. (ERROR IN PROPOSAL) PRIME - LOTS OF BYPASS PROJECTS SHOWN -				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	MARG/ADQ
Comments	PM - 80 HRS. BUT CLEAR NEXT YEAR. DESIGN - 64 HRS - ENV - 55 HRS - ERROR ON TABLE. PRIME - GOOD RESOURCES.				
Firm Name: ICA Engineering, Inc.					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	POOR/MARG
Comments	PM - PE - NO PDP TYPE PROJECT EXP SHOWN - MOSTLY ITS - OPERATIONS etc. DESIGN - 13 yr exp - only one widening project - others minor - or listed as PM ENV - 13 yrs exp - project exp looks ok. PRIME - ADQ PROJECTS LISTED.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	POOR
Comments	PM - 104 HRS. DESIGN - 152 HRS. ENV - 130 HRS. PRIME - WEAK IN CONTENT REGARDING FLEXIBLE RESOURCES.				
Firm Name: Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	ADQ/GOOD
Comments	PM - 30 yrs exp - PE - PROJECT EXP DESCRIBE SR56 PROPOSAL. (LUT & PASTP) DESIGN - 4 yrs exp? - PE - OK PROJECT EXP SHOWN - MOSTLY WIDENING. ENV - 15 yrs exp. AICP - GOOD EXP. PRIME - ONE NEW LOCATION - WIDENING.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	ADQ/GOOD.
Comments	PM - 16 HRS DESIGN - 70 HRS > BOTH ON NWC ENV - 66 HRS. PRIME - GOOD DISCUSSION ON RESOURCES.				

10/4/14

Contract B3-2		RFQ-484-040714-TIA - Design Services for TIA Projects		 <small>TIA Department's Responsibilities</small>	
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: International Design Services, Inc.					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	MAR/POOR
Comments	PM - yrs of exp? - PE - LOOKS LIKE MEETING DESIGN/ENG exp. LITTLE CONFUSING. DESIGN - 11 - PE - LOOKS SCATTERED - CONFUSING. ENV - 23 yrs exp - EA/ENR I - PRIME - LOOKS OK. DON'T THINK THY WERE PRIME?				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	ADD
Comments	PM - 27 hrs - DESIGN - 60 hrs - ENV - 30 hrs - PRIME - SWE - UTILITY - SURVEY - ON STAFF				
Firm Name: Keck & Wood, Inc.					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	MAR/ADD
Comments	PM - PE - EXP LOOKS OK, NOT A LOT OF DETAIL ON WHAT HE DID. DESIGN - 7 yrs exp - PE - PROJECTS LISTED, LOOK SMALL IN SCALE, NOT A LOT OF EXP. ENV - 15 yrs exp - AICP - HAS GOOD EXP LISTED - EA/HF etc. PRIME - OF PROJECT EXP SHOWN - UCI - WIDENING. WOULD LIKE TO SEE MORE BYPASS - NEW LOCATION				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	MAR/ADD
Comments	PM - 140 hrs - DESIGN - 90 hrs - ENV - 66 hrs - PRIME - 20 STAFF TOTAL - NO MENTION OF NEED TO USE TIA MANUAL.				
Firm Name: Lowe Engineers, LLC					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	MAR/ADD
Comments	PM - 13 yrs exp. PE - NEW LOCATION. WIDENING - GRADUATED IN 2003 HOW DOES HE HAVE 13 yrs exp? DESIGN - 14 yrs exp - PE - ONLY LIST ONE OF 3 PROJECTS AS ENG. 2 AS PM. ENV - 15 yrs exp - AICP - GOOD EXP LISTED - EA/HF → CEI PRIME - WIDENING PROJECTS SHOWN - OK.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	MAR/ADD
Comments	PM - 80 hrs. > BOTH ARE LEADING ENG ON 008347-TIA, PROPOSAL IS INCOMED DESIGN - 75 hrs. - INCONSISTENT WITH OTHER PROPOSALS. ENV - 30 hrs. - PRIME - DISCUSS GEOTECH, DRAINAGE. - TRAFFIC. - GOOD RESOURCES.				
Firm Name: Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	ADD/GOOD
Comments	PM - 25 yrs exp. PE - ALL GOOD EXAMPLES. DESIGN - 15 yrs - PE - ALL 3 PROJECTS WIDENING - ON BLENDED ENV - AICP - EA/ENR I - ET - 404 PERMIT PRIME - ALL GOOD EXAMPLES.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	MARGINAL
Comments	PM - 68 hrs - PM WORKING ON 2 OTHER TIA PROJECTS NOT SHOWN. ON CALL COUNTY INCREASE DESIGN - 130 hrs. ENV - 72 hrs. PRIME - LOCAL CONTRACTS. - RESOURCES LOOK OK.				

104-12

Contract B3-2		RFQ-484-040744TIA - 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	ADD/GOOD
Comments	PM - 27 yrs exp - PE - GOOD PROJECTS LISTED - LISTED AS PRECONSTRUCTION MGR NO PM. Design - 35 yrs exp - PE - 8 of 35 yrs on A DOT PROJECTS. ENV - 20 yrs exp - 2 TIA PROJECTS. PRIME - ALL GOOD PROJECTS SHOWN				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	GOOD/ADD
Comments	PM - 58 hrs Design - 48 hrs ENV - 55 hrs - ERRORS IN PROPOSAL - PRIME - PLENTY OF STAFF CAPACITY -				
Firm Name: Pond & Company					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	MAR/ADD
Comments	PM - 17 yrs exp - PE - ONLY 2 PROJECTS SIMILAR SHOWN - Design - 8 yrs exp - PE - NOT MUCH PROJECT EXP SIMILAR TO THIS PROJECT. ENV - 20 yrs exp - GPPA - TIA PRIME - GOOD PROJECT EXP SHOWN.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	ADD/MAR.
Comments	PM - 60 MS. Design - 104 MS. ENV - 55 MS. - ERRORS ON PROPOSAL. PRIME - STAFF AVAILABLE				
Firm Name: QK4/dba/Presnell Associates, Inc.					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	ADD/MAR.
Comments	PM - 25 yrs exp - PE - ALL WIDENING PROJECTS SHOWN. Design - 33 yrs exp - PE, PTOE - NO REAL ENG EXP SHOWN. & ENV - 20 yrs exp - SANDIS(TIA) SMALL INDICATION. PRIME - OK PROJECTS SHOWN.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	GOOD/ADD
Comments	PM - 10 hrs. Design - 15 hrs. ENV - 55 hrs. PRIME - GOOD DISCUSSION ON TIA & OTHER RESOURCES.				
Firm Name: R.K. Shah & Associates					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20% * POTENTIAL COE				Assigned Rating	ADD/MAR.
Comments	PM - 38 yrs exp - PE - GOOD PROJECTS SHOWN - WIDENING & BYPASS. Design - 19 yrs exp - PE - ENG ON 1 of 3 projects - Asst PM on OTHER 2. & ENV - 15 yrs - AICP - NEPA, 4f, EA exp shown. PRIME - ALL WIDENING SHOWN - NO BYPASS SHOWN.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	ADD
Comments	PM - 48 hrs. Design - 72 hrs. ENV - 56 hrs. PRIME - INTERESTING DISCUSSION ON RECORD/HISTORY - OK RESOURCES.				

10414

Contract B3-2		RFQ-484-84674 TIA - 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: Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	GOOD.
Comments	PM - 20 yrs exp - PE - PROJECTS LISTED ARE COMPARABLE. Design - PE, exp? - GOOD exp shown. ENV - PE - PDE - WETLAND, LT, IMPACTS - EA/FORSI PRIME - ALL GOOD PROJECTS SHOWN.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	ADQ
Comments	PM - 110 hrs. Design - 90 hrs. ENV - 38 hrs. PRIME - MIX OF TEAM EXP - LOCATIONS NEAR PROJECT 100 STAFF				
Firm Name: Thompson Engineering, Inc.					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	GOOD.
Comments	PM - 22 yrs exp - PE - WILDING & NEW LOCATION SHOWN. Design - 24 yrs exp - PE - PROJECTS LOOK OK. ENV - 15 yrs exp - DENIMM'S - 4F - NEPA - EA. PRIME - ALL GOOD PROJECTS SHOWN.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	GOOD/ADQ
Comments	PM - 28 hrs. Design - 60 hrs. ENV - 68 hrs. PRIME - GOOD MIX OF RESOURCES. LEAD ENG SHOWN AS QX/QA MGR.				
Firm Name: TranSystems Corporation					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	MAR/ADQ
Comments	PM - 17 yrs exp PE - SPOOL PROJECTS - LOTS OF PM/ENG EXP. Design - 30 yrs exp NOPE - NO ENG DEGREE. ENV - 20 yrs exp - TIA PROJECTS SHOWN. PRIME - GOOD PROJECTS SHOWN.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	ADQ/MAR
Comments	PM - 22 hrs. Design - 40 hrs. ENV - 55 hrs. WORKING PROPOSAL. PRIME - SPOOL MIND SET - GOOD RESOURCES.				
Firm Name: W. R. Toole Engineers, Inc.					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	ADQ
Comments	PE - 21 yrs exp - PE - GOOD EXAMPLES Design - PE - GOOD EXAMPLES. ENV - 15 yrs exp - 4F - NEPA - EA PRIME - PROJECTS SHOWN OK				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	ADQ
Comments	PM - 55 hrs. Design 104 hrs. ENV - 68 hrs. PRIME - OK RESOURCES.				

Contract B3-2	RFQ-484-101414TIA - 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: American Consulting Professional, LLC			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%			Assigned Rating Adequate
Comments	<i>Project Manager has VE experience, PE, 20 years experience; has worked on similar projects; KTL Design is PE, has 18 years experience, similar projects; NEPA KTL has done GDOT work, is on GPTQ committies; Firm has bypass work, some in FL some in GA</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%			Assigned Rating Good
Comments	<i>good support staff; Project Manager=45 hours; Design=80 hours; Env=40 hours; good availability</i>		
Firm Name: CHA Consulting, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%			Assigned Rating Adequate
Comments	<i>Project Manager is AVS and PE, has GDOT bypass experience 28 years experience; Design KTL is a PE and has 22 years experience, new location widening work; NEPA KTL has 24 years experience, similar project (bypass) with GDOT; Firm has bypass experience, projects in GA</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%			Assigned Rating Marginal
Comments	<i>good support staff; Project Manager=44 hours; Design=64 hours; Env=54 hours; good availability</i>		
Firm Name: Croy Engineering, LLC			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%			Assigned Rating Adequate
Comments	<i>Project Manager has 25 years of experience, PE, bypass work with GDOT; Design KTL is PE, only 8 years of experience but did a bypass project at GDOT; NEPA KTL has 13 years experience, no bypass project; Firms work is in GA, but not much with GDOT as client, no bypass listed</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%			Assigned Rating Marginal
Comments	<i>ok staffing; Project Manager=62 hours; Design=50; Env=0</i>		
Firm Name: Delon Hampton Associates			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%			Assigned Rating Adequate
Comments	<i>Project Manager has 30+ years exp, PE, bypass exp.; Design KTL does not have a PE , 26 years exp but no bypass listed; Env KTL has 28 years exp no bypass shown; one similar project listed by firm, mostly county work</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%			Assigned Rating Marginal
Comments	<i>some extra staff; Project Manager=30hours; Design=26; NEPA=144 somewhat limited.</i>		

Contract B3-2	RFQ-484-101414TIA - 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: EMC Engineering Services, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	<i>Project Manager has 34 years, PE, widening and reconstruction exp but no bypass; Design KTL has 20 years, PE, wideing and reconstruction exp but no bypass; NEPA has 27 years bridge work, widening but no bypass experience; firms experience is all widening and reconstruction</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	<i>limited extra staffing; Project Manager seems very busy, others ok, but no hours were given</i>		
Firm Name: Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Excellent
Comments	<i>Project Manager has 25 years, PE, bypass experience; Design has 25 years, PE, bypass experience, NEPA has 14 years, is an EIT, truck route experience; firm has a lot of bypass experience</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Good
Comments	<i>Good staffing availibity; Project Manager =80 hours now, 64 by end of year, 24 by middle of next year; Design has 64 now, 48 in January; NEPA has 55 now, 45 in November; workloads are decreasing</i>		
Firm Name: ICA Engineering, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	<i>Project Manager has 28 yearsexp, PE, no bypass listed; mostly GDOT ITS work; KTL Design has 13 yrs? Exp, PE, no bypass mostly bridge on call work;NEPA has 27 years planning exp?, 13 env but no bypass exp; firm shows bypass work but this isnt listed in bio for Design KTL</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	<i>has extra staff; Project Manager=104, Design=152; NEPA=130; Very busy; no availability for more work</i>		
Firm Name: Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	<i>Project Manager has PE, 30 years, no bypass but GDOT work; Design KTL is a PE, didn't give years of exp or even a graduation date; no bypass but GDOT widening exp.; NEPA has 15 years exp, no bypass byt GDOT widening exp, GEPA exp.; firm has no bypass project, some of the GDOT work was from 2009</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Good
Comments	<i>some extra staff; Project Manager=16 hours; Design=70 but ending in May 15 NEPA=66; lots of their work is going away so good availability</i>		

Contract B3-2	RFQ-484-101414TIA - 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: International Design Services, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	<i>Project Manager has 16 years exp, PE, bypass experience; Design KTL has 20 years, PE, no bypass, limited exp (typo in this section); NEPA no bypass exp, 25 years; Firm has bypass exp but project mostly done by other people not those in proposal</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Good
Comments	<i>extra staff; Project Manager=27 Design=60 NEPA=30</i>		
Firm Name: Keck & Wood, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	<i>Project Manager has 30 years PE, no bypass exp; Design KTL has 7 years PE, no bypass, limited roadway exp; NEPA has 15 years no bypass; Firm has no bypass experience</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	<i>some extra staff; Project Manager=140 hours, Design=90, NEPA=66; not much availability</i>		
Firm Name: Lowe Engineers, LLC			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	<i>Project Manager has 13 years, PE (but graduated in 2003)?, some bypass exp; Roadway has 14 years no bypass exp; NEPA has 15 years no bypass, prime no bypass</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	<i>some extra staff; Project Manager=80; Design=75; NEPA=65</i>		
Firm Name: Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	<i>Project Manager has 25 years and PE, no bypass exp; Roadway 15 years exp, PE, no bypass all widening; NEPA has 25 years with bypass exp; prime used mostly county work as examples</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	<i>extra staff; Project Manager=68, Design=130 NEPA=60 now will increase to 72 in 2015 (NEPA not consistent with other proposals)</i>		

Contract B3-2	RFQ-484-101414TIA - 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: Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Good
Comments	<i>Project Manager 30 years PE; several bypass projects but was he really a Project Manager?; Design KTL has PE 35 years exp no bypas; NEPA 20 years some bypass some TIA but they just started these; Prime did not list bypass exp</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	<i>some extra staff; Project Manager=58 reducing down to 38; Design=48; NEPA =55</i>		
Firm Name: Pond & Company			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	<i>Project Manager 17 years, PE, no bypass, several county projects; DKTL 8 years PE no bypass, limited experience; NEPA 20 years, bypass TIA (new projects); Firm no bypass but some TIA work</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Good
Comments	<i>some staff; Project Manager=60, Design=104, NEPA 55 down to 25</i>		
Firm Name: QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	<i>Project Manager has 25 years, PE, widening GDOT project; Design 33 years, PE, widening; NEPA 20 years bypass TIA (new projects)</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Good
Comments	<i>Project Manager=10 down to 0; Roadway=15; NEPA =55 down to 10, good availability; good extra staff available</i>		
Firm Name: R.K. Shah & Associates			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	<i>Project Manager=38 years, PE, Bypass exp for GDOT; Design 19 years PE, no bypass; Firm has widening exp</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	<i>some extra staffing; Project Manager=48; Design=72; NEPA =55 (was 66 I other proposals)</i>		

Contract B3-2	RFQ-484-101414TIA - 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: Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	<i>Project Manager has 20 years, PE, widening but no bypass; Design has 20 years, PE, widening but no bypass; NEPA has 12 years, PE, widening but no bypass; Fiem has widening experience</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	<i>some extra staff; Project Manager=110; Design=90; NEPA =38; pretty busy!</i>		
Firm Name: Thompson Engineering, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	<i>Project Manager has 22 years, PE, bypass exp; Design has 24 years, PE, no bypass but widening; Env has 15 years, widening exp, ENV widening exp GEPA; Firm has widening mostly out of state</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	<i>good staffing; Project Manager=28, Design=60, NEPA=66 (different hours in different proposals); Lead engineer is also QA/QC manager?</i>		
Firm Name: TranSystems Corporation			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	<i>Project Manager=19 years PE, no bypass exp mostly bridge; Des NO PE, 30 years exp, NEAP=20 years, bypass, TIA (new projects) Firm no bypass, what is "technical director"</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Good
Comments	<i>some staffing; Project Manager=22; Design=40; NEPA 55 now, 10 in 2014</i>		
Firm Name: W. R. Toole Engineers, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	<i>Project Manager has PE, 21 years bypass and widening; Design has PE 20 years widening and TIA; NEAP has 15 years but no bypass; Firm has no bypass exp.</i>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	<i>Good staffing; Project Manager=55; Design =104; NEPA 66; limited availability for design</i>		

101414

Contract B3-2		RFQ-484-848714TIA - 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: American Consulting Professional, LLC					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	PM demonstrates good level of experience. Design lead does not list new locations projects.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	Good.
Comments	Key Team list very good availability for this project.				
Firm Name: CHA Consulting, Inc.					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	Good.
Comments	PM & NEPA list good experience with projects similar to the one proposed on this contract. Design also lists relevant project experience.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	Good.
Comments	Key Team lists good availability for this project.				
Firm Name: Croy Engineering, LLC					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	Key Team does not list experience with new location projects. Design lead also does not list experience with interchange design which may be required on this project.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	Good-
Comments	Key Team lists good availability for this project. NEPA NEPA lead lists near full capacity for this project.				
Firm Name: Delon Hampton Associates					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	PM lists primarily Bridge experience. Roadway lead lists experience with facilities with high truck traffic; no new locations. NEPA does not specify doc types in experience.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	Marginal.
Comments	NEPA lead lists extensive previous project commitments. Other Team leads demonstrate Good availability.				

10/4/14

Contract B3-2	RFQ-484-040714FIA - 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: EMC Engineering Services, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Poor.
Comments	PM does not list dates of listed projects or relevance to this project. Reading lead does not list experience @ new location projects. NEPA lead does not specify experience @ various doc. types.		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	Key Team does not list monthly hourly commitments. PM lists such commitments to previous projects.		
Firm Name: Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	PM lists good experience comparable to this project. Reading lead does not list projects in which he acted as reading lead mainly PM.		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Good.
Comments	Key Team list availability @ more than 50%.		
Firm Name: ICA Engineering, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	PM demonstrates no experience with Reading projects; mainly ITS. Reading lead lists no experience with new location projects.		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Marginal
Comments	Key Team lists previous project commitments @ near 100% in the case of Reading lead and well over 50% for all Key Team leads		
Firm Name: Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%		Assigned Rating	Good.
Comments	PM + Reading lead list good experience with reading projects. would prefer to also see new location projects.		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%		Assigned Rating	Excellent
Comments	PM + Reading lead demonstrate 100% availability @ NTP. NEPA lead lists availability @ over 50%.		

10/1/14

Contract B3-2	RFQ-484-040744TIA - 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: International Design Services, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%			Assigned Rating
Comments	<p>PM lists main duties on past projects as utility coordination. Reading lead does not describe past projects in relation to duties likely to be encountered on this project.</p>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%			Assigned Rating
Comments	<p>Key Team lists good availability for this project.</p>		
Firm Name: Keck & Wood, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%			Assigned Rating
Comments	<p>PM lists some previous experience with Reading Widery. Reading lead does not list similar experience.</p>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%			Assigned Rating
Comments	<p>PM lists previous project commitments @ about 70%. Reading + NEPA lists several projects, but report availability @ about 50%.</p>		
Firm Name: Lowe Engineers, LLC			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%			Assigned Rating
Comments	<p>Key Team leads show good experience similar to that proposed on this project.</p>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%			Assigned Rating
Comments	<p>Key Team show adequate availability to complete project.</p>		
Firm Name: Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%			Assigned Rating
Comments	<p>Key Team leads show good experience similar to that proposed on this project would have preferred references to new location projects.</p>		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%			Assigned Rating
Comments	<p>PM and NEPA lead demonstrate adequate availability for this project. Reading lead lists considerable previous project commitments.</p>		

101414

Contract B3-2		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: Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	Good.
Comments	Key Team demonstrates good experience in relation to this project. the would have preferred to see some new location experience under Roadway lead.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	Good.
Comments	Key team demonstrates good availability to complete this project.				
Firm Name: Pond & Company					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	Good.
Comments	Key Team demonstrates good project experience with previous projects similar to the one proposed here.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	Good
Comments	PM & NEPA lead list will under 50% capacity @ NTP. Roadway lead list just over 50% capacity @ NTP.				
Firm Name: QK4/dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	Good
Comments	Key Team demonstrates good experience overall. Roadway Lead lists limited projects where he served as design lead that meet the same requirements as this project.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	Excellent
Comments	Key Team demonstrates very little project commitments				
Firm Name: R.K. Shah & Associates					
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%				Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments	Roadway Design Lead lists limited experience working as Roadway Design Lead PM & NEPA demonstrate good experience for this project.				
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%				Assigned Rating	Good.
Comments	Key Team demonstrates over 50% capacity available for this project.				

101414

Contract B3-2	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: Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%			Assigned Rating
Comments	Adequate		
	Key Team list some projects similar in some ways to this project although no new location projects are listed.		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%			Assigned Rating
Comments	Adequate		
	Key Team demonstrate adequate availability for this contract. PM lists previous project. commitments well over 50%, PM Ready also over 50%.		
Firm Name: Thompson Engineering, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%			Assigned Rating
Comments	Excellent		
	Key Team demonstrates experience with projects very similar to the work likely required on this project.		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%			Assigned Rating
Comments	Good		
	Key Team members demonstrate well under 50% utilization on previous project commitments.		
Firm Name: TranSystems Corporation			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%			Assigned Rating
Comments	Good		
	PM + NEPA list good experience in relation to this proposed project. Ready lead should list more applicable projects with some new location.		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%			Assigned Rating
Comments	Good		
	Key Team members demonstrate well under 50% utilization on previous project commitments		
Firm Name: W. R. Toole Engineers, Inc.			
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%			Assigned Rating
Comments	Good		
	Key Team demonstrates good work experience in relation to the proposed project.		
Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 25%			Assigned Rating
Comments	Good		
	Key Team members demonstrate under 50% utilization on previous project commitments.		

PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS		RFQ-484-101414TIA
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:	American Consulting Professional, LLC	Contract B3-2
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating: Adequate
Comments	Widening and bypass experience for both PM and Engineer. No specific new location experience related.	
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating: Good
Comments	Gave specific percents for availability. Good availability.	
Firm:	CHA Consulting, Inc.	Contract B3-2
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating: Adequate
Comments	Prime exp with widening and new location. Demonstrated RR coordination Designers exper not as relative.	
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating: Adequate
Comments	24 staff co-located with env staff. Adequate capacity with decreasing workloads.	
Firm:	Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC	Contract B3-2
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating: Adequate
Comments	Roadway lead relavent projects except for new location. Env GEPA exp.	
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating: Good
Comments	PM and Rdwy 100% avail. Env has heavy project load.	
Firm:	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Contract B3-2
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating: Adequate
Comments	PM exp mostly Dist Design/Pcst engineer - not a GDOT PM. Rdwy - 8 of 35 yrs GDOT projects. Env TIA experiance.	
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating: Good
Comments	Good staff capacity for work needed.	
Firm:	Pond & Company	Contract B3-2
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating: Adequate
Comments	Lead designer showed relevant experience, but not a lot of years. PM showed 2 similar projects. Remainder of team adequate.	
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating: Good
Comments	Design workload heavy. Remainder of team is good.	

PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS		RFQ-484-101414TIA
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:	QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	Contract B3-2
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating: Adequate
Comments	Designer exp showed only concept, no design experience. PM showed widening projects. Env has adequate experience.	
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating: Good
Comments	Good availability of lead staff.	
Firm:	R.K. Shah & Associates	Contract B3-2
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating: Adequate
Comments	PM number of years exp and bypass exp. Lead design engineer of only 1 project listed.	
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating: Adequate
Comments	Availability of key team and PM less than 50%. Environmental availability reported differently than on other proposals.	
Firm:	Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Contract B3-2
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating: Good
Comments	Good years experience and widening experience and new location. Good env discussion.	
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating: Adequate
Comments	Lead engineer is QC/QA Mgr - not good practice. Environmental availability reported differently than on other proposals.	
Firm:	TranSystems Corporation	Contract B3-2
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating: Adequate
Comments	Designer has adequate experience.	
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating: Good
Comments	Good availability of lead staff.	
Firm:	W. R. Toole Engineers, Inc.	Contract B3-2
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating: Adequate
Comments	Lead design has widening and new location experience. TIA experience.	
Resources availability and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating: Adequate
Comments	Adequate availability.	

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF TOP SUBMITTALS FOR PHASE I						
RFQ-484-101414TIA	Design Services for TIA Projects - Batch 3			Contract B3-2		
Evaluation Criteria	Experience and Qualifications	Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Work Previously Awarded			
				Phase One Scores and Group Ranking		SUBMITTING FIRMS FINAL RANKING
Maximum Points allowed =	200	250	50	Total Score	Ranking	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	▼			
American Consulting Professional, LLC	Adequate	Good	50.0	337.5	1	1 American Consulting Professional, LLC
CHA Consulting, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	50.0	275.0	8	1 Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC
Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC	Adequate	Good	50.0	337.5	1	1 Pond & Company
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Adequate	Good	37.5	325.0	6	1 QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.
Pond & Company	Adequate	Good	50.0	337.5	1	1 TranSystems Corporation
QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Good	50.0	337.5	1	6 Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
R.K. Shah & Associates	Adequate	Adequate	50.0	275.0	8	6 Thompson Engineering, Inc.
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Good	Adequate	50.0	325.0	6	8 CHA Consulting, Inc.
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Good	50.0	337.5	1	8 R.K. Shah & Associates
W. R. Toole Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	50.0	275.0	8	8 W. R. Toole Engineers, Inc.
0						
Maximum Points allowed =	200	250	50	500		



November 14, 2014

NOTICE TO SELECTED FINALISTS

**To: American Consulting Professionals, LLC;
Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC; Pond & Company;
Qk4, Inc.; TranSystems Corporation**

**Re: RFQ-484-101414TIA
Engineering Design Services for TIA Projects
Contract B3-2**

*******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)	11/14/2014	
2. Deadline for submission of written questions from finalists (e-mail)	11/18/2014	2:00 PM
3. Phase II Submittal due to GDOT	11/24/2014	2:00 PM
4. GDOT completes evaluation of Phase II submittal	12/16/2014	
5. GDOT announces apparent awardee	12/18/2014	

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.

PHASE II SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ-484-101414TIA		
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Design Services for TIA Projects - Batch 3		
CONTRACT #:	Contract B3-2		
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	November 24, 2014		
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00 PM		
Consultants	Date	Time	Compliant with Page # Limitations
American Consulting Professional, LLC	11/24/2014	12:29 PM	x
Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC	11/24/2014	12:01 PM	x
Pond & Company	11/24/2014	11:38 AM	x
QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	11/24/2014	12:21 PM	x
TranSystems Corporation	11/24/2014	11:59 AM	x

PHASE II SUMMARY COMMENTS		RFQ-484-101414TIA	
Firm:	American Consulting Professional, LLC	Contract B3-2	
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating:	Good
<p>Good discussion on VE methods. Liked problems issues matrix and mitigation ideas. Looking specifically at this project. Approach specifically referenced the TIA manual. Showed TIA perspective approach.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating:	Good
<p>Based on provided references</p>			
Firm:	Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC	Contract B3-2	
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
<p>Good discusson on budget and cost - understand financial constraints. Looked like some up front work on utilities. Some of the project assumptions/proposals were not followed up on.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating:	Good
<p>Based on provided references</p>			
Firm:	Pond & Company	Contract B3-2	
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating:	Marginal
<p>No project detail given. No mention of use of SB or DBE. No mention QC. Said innovation but did not talk about how they would be innovative. Talked mostly about the Sardis project.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating:	Excellent
<p>Based on provided references</p>			

PHASE II SUMMARY COMMENTS		RFQ-484-101414TIA	
Firm:	QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	Contract B3-2	
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
<p>Demonstrate understanding of TIA program. Concern about statements of using local funds to expand project. Project approach was general discussion, not project specific. Very generic. Good discussion on budget "control" but did not apply specifically to this project. Good process on documenting project management issues.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating:	Marginal
<p>Based on provided references</p>			
Firm:	TranSystems Corporation	Contract B3-2	
Suitability -Technical Approach		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
<p>Touched on a little bit of everything - TIA, budget, Env. Nothing stood out. Talked some about the project, but brief discussions with no great detail on +/-. No discussion of DBE/SB.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating:	Adequate
<p>Based on provided references</p>			

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF SUBMITTALS								
<i>RFQ-484-101414TIA</i>	<i>Design Services for TIA Projects - Batch 3</i>							
<i>Contract B3-2</i>	<i>Final Committee Scoring</i>							
Evaluation Criteria:	Experience and Qualifications	Resources availability and Workload Capacity	Work Previously Awarded	Technical Approach - Suitability	Past Performance			
	PHASE I			PHASE II		Total Score	Ranking	
	SUBMITTING FIRMS							
	American Consulting Professional, LLC	Adequate	Good	50.0	Good	Good	712.5	1
	Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC	Adequate	Good	50.0	Adequate	Good	612.5	2
Pond & Company	Adequate	Good	50.0	Marginal	Excellent	537.5	5	
QK4 /dba/ Presnell Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Good	50.0	Adequate	Marginal	562.5	4	
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Good	50.0	Adequate	Adequate	587.5	3	
<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	250	50.0	400	100	1000.0		

Reference Check

RFQ-484-101414TIA - Contract B3-2

TIA Design Services

Questions to be answered on a 1-10 scale with 10 indicating the best.

Rate the firm's quality of leadership in PM for your project.

Project	American Consulting Professionals	Infrastructure Consulting	Pond & Company	Qk4	TranSystems Corporation
a	8	9	10	9	7
b	8.5	10	10	6	10
Section Average:	8.25	9.5	10	7.5	8.5

Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.

a	9	8	9	8	7
b	9	10	10	5	10
Section Average:	9	9	9.5	6.5	8.5

Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.

a	9	9	9	9	6
b	10	10	10	4	10
Section Average:	9.5	9.5	9.5	6.5	8

Rate the Firm's technical assistance in project management.

a	7.5	9	9	9	5
b	8.5	9	9	6	10
Section Average:	8	9	9	7.5	7.5

Rate the overall success of the project thus far.

a	9	9	10	10	5
b	9.5	10	10	7	10
Section Average:	9.25	9.5	10	8.5	7.5
Overall Average:	8.8	9.3	9.6	7.3	8

Reference Check

RFQ-484-101414TIA - Contract B3-2

TIA Design Services

Firm: American Consulting Professionals

Project a: FDOT, SR 54 Widening

Contact: Steve Carroll - retired, Pia Cormier took his projects, 813-975-6176

Comments:

Project b: Escambia Co., FL, CR 297A

Contact: Liz Bush, 850-595-3440 x3450

Comments: Worked with Tracy Boutwell for 11-12 years. Overall a very good engineer.

Firm: Infrastructure Consulting

Project a: GDOT, I-75 SB Auxiliary Lane (ref for Larry Cook from a previous firm)

Contact: Albert Shelby, 404-631-1758

Comments:

Project b: Town of Hilton Head, Mathews Drive Widening

Contact: Jeff Buckalew, 843-341-4772

Comments:

Firm: Pond & Company

Project a: GDOT, SR 9 Widening, Forsyth Co.

Contact: Peter Emmanuel 404-631-1158

Comments:

Project b: GDOT, TIA On-Call Design Services

Contact: Mike Dover, 404-631-1733

Comments:

Firm: Qk4

Project a: GDOT, US 1 Widening, Toombs-Emanuel

Contact: David Norwood, 404-631-1581

Comments:

Project b: I-20/Alcovy Rd Widening and Intersection Reconstruction, Newton

Contact: Joe Wheeler (retired) Talked to Mike Haithcock

Comments:

Firm: TranSystems Corporation

Project a: GDOT, SR 44 Widening Putnam/Greene

Contact: George Brewer 478-552-4639

Comments:

Project b: City of Oakwood, GA, Thurman Tanner Pkwy

Contact: Stan Brown, 770-534-2365

Comments: Came in and salvaged the project from another consultant that was not performing.

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : "american consulting*"
Record Status: Active

No Search Results

**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
American Consulting Professionals, LLC 243 N. Hamilton Street, Suite 2 Dalton, GA 30720	6/12/14	3/31/17
	SIGNATURE	
		

<p>1. Transportation Planning</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.01 State Wide Systems Planning Urban Area and Regional Transportation</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.02 Planning</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.03 Aviation Systems Planning</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.04 Mass and Rapid Transportation Planning</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.05 Alternate System and Corridor Location Planning</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.06 Unknown</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06a NEPA Documentation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.06b History</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06c Air Studies</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06d Noise Studies</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06e Ecology</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.06f Archaeology</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.06g Freshwater Aquatic Surveys</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.07 Attitude, Opinion and Community Value Studies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.08 Airport Master Planning</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.09 Location Studies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.10 Traffic Studies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.11 Traffic and Toll Revenue Studies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.12 Major Investment Studies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1.13 Non-Motorized Transportation Planning</p>	<p>3. Highway Design Roadway (Continued)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3.09 Traffic Control Systems Analysis, Design and Implementation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3.10 Utility Coordination</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3.11 Architecture</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.12 Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.13 Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3.14 Historic Rehabilitation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3.15 Highway Lighting</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3.16 Value Engineering</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3.17 Design of Toll Facilities Infrastructure</p>
<p>2. Mass Transit Operations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.01 Mass Transit Program (Systems) Management</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.02 Mass Transit Feasibility and Technical Studies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.03 Mass Transit Vehicle and Propulsion System</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.04 Mass Transit Controls, Communications and Information Systems</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.05 Mass Transit Architectural Engineering</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.06 Mass Transit Unique Structures</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.07 Mass Transit Electrical and Mechanical Systems</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.08 Mass Transit Operations Management and Support Services</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.09 Aviation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2.10 Mass Transit Program (Systems) Marketing</p>	<p>4. Highway Structures</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.01 Minor Bridges Design</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.02 Major Bridges Design</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4.03 Movable Span Bridges Design</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4.04 Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4.05 Bridge Inspection</p>
<p>3. Highway Design Roadway</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.01 Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Rural Generally Free Access Highway Design</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.02 Two-Lane or Multi-Lane with Curb and Gutter Generally Free Access Highways Design Including Storm Sewers</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3.04 Multi-Lane, Limited Access Expressway Type Highway Design</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3.05 Design of Urban Expressway and Interstate</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.06 Traffic Operations Studies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3.07 Traffic Operations Design</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3.08 Landscape Architecture</p>	<p>5. Topography</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5.01 Land Surveying</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5.02 Engineering Surveying</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5.03 Geodetic Surveying</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5.04 Aerial Photography</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5.05 Aerial Photogrammetry</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5.06 Topographic Remote Sensing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5.07 Cartography</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5.08 Subsurface Utility Engineering</p>
	<p>6. Soils, Foundation & Materials Testing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6.01a Soil Surveys</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6.01b Geological and Geophysical Studies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6.02 Bridge Foundation Studies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6.03 Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Soils and Foundation)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6.04a Laboratory Materials Testing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6.04b Field Testing of Roadway Construction Materials</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6.05 Hazard Waste Site Assessment Studies</p>
	<p>8. Construction</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 8.01 Construction Supervision</p>
	<p>9. Erosion and Sedimentation Control</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9.01 Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control and Comprehensive Monitoring Program</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 9.02 Rainfall and Runoff Reporting</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 9.03 Field Inspections for Compliance of Erosion and Sedimentation Control Devices Installations</p>