



Interoffice Memo

DATE: October 25, 2021

FROM: Curtis Scott, Assistant Chief Procurement Officer for Transportation Services

TO: Treasury Young, Chief Procurement Officer

SUBJECT RFQ-484-051121; Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services,
Contract 10 - PI #0017739, White County
Ranking Approval

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

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

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

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

1. **TranSystems Corporation**
2. **Holt Consulting Company, LLC**
2. **Arcadis U.S., Inc.**
4. **Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.**
5. **Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.**
5. **STV Incorporated**

The Selection Committee recommends the selection of the top ranked firm, **TranSystems Corporation**.

Concurrence with Award from Responsible Division Director: Certification Procurement Requirements Met:

Albert Shelby, Director of Program Delivery

Treasury Young, Chief Procurement Officer

CS:cd

Attachments



Request for Qualifications

To Provide

Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services

RFQ-484-051121

Qualifications Due: May 11, 2021

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

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

484-051121

Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services

Each Statement of Qualification (SOQ) submittal will require one (1) Contract Consideration Checklist sheet similar to the last page of this RFQ, indicating **ALL** of the contract(s) a firm have submitted SOQs for under RFQ-484-051121. This form is to ensure all SOQs submitted are accounted for and included in the correct Contract evaluation package.

Contract #	PI #	County	Project Description
1	0013064	Meriwether/Pike	SR 109 FROM SR 41/MERIWETHER TO SR 18/PIKE
2	0013591	Catoosa	SR 3 FROM SR 151 TO SR 146
3	0017729	Dawson	SR 53 @ THOMPSON CREEK
4	0017732	Habersham	SR 17/SR 115 @ SOQUEE RIVER
5	0017733	Habersham	SR 255 @ AMYS CREEK
6	0017734	Habersham/White	SR 384 @ CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER
7	0017735	Hall	SR 283 @ FLAT CREEK
8	0017736	Hart	SR 77 @ SHOAL CREEK
9	0017737	Towns	SR 17/SR 75 @ SOAPSTONE CREEK
10	0017739	White	SR 17/SR 75 @ CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER
11	0017770	Henry	SR 42 FROM CS 634/MLK JR BLVD TO CS 680/MARKETPLACE BLVD
12	0017845	Fulton	SR 141 @ CS 119/STATE BRIDGE ROAD

I. General Project Information

A. Overview

The Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) is soliciting Statement of Qualifications (SOQs) 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).

This Request for Qualifications (RFQ) seeks to identify potential providers for the Scope of Services for the project/contract listed in Exhibit I -1 thru Exhibit I-12. Firms that respond to this RFQ, and are determined by GDOT to be sufficiently qualified, may be deemed eligible, and invited to offer a technical approach and/or possibly present and/or interview for these services. All respondents to this RFQ are subject to instructions communicated in this document, and are cautioned to completely review the entire RFQ and follow instructions carefully. GDOT reserves the right to reject any or all Statements of Qualifications or Technical Approach, and to waive technicalities and informalities at the discretion of GDOT.

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

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

C. **The Georgia Department of Transportation Board has adopted a 16% overall annual goal for DBE participation on all federally funded projects. This goal is not to be considered as a fixed quota, set aside or preference. The DBE goal can be met by prime contracting, sub-contracting, joint-venture or mentor/protégé relationship.**

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

For more information on the GDOT DBE Program please contact:

Georgia Department of Transportation
Equal Opportunity Division
One Georgia Center, 7th Floor
600 West Peachtree Street, NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30308
Phone: (404) 631-1972

D. Scope of Services

Under the terms of the resulting Agreements, the selected consultants will provide full engineering design services, for each GDOT Project(s) identified. The anticipated scope of work for each project/contract is included in **Exhibit I-1 thru Exhibit I-12**.

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

E. Contract Term and Type

GDOT anticipates one (1) Multi-Phase, Project Specific contract to be awarded to one (1) firm, for each project/contract identified. GDOT anticipates that the Contract Payment may be Lump Sum, Cost Plus Fixed Fee, Cost per Unit of Work or Specific Rate of Compensation. As a Project Specific contract, it is the Department's intention that the Agreements will remain in effect until successful completion of the preliminary engineering phase of the projects, and may choose to utilize the selected consultant for use on construction revisions as necessary.

F. Contract Amount

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

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-484-051121. 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 **Technical Approach** of the three (3) to five (5) finalist firms for the 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 Technical Approach due date. Any additional detailed Technical Approach instructions and requirements, beyond that provided in **Section V. Selection Criteria for Phase II**, for the finalists will be provided in the Finalist Notification. All members of the Selection Committee will review the Technical Approach (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-484-051121	04/09/2021	-----
b. Deadline for submission of written questions and requests for clarification	04/26/2021	2:00 PM
c. Deadline for submission of Statements of Qualifications	05/11/2021	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.C.4.** below. All Submittals will be pre-screened to verify that the Prime consultant has the required Area Class(es) and that the overall team has the required Area Class(es). Any submittal in which the Prime consultant or the overall team area class requirements are not met will be disqualified from further consideration.

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

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

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

1. Project Manager education, registration, relevant engineering experience, relevant project management experience, experience in utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance.
2. Key Team Leaders' education, registration, relevant technical experience, and relevant experience in utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance.
3. Prime Consultant's experience in delivering projects of similar complexity, size, scope, and function.

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

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

1. Project Manager Workload
2. Workload capacity of Key Team Leader(s)
3. Resources dedicated to delivering project
4. Ability to Meet Project Schedule

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

A. Technical Approach – 40%

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

1. 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.
2. Identify any unique challenges of the project and how your firm intends to mitigate these challenges, including quality control, quality assurance procedures.
3. Provide any specific qualifications, skills, knowledge of the project and project area which may uniquely benefit the firm and project, and your ability and willingness to meet time requirements.

B. Past Performance – 10%

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

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

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

Cover page – Each 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, County(ies), and Description.

A. Contract Consideration Checklist

Each Statement of Qualification (SOQ) submittal should include one (1) Contract Consideration Checklist sheet similar to the one shown on the last page of the RFQ, indicating all of the contract(s) a firm have submitted SOQs for under RFQ-484-051121. This one (1) checklist will ensure that **ALL** SOQs submitted are accounted for and included in the correct evaluation package(s). In the event that there are inconsistencies between the contract number(s) and the PI number(s) indicated on a firm's SOQ cover page, the PI number(s) indicated will prevail to determine which contract a firm will be considered for. QA/QC is a must to ensure the correct contract submittal.

B. Administrative Requirements

It is required to submit the information below for each copy of each submittal. This is general information and will not be scored but may be used to determine eligibility for selection. Under Administrative Requirements section, only submit the information requested; additional information will be subject to disqualification of your firm.

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**.

C. 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.

- 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 (2) 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-1 thru Exhibit I-12, specifically Section 7** for the list of Key Team Leaders for each Project). For each Key Team Leader identified provide:
 - a. **Education.**
 - b. **Registration** (if necessary and applicable.)
 - c. **Relevant experience** in the applicable resource area 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 team leader's area.

This information is limited to one (1) page maximum for each Key Team Leader identified in Section 7 of each Exhibit I-1 thru Exhibit I-12. Respondents submitting more than one (1) page for each Key Team Leader identified will be subject to disqualification. Respondents who provide more Key Team Leaders than what is outlined in the requirement will be subject to disqualification as this would provide an advantage over firms who complied with the requirement and had the required number of Key Team Leaders. Respondents who do not provide the required Key Team Leaders will be subject to disqualification as this does not meet the requirements of the project and therefore would deem the respondent and its team unqualified for the award.

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, 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, telephone numbers and **e-mail address**.
 - f. **Involvement of Key Team Leaders** on the projects.

This information is limited to two (2) pages maximum.

4. **Area Class Summary Form and Notice of Professional Consultant Qualifications** - Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their sub-consultants, who are considered team members. Prime Consultants and their sub-consultant team members must meet the Area Class requirements listed in Exhibit I-1 thru Exhibit I-12 for each project on which they apply. In regards to the required Area Classes, for each project/contract on which they apply, respondents should submit a summary form (example provided in Exhibit IV) which details the required area classes for the Prime Consultant and all sub-consultants or joint-venture of consultants on the team listed in the Statement of Qualifications. The area classes and firm's meeting the area classes listed on the summary form must meet all required area classes or the team will be disqualified. If a team member's prequalification will expire prior to the due date of the SOQs, documentation must be provided which shows that the firm has submitted its application for prequalification prior to the SOQ due date. The team must maintain its prequalification certification in order to be considered eligible for award if selected. **Additionally, respondents should submit the Notice of Professional Consultant Qualifications (for the Prime Consultant and all 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.

D. 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. This chart may be submitted on a 11" x 17" page. **(Excluded from the page count)**
 - 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. **This information to be included on the one (1) page with the Narrative on Additional Resource Areas and Ability.**
 - c. **Narrative on Additional Resource Areas and Ability** – Respondents are 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-1 thru Exhibit I-12** (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 (1) page allowed (combined for D1.b. and D1.c.) 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-1 thru Exhibit I-12**, 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 (excluded from page count), one (1) page combined of text (for both the Primary Office and Narrative on Resource Areas and Ability), and the tables.

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

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

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

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

A. Technical Approach

1. 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.
2. Identify any unique challenges of the project and how your firm intends to mitigate these challenges, including quality control, quality assurance procedures.
3. Provide any specific qualifications, skills, knowledge of the project and project area which may uniquely benefit the firm and project, and your ability and willingness to meet time requirements.

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

B. Past Performance

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

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

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

- A. There is one (1) electronic version submittal required. The Submittal 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**. 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 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. Each Statement of Qualifications shall be prepared simply and economically as indicated above. 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 are limited to the information requested in Section VI. Instructions for Content and Preparation of Statements of Qualifications - Phase I Response only. Hyperlinks or embedded video are not allowed.

Statements of Qualifications submittals must be a PDF document for each project/contract. Each PDF document must follow the naming convention for electronic records as follows: the proposing firm's full legal name, RFQ#, RFQ Title and the specific project contract number being submitted on. To submit your Statement of Qualification click the following Links:

- Contract 1: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%201%20
 Contract 2: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%202%20
 Contract 3: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%203%20
 Contract 4: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%204%20
 Contract 5: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%205%20
 Contract 6: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%206%20
 Contract 7: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%207%20
 Contract 8: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%208%20
 Contract 9: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%209%20
 Contract 10: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%2010%20
 Contract 11: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%2011%20
 Contract 12: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%2012%20

If a firm is responding to multiple projects/contracts, each submittal must be e-mail separately using the naming convention for electronic records, and **submission link provided**. Upon successful receipt of the electronic submittal, the system will send a receipt confirmation e-mail to the sender. **If you do not receive an email receipt confirmation for your submittal within one (1) hour of your submittal, please contact Folyan Battle at fbattle@dot.ga.gov.**

Statements of Qualifications **must be received by GDOT** prior to the deadline indicated in the Schedule of Events (*Section III of RFQ*).

No submittals will be accepted after the time and date set for receipt.

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

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

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

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

- A. There is one (1) electronic version submittal required. The Submittal 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**. 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 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. Each Statement of Qualifications shall be prepared simply and economically as indicated above. 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 are limited to the information requested in Section VII. Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response-Phase II Response only. Hyperlinks or embedded video are not allowed.

- C. **Technical Approach submittal must be a PDF document for each project/contract. Each PDF document must follow the naming convention for electronic records as follows: the proposing firm's full legal name, RFQ#, RFQ Title and the specific project contract being submitted on. To submit your Technical Approach click the following Links:**

Contract 1: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%201%20
 Contract 2: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%202%20
 Contract 3: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%203%20
 Contract 4: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%204%20
 Contract 5: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%205%20
 Contract 6: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%206%20
 Contract 7: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%207%20
 Contract 8: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%208%20
 Contract 9: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%209%20
 Contract 10: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%2010%20
 Contract 11: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%2011%20
 Contract 12: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-051121%20Contract%2012%20

If a firm is responding to multiple projects/contracts, each submittal must be e-mail separately using the naming convention for electronic records, and **submission link provided.** Upon successful receipt of the electronic submittal, the system will send a receipt confirmation e-mail to the sender. **If you do not receive an email receipt confirmation for your submittal within one (1) hour of your submittal, please contact Folayan Battle at fbattle@dot.ga.gov.**

Technical Approach must be received by GDOT prior to the deadline indicated in Notice to Selected Finalists.

No submittals will be accepted after the time and date set for receipt.

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.

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: **Folayan Battle, e-mail: fbattle@dot.ga.gov, or as directed in the Notice to Selected Finalists, if different.** The deadlines for submission of questions relating to the Phase II Response will be identified in the Notice to Selected 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.

The respondent also understands that failure to provide required information may result in disqualification. Failure to provide administrative information may not result in disqualification. At the Department's discretion, the Department may notify the respondent that administrative information is not provided or there was an error in the information provided, **and** the Department will allow a respondent to provide an update to the administrative information. However, the exception to this is the provision of the required **GEORGIA SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION COMPLIANCE ACT AFFIDAVIT**, which by Georgia Law requires disqualification of the response. The above changes mentioned to administrative information would be considered allowable as these would be limited to changes which **do not** affect the information which the evaluators use to score the respondents. Failure of a respondent to provide the specific administrative information as required in the notice will result in disqualification. Any respondent who provides changes in addition to the information requested in the notice shall be subject to disqualification. Failure of a respondent's SOQ to provide any information pertaining to a respondent and its teams qualifications, of any type, will subject the SOQ to disqualification. The Department will not allow updates to qualifications to be provided to avoid disqualification as this would allow a respondent to modify its SOQ and alter the information which evaluators would score. The above changes related to qualifications would not be allowable as these would allow changes which **do** affect the information which the evaluators use to score the respondents SOQ.

B. Joint-Venture Proposals, Sub-Consultants, and Vendors

GDOT does not generally desire to enter into "joint-venture" agreements with multiple firms. In the event two or more firms desire to "joint-venture", it is strongly recommended that one incorporated firm propose and maintain status as the Program Management firm with the remaining firms participating as major firms. Any joint-venture, proposed and established as a separate business entity, should have its own set of books and supporting documentation sufficient for an audit trail. Transactions should be recorded consistent with the joint-venture agreement, and care must be taken to ensure that the joint-venture bears its equitable share of the costs. Therefore, "unpopulated joint-ventures" would not have an adequate accounting system suitable for cost reimbursement contracts.

However more traditional "populated joint-ventures" are welcomed. A populated joint-venture is where an alliance is brought to life by infusing it with working capital, employees, and control systems. The alliance implements all necessary business systems, including payroll processing, purchasing, property control, etc. The alliance will develop its own indirect rate structure and calculates its own indirect cost rates, based on the direct and indirect costs it incurs.

Sub-Consultants shall generally be considered any team member which is performing any service which typically requires prequalification, which is subject to the Audit and Accounting System Requirements, and whose services are billed as costs. Sub-Consultant Team Members must be written into the resulting Agreement and are subject to all terms and conditions in the Agreement. Vendors shall be considered any team member which is performing any service which typically does not require prequalification, which is not subject to the Audit and Accounting System Requirements, and whose services are billed as direct expenses. Vendors may not be written into the resulting Agreement and may not be subject to all terms and conditions in the Agreement.

C. Non-Discrimination and DBE Requirements

The Georgia Department of Transportation in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 78 Stat. 252, 42 USC 2000d--42 and Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Department of Transportation, Subtitle A, Office of the Secretary, part 21, Nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs of the Department of Transportation issued pursuant to such Act, hereby notifies all proposers that it will affirmatively ensure that any contract entered into pursuant to this advertisement, minority business enterprises will be afforded full opportunity to submit bids in response to this invitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin in consideration for an award.

The Georgia Department of Transportation Board has adopted a 16% overall annual goal for DBE participation on all federally funded projects. This goal is not to be considered as a fixed quota, set aside or preference. The DBE goal can be met by prime contracting, sub-contracting, joint-venture or mentor/protégé relationship.

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

For more information on the GDOT DBE Program please contact:

Georgia Department of Transportation
Equal Opportunity Division
One Georgia Center, 7th Floor
600 West Peachtree Street, NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30308
Phone: (404) 631-1972

D. Audit and Accounting System Requirements

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

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

E. Submittal Costs and Confidentiality

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

F. Award Conditions

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

judgment of the Department is in the best interest of the Department (if any is so determined), with respect to the evaluation criteria stated herein. The Department then intends to conduct negotiations with such respondent(s) to determine if an acceptable contract may be reached.

G. Debriefings

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

H. Right to Cancel or Change RFQ

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

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

I. Substitutions, Alternates, Exceptions, and Extensions

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

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

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

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

EXHIBIT I-1

Project/Contract

1. Project Numbers: N/A
2. PI Number: 0013064
3. Counties: Meriwether/Pike
4. Description: SR 109 From SR 41/Meriwether To SR 18/Pike
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.09	Location Studies
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operation Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.04(a)	Aerial Photography/ Conventional Aircraft
OR	
5.04(c)	Aerial Photography/ Unmanned Aircraft System (Design Grade)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide development of the environmental document, including all required special studies (Air, Noise, History, Archaeology and Ecology), concept report, preliminary construction plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, preliminary and final roadway plans, staging plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance) and construction services. All required engineering studies are considered part of the Scope of Services.

All deliverables shall be in accordance with, but not limited to, the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), GDOT Design Policy Manual, GDOT Drainage Manual, GDOT Bridge and Structures Design Manual, Plan Presentation Guide, Georgia Environmental Policy Act (GEPA) and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Scoping:

- 1) Analyze project corridor for potential improvement types and locations that meet the defined capacity-improvement purpose and scope of the project. Such alternatives may include developing the corridor as part of a freight route that connects I-85 near Lagrange and I-475 in Macon; segregating the project into multiple projects including bypasses around impacted cities; or limiting the project to addition of passing lanes and/or turn lanes.
- 2) Conduct Traffic Studies.
- 3) Develop traffic projections based on both historic project-specific data and potential changes resulting from development of corridor to a targeted freight corridor.
- 4) Compile a matrix of potential improvements with associated costs for each, and a draft prioritization (Cost/Benefit Analysis). Right-of-way cost estimates must be completed by a GDOT prequalified right-of-way consultant.
- 5) Provide recommendations for specific improvements to be separated/bundled as potential stand-alone projects. The focus of this process will be to expedite the implementation of those projects that can benefit from accelerated design, permitting, and construction.
- 6) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance – Prepare and discuss the matrix and recommendations to GDOT staff to derive an approved list of improvements to implement.
- 7) Prepare Concept Layouts and alignment alternatives for the selected improvements.
- 8) Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 9) Concept Design Data Book.
- 10) Approved Concept Report.
- 11) Approved Public Involvement Plan – Plan must be approved by State Communications Office.
- 12) Compile and maintain contact list of pertinent stakeholders, including, but not limited to individuals; businesses; regulatory agencies; local, State and Federal government officials; emergency service providers, and utilities.
- 13) Coordinate the project's goals and scope with those of PI #s 0008674, 0013063, 0013065, 0013066, and 0013067, and other abutting projects, with the GDOT Planning Office and the Office of Program Delivery.
- 14) Prepare for and attend one (1) Public Information Open House (PIOH).
- 15) Prepare for and attend up to four (4) Stakeholder or Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings.

B. Data Collection:

- 1) Conduct AM & PM Peak Period turning movement counts on SR 109 and all approaches to SR 109.
- 2) Conduct 24-hour classification counts on SR 109 and all on-system approaches to SR 109.
- 3) Conduct early coordination with local governments, regulatory agencies, and targeted stakeholders (e.g., churches, emergency response providers and hospitals, business owners, civic groups) as directed and maintain records of communication.

C. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Conceptual construction cost estimate(s) and conceptual right-of-way estimate(s) using GDOT prequalified right-of-way consultant.
- 3) Prepare concept layouts and alignment alternatives.
- 4) Initial Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 5) Approved Concept Report.
- 6) Concept Design Data Book.
- 7) Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.

D. Environmental:

- 1) Perform Ecology Resources survey and prepare Ecology Survey Report.
- 2) Agency coordination, including multiple meetings to ensure consistency of expectations, design, and clearance limits under each project.
- 3) Perform Historic Resources Survey and Prepare Report.
- 4) Perform Archaeological Resources Survey and Prepare Report.
- 5) Mitigation Credits Screening.
- 6) Aquatic Survey and Report.
- 7) Prepare for and attend Public Involvement (Public Information Open House (PIOH)/Public Hearing Open House (PHOH)/Noise Wall Meetings) and associated coordination with GDOT. One (1) PIOH anticipated.
- 8) Terrestrial Protected Species Survey and Report.
- 9) TPro and P6 updates.
- 10) Prepare for and attend A3M Meeting.

E. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signal Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Staging & Erosion Control Plans.
- 2) Preliminary Bridge Layouts and hydraulic studies.
- 3) Cost Estimation with annual updates.
- 4) Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
- 5) Location and Design Report.
- 6) Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) participation, report, and responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 7) Traffic Studies.
- 8) Preliminary Construction Plans.
- 9) Prepare Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Floodplain Studies, Draft and Final No-Rise Certifications.
- 10) Pavement Evaluation/UST & Monitoring wells/Soil Survey.
- 11) Pavement Type selection.
- 12) Constructability Review meeting.
- 13) Approved Pavement Design.

F. Survey:

- 1) Aerial Photogrammetry/Mapping using GDOT provided aerial photography and LIDAR data.
- 2) Survey Control.
- 3) Complete Survey Database.
- 4) Property Information and Owners (with updates).
- 5) Complete stream hydraulic surveys streams.
- 6) Extend survey limits (if necessary).
- 7) Survey package report.

G. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Attend ROW/Utility Team Meeting.
- 2) Prepare, Revise, and deliver final Right-of Way plans.
- 3) Coordinate field review of right-of-way plans and staking.
- 4) Right-of-Way revisions during acquisitions.
- 5) Coordination with the GDOT Right-of-Way Office during acquisitions.
- 6) Location & Design Approval.

H. Final Design:

- 1) Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) participation, report and responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 2) Erosion Control Plans.

- 3) Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews.
- 4) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 5) Cost Estimation System (CES) Final cost estimate.
- 6) Final Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) Package.
- 7) Amendments & Revisions.
- 8) Final Design Data Book.
- 9) Complete Final Roadway Plans:
 - a. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Final Signal Plans.
 - c. Final Staging & Erosion Plans.
 - d. Final Bridge Plans.
- 10) Utility Plans:

Utility Relocation Plans.
- 11) Update all Environmental Special Studies Reports:
 - a. History.
 - b. Ecology.
 - c. Archaeology.
 - d. Air.
 - e. Noise.
 - f. Freshwater Aquatic and other protected species surveys, as needed.
- 12) Pavement Evaluation.
- 13) Special Provisions.
- I. Construction:
 - 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
 - 2) Site Condition Revisions.
 - 3) Shop Drawings.
- J. Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews for all deliverables.
- K. Attendance in and meeting minutes of monthly meetings to discuss progress and/or issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).
- L. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Package, address/respond to comments, and make plan changes. The Consultant shall provide written responses to all Field Plan Review Reports to the Department's project manager no later than 48 hours prior to the distribution deadline.
- M. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute preliminary and final plans and all supporting disciplines (signing and marking, erosion control, R/W, Utilities) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.
7. Related Key Team Leaders:
 - A. Roadway Design Lead
 - B. Bridge Design Lead
 - C. Environmental Lead
8. An expected schedule includes the following milestone dates:
 - A. Notice to Proceed - Q3 FY 2022
 - B. Scoping Report - Q4 FY 2024
 - C. Right-of-Way Authorization – Q2 FY 2030
 - D. Construction Authorization – Q2 FY 2032

EXHIBIT I-2

Project/Contract

1. Project Numbers: N/A
2. PI Numbers: 0013591
3. County: Catoosa
4. Description: SR 3 From SR 151 To SR 146

5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design
3.02	Urban Roadway Design
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operation Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.04(a)	Aerial Photography/ Conventional Aircraft
OR	
5.04(c)	Aerial Photography/ Unmanned Aircraft System (Design Grade)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

The Consultant shall provide development of the environmental document, including all required special studies (History, Air, Noise, History, Archaeology, Ecology, Freshwater Aquatic Surveys, and NEPA), concept report, preliminary construction plans, roadway and bridge hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, utility plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, preliminary and final roadway plans, staging plans and final construction plans (including revisions through project final acceptance) and construction services, including review and approval of structural shop drawings. All required engineering studies are considered part of the scope of services.

All deliverables shall be in accordance with, but not limited to, the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), GDOT Design Policy Manual, GDOT Drainage Manual, GDOT Bridge and Structures Design Manual, Plan Presentation Guide, Georgia Environmental Policy Act (GEPA) and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Scoping:

- 1) Analyze project corridor for potential improvement types and locations that meet the defined capacity-improvement purpose and scope of the project.
- 2) Develop traffic projections based on both historic project-specific data and potential changes resulting from development of the area.
- 3) Compile a matrix of potential improvements with associated construction, utility and right-of-way costs for each, and a draft prioritization (Cost/Benefit Analysis). Right of way cost estimates must be completed by a GDOT prequalified right-of-way consultant.
- 4) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance
- 5) Prepare Concept Layouts and alignment alternatives for the selected improvements.
- 6) Concept Design Data Book.
- 7) Approved Project Execution Plan.
- 8) Approved Public Involvement Plan – Plan must be approved by State Communications Office.
- 9) Compile and maintain contact list of pertinent stakeholders, including, but not limited to, individuals; businesses; regulatory agencies; local, State and Federal government officials; emergency service providers, and utilities.
- 10) Prepare for and attend up to four (4) stakeholder or Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings.
- 11) Prepare Draft Concept Report.

B. Data Collection:

- 1) Conduct AM & PM Peak Period turning movement counts.
- 2) Conduct 24-hour classification counts on SR 3 and all on-system approaches to SR 3.
- 3) Property Information and Owners from available sources.
- 4) Conduct early coordination with local governments, regulatory agencies, and targeted stakeholders (e.g., churches, emergency response providers and hospitals, business owners, civic groups) as directed and maintain records of communication.

C. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Conceptual construction cost estimate(s) and conceptual right of way estimate(s) using GDOT prequalified right-of-way consultant.
- 3) Prepare concept layouts and alignment alternatives.
- 4) Initial Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 5) Approved Concept Report.
- 6) Concept Design Data Book.
- 7) Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 8) Prepare for and attend Public Involvement (Public Information Open House (PIOH)/Public Hearing Open House (PHOH)/Noise Wall Meetings) and associated coordination with GDOT. Two (2) PIOHs anticipated. Each PIOH/PHOH to be held at two different locations.

D. Environmental:

- 1) Perform Ecology Resources survey and prepare Ecology Survey Report.
- 2) Agency coordination, including multiple meetings to ensure consistency of expectations, design, and clearance limits under each project.
- 3) Perform Historic Resources Survey and Prepare Report.
- 4) Perform Air Studies and Prepare Report.
- 5) Perform Noise Studies and Prepare Report.
- 6) Perform Archaeological Resources Survey and Prepare Report.
- 7) Mitigation Credits Screening.
- 8) Aquatic Survey and report.
- 9) UST & Monitoring wells.
- 10) Prepare for and attend Public Involvement (Public Information Open House (PIOH)/Public Hearing Open House (PHOH)/Noise Wall Meetings) and associated coordination with GDOT. Two (2) PIOHs anticipated. Each PIOH/PHOH to be held at two (2) different locations.
- 11) Terrestrial Protected Species Survey and Report.
- 12) TPro and P6 updates.
- 13) Prepare for and attend A3M Meeting.

E. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Signal Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Staging & Erosion Control Plans.
- 2) Prepare for and attend A3M Meeting.
- 3) Preliminary Bridge Layouts and hydraulic studies.
- 4) Geotechnical/Soil Surveys.
- 5) Prepare for and attend Constructability Review Meeting.
- 6) AASHTOWare Cost Estimation with annual updates.
- 7) Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) participation, report, and responses (All plan sets, and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 10) Traffic Studies.
- 11) Preliminary Construction Plans.
- 12) Prepare Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Floodplain Studies, Draft and Final No-Rise Certifications.
- 13) Pavement Evaluation.
- 14) Pavement Type selection.
- 15) Approved Pavement Design.

F. Survey:

- 1) Aerial Photogrammetry/Mapping using aerial photography and LIDAR data provide by GDOT's State Location Bureau (SLB).
- 2) Complete Survey Control.
- 3) Complete Survey Database.
- 4) Right-of-Way Staking.
- 5) Bridge Layout Staking.
- 6) Property Information and Owners (with updates).
- 7) Complete stream hydraulic surveys - streams.
- 8) Extend survey limits (if necessary).
- 9) Survey package report.

G. Right-of-Way Plans:

- 1) Attend ROW/Utility Team Meeting.
- 2) Prepare, Revise, and deliver final Right-of-Way plans.
- 3) Coordinate field review of right-of-way plans and staking.
- 4) Right-of-Way revisions during acquisitions.
- 5) Coordination with the GDOT Right-of-Way Office during acquisitions.
- 6) Location & Design Approval.

H. Final Design:

- 1) FFPR participation, report, and responses (All plan sets, and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 2) Soil Survey Report.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation Report
- 4) Wall Foundation Investigation Report, if needed.
- 5) Culvert Foundation Investigation Report, if needed.
- 6) Erosion Control Plans.
- 7) Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews.
- 8) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 9) AASHTOWare Final cost estimate.
- 10) Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) Package.
- 11) Amendments & Revisions.
- 12) Final Design Data Book.
- 13) Complete Final Roadway Plans:
 - a. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Final Signal Plans.
 - c. Final Staging & Erosion Plans.
 - d. Final Bridge Plans.
 - e. Utility Plans.
 - f. Utility Relocation Plans.
- 14) Update all Environmental Special Studies Reports:
 - a. History.
 - b. Ecology.
 - c. Archaeology.
 - d. Air.
 - e. Noise.
 - f. Freshwater Aquatic and other protected species surveys as needed.
- 15) Approved Pavement Evaluation.
- 16) Special Provisions.

I. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Site Condition Revisions.
- 3) Shop Drawings.

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

- K. Attendance in and meeting minutes of monthly meetings to discuss progress and/or issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).
 - L. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR) Package, address/respond to comments, and make plan changes. The Consultant shall provide written responses to all Field Plan Review Reports to the Department's project manager no later than 48 hours prior to the distribution deadline.
 - M. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute preliminary and final plans and all supporting disciplines (signing and marking, erosion control, R/W, Utilities,) as well as all special provisions, all design files, and supporting documentation.
7. Related Key Team Leaders:
- A. Roadway Design Lead
 - B. Bridge Design Lead
 - C. NEPA Lead
8. An expected schedule includes the following milestone dates:
- A. Notice to Proceed - Q3 FY 2022
 - B. Scoping Report - Q4 FY 2024
 - C. Right of Way Authorization - Q2 FY 2028
 - D. Construction Authorization - Q2 FY 2030

EXHIBIT I-3

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017729
3. County: Dawson
4. Description: SR 53 @ Thompson Creek
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

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

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4) Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design, including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4),, if applicable.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions during Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals, including Railroad (RR).
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans, as required.

G. Final Design:

1) Complete Final Roadway Plans:

- a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
- b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
- c. Final ESPCP.
- d. Final Utility Plans.
- e. Final Staging Plans.
- f. Final Drainage Design including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
- g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.

- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. PFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-4

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017732
3. County: Habersham
4. Description: SR 17/SR 115 @ Soquee River
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

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

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4) Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design, including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
 - g. Preliminary Lighting Plans.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study and Approved Preliminary Layout.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions During Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals, including Railroad (RR).
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans as Required.

G. Final Design:

- 1) Complete Final Roadway Plans, including, but not limited to:
 - a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
 - b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Final ESPCP.
 - d. Final Utility Plans.
 - e. Final Staging Plans.
 - f. Final Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.
 - g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.
 - h. Final Lighting Plans.
- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. PFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-5

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017733
3. County: Habersham
4. Description: SR 255 @ Amys Creek
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

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

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for ROW Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4))Practical Alternatives Review (PAR Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design, including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study and Approved Preliminary Layout.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Review Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions During Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals.
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans, as required.

G. Final Design:

1) Complete Final Roadway Plans:

- a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
- b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
- c. Final ESPCP.
- d. Final Utility Plans.
- e. Final Staging Plans.
- f. Final Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.
- g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.

- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. PFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-6

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017734
3. Counties: Habersham/White
4. Description: SR 384 @ Chattahoochee River
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

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

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for ROW Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4) Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study and Approved Preliminary Layout.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Review Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions During Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals.
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans, as required.

G. Final Design:

1) Complete Final Roadway Plans:

- a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
- b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
- c. Final ESPCP.
- d. Final Utility Plans.
- e. Final Staging Plans.
- f. Final Drainage Design, including MS4, if applicable.
- g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.

- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. PFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-7

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017735
3. County: Hall
4. Description: SR 283 @ Flat Creek
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

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

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4) Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study and Approved Preliminary Layout.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Review Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions During Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals.
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans, as required.

G. Final Design:

- 1) Complete Final Roadway Plans:
 - a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
 - b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Final ESPCP.
 - d. Final Utility Plans.
 - e. Final Staging Plans.
 - f. Final Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.
 - g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.
- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. PFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-8

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017736
3. County: Hart
4. Description: SR 77 @ Shoal Creek
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

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

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4) Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study and Approved Preliminary Layout.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Review Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions During Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals.
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans, as required.

G. Final Design:

1) Complete Final Roadway Plans:

- a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
- b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
- c. Final ESPCP.
- d. Final Utility Plans.
- e. Final Staging Plans.
- f. Final Drainage Design, including MS4, if applicable.
- g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.

- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. PFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-9

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017737
3. County: Towns
4. Description: SR 17/SR 75 @ Soapstone Creek
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

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

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4) Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study and Approved Preliminary Layout.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions During Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals, including Railroad (RR).
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans, as required.

G. Final Design:

1) Complete Final Roadway Plans:

- a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
- b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
- c. Final ESPCP.
- d. Final Utility Plans.
- e. Final Staging Plans.
- f. Final Drainage Design, including MS4, if applicable.
- g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.

- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. PFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-10

Project/Contract

1. Project Number: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017739
3. County: White
4. Description: SR 17/SR 75 @ Chattahoochee River
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.04	Rural Interstate Highway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
OR	
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design – CONDITIONAL
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

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

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

- 1) Provide Survey Control Package.
- 2) Provide OpenRoads Survey Database.
- 3) Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
- 4) Staking for Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Cost Estimates.
- 3) Initial Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 4) Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities, if needed.
- 5) Concept Team Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's Approval).
- 9) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates, including Right-of-Way.

C. Environmental Document:

- 1) Necessary Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports and Assessments of Effects (e.g., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
- 2) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. NEPA and/or Special Studies Re-evaluation.
 - d. Section 4(f) Coordination.
- 3) Preparation of a Section 404 Permit Application.
- 4) Preparation of a Buffer Variance Application.
- 5) Conduct Section 408 Coordination, as needed.
- 6) Conduct Public Involvement.
- 7) Prepare for and Attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Prepare Mitigation Credit Application, if needed.

D. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP).
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Preliminary Drainage Design including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), if applicable.
- 2) Bridge Hydraulic Study and Approved Preliminary Layout.
- 3) Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) Report.
- 4) Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
- 5) Avoidance & Minimization Measures Meeting (A3M) Participation.
- 6) Constructability Meeting Participation.
- 7) Cost Estimate with Annual Updates.
- 8) Location and Design Report.
- 9) PFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare ROW Plans and Coordinate ROW Staking.
- 2) ROW Revisions During Acquisition, as needed.

F. Utilities:

- 1) 1st and 2nd Utility Submittals.
- 2) Utility Plans and Utility Relocation Plans, as required.

G. Final Design:

1) Complete Final Roadway Plans:

- a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
- b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
- c. Final ESPCP.
- d. Final Utility Plans.
- e. Final Staging Plans.
- f. Final Drainage Design, including MS4, if applicable.
- g. Constructability Review Meeting Participation.

- 2) FFPR Participation, Report, and Responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 3) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 4) Annual Cost Estimate Updates and Final Cost Estimate.
- 5) Final PS&E Package.
- 6) Amendments and Revisions.

H. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Review Shop Drawings.

I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for All Deliverables.

J. Attendance in, and Meeting Minutes of, Monthly Meetings to Discuss Progress and/or Issues (Additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

8. The Following Milestone Dates are Proposed:

- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 23
- B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q2 FY 24
- C. FFPR – Q3 FY 25
- D. FFPR – Q3 FY 26
- E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 27

EXHIBIT I-11

Project/Contract

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Number: 0017770
3. County: Henry
4. Description: SR 42 From CS 634/MLK Jr Blvd To CS 680/MarketPlace Blvd
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Urban Highway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.01	Statewide Systems Planning
1.02	Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning
1.05	Alternate System and Corridor Location Planning
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.09	Location Studies
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.09	Traffic Control Systems Analysis, Design and Implementation
3.10	Utility Coordination
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
3.15	Highway Lighting
4.01(a)	Minor Bridge Design
	OR
4.01(b)	Minor Bridge Design - CONDITIONAL
4.02	Major Bridges Design
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
	Must meet one of the Area Classes below in the 5.04 series.
5.04(a)	Aerial Photography/ Conventional Aircraft
5.04(b)	Aerial Photography/Unmanned Aircraft System (Concept Grade)
5.04(c)	Aerial Photography/Unmanned Aircraft System (Design Grade)
5.05	Aerial Photogrammetry

	Must meet one of the Area Classes below in the 5.06 series.
5.06(a)	Topographic Remote Sensing (LIDAR) (Conventional Aircraft, Terrestrial Sensors and Mobile Vehicle, Boat, or Rail Units) (Design Grade)
5.06(b)	Topographic Remote Sensing (Unmanned Aircraft System LIDAR) (Design Grade)
5.06(c)	Topographic Remote Sensing (Unmanned Aircraft System LIDAR) (Concept Grade)
5.06(d)	Topographic Remote Sensing (Sonar)
5.06(e)	Topographic Remote Sensing Thermal and Infrared Sensors
5.08	Subsurface Utility Engineering
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.03	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Soils and Foundation)
6.05	Hazard Waste Site Assessment Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan (ESP/CP) Preparation

6. Scope:

The project proposes to widen SR 42 from CS 634/MLK Jr Blvd to CS 680/Marketplace Blvd in Henry County. The Consultant should consider a full range of alternatives to recommend the best concept to GDOT. At this time, the proposed project only has a scoping phase funded.

The proposed project will be delivered via a series of Task Orders throughout the Master Contract duration. Currently the project only has a scoping phase with no PE, ROW, or CST funds identified. Task Order 1 is anticipated to be some concept level activities with the anticipated deliverable to be a concept report. This initial task order will include the following:

- Examine the possibility of creating a one-way pair.
- Examine locations throughout the Norfolk Southern rail line within the project limits for multiple crossing points and rank them by type of crossing and feasibility.
- Provide existing and projected traffic and volume data on the affected road network.
- Provide railroad utilization data for the corridor within the study area including frequency, length, and average road travel delays due to blocked crossings.
- Provide safety information relative to the rail crossings within the study area.
- Identify restraints due to topography, utilities, flood, soils, other environmental factors, historic properties, and land use.
- Attend meetings with a Steering Committee and the City Council as needed and at least one meeting with the general public.
- Contact stakeholders.
- Present a minimum of two (2) up to five (5) alternatives with future impacts and cost estimates.

It is not likely that all standard concept activities will be completed due to limited scoping funds. All deliverables shall be in accordance with, but not limited to, the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), GDOT Design Policy Manual, GDOT Drainage Manual, GDOT Bridge and Structures Design Manual, Plan Presentation Guide, National / Georgia Env Policy Act (NEPA/GEPA) and the GDOT Environmental Procedures Manual.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Concept Report:

- 1) Traffic Studies.
- 2) Conceptual right-of-way cost estimate utilizing vendor from GDOT's Right-of-Way services prequalified contractor list.
- 3) Conceptual construction cost estimate.
- 4) Prepare concept layouts and alignments alternatives.
- 5) Initial Concept meeting Preparation and Attendance.
- 6) Approved Concept Report.
- 7) Concept Design Data Book.
- 8) Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.

B. Environment Document:

- 1) GDOT will complete the Environmental Resource ID (Ecology, Archeology, & History) in advance of anticipated Consultant's Notice to Proceed. The Consultant will complete all other necessary Environmental Special Studies (Air, Aquatics, and Protected Species, as required) and Assessment of Effects (AOEs).
- 2) Agency coordination including multiple meetings to ensure consistency of expectations, design, and clearance limits.
- 3) Preparation of Section 404 Permit Application/Local Coordination Procedures.
- 4) Section 7 Coordination.
- 5) Protected Species Surveys including Aquatic & Terrestrial Surveys, as required.
- 6) Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
- 7) Execution of Public Involvement Plan (PIP) including the Public Involvement (Public Information Open House (PIOH) and associated coordination with GDOT.
- 8) Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), Constructability Review, and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 9) Preparation of Environmental Commitments Table "Green Sheet" and Environmental Resource Impact Table (ERIT).
- 10) Certification for Let.
- 11) TPro and P6 Updates.

C. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signal Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Staging & Erosion Control Plans.
- 2) Preliminary Bridge Layouts, as required.
- 3) Cost Estimation System (CES) Preliminary cost estimate with annual updates.
- 4) Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
- 5) Location and Design Report.
- 6) Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) participation, report, and responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 7) Traffic Studies.
- 8) Preliminary Construction plans.
- 9) Railroad Coordination.
- 10) Pavement Evaluation/UST & Monitoring wells/Soil Survey.
- 11) Pavement Type selection.
- 12) Constructability Review meeting.
- 13) Approved Pavement Design.

D. Survey:

- 1) Survey Control.
- 2) Complete Survey Database.
- 3) Property Information and Owners (with updates).
- 4) Complete stream hydraulic surveys streams.
- 5) Extend survey limits (if necessary).
- 6) Survey package report.

E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare, Revise and deliver final Right-of-Way plans.
- 2) Coordinated field review of right-of-way plans and staking.
- 3) Right-of-Way revisions during acquisitions.
- 4) Coordination with the GDOT Right-of-Way Office during acquisitions.
- 5) Location & Design Approval.

F. Final Design:

- 1) FFPR participation, report, and responses (All plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 2) Erosion Control Plans.
- 3) Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews.

- 4) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 5) Cost Estimation System (CES) Final cost estimate.
- 6) Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) Package.
- 7) Amendments & Revisions.
- 8) Final Design Data Book.

- 9) Complete Final Roadway Plans:
 - a. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Final Signal Plans.
 - c. Final Staging & Erosion Plans.

- 10) Utility Plans.

- 11) Update all Environmental Special Studies Reports:
 - a. History.
 - b. Ecology.
 - c. Archaeology.
 - d. Air.
 - e. Noise.
 - f. Freshwater Aquatic and other protected species surveys, as needed.

- 12) Pavement Evaluation.
- 13) Special Provisions.
- 14) Railroad Coordination.
- 15) Final Bridge Plans.
- 16) Bridge Foundation Studies.

G. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Site Condition Revisions.
- 3) Shop Drawings.

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

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

J. Prepare, reproduce, and distribute Field Plan Review (FPR) Packages, address/respond to comments, and make changes. The Consultant shall provide written responses to all Field Plan Review Reports to the Department's project manager no later than 48 hours prior to the distribution deadline.

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

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

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

8. An expected schedule includes the following key milestone date:

Notice to Proceed - Q2 FY 2022

EXHIBIT I-12

Project/Contract

1. Project Numbers: N/A
2. PI Number: 0017845
3. County: Fulton
4. Description: SR 141 @ CS 119/State Bridge Road
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.02	Urban Roadway Design
3.03	Complex Urban Roadway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Studies
1.06(d)	Noise Studies
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.10	Traffic Projections
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.09	Traffic Control Systems Analysis, Design and Implementation
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.13	Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Design
3.15	Highway Lighting and Outdoor Lighting
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.03	Hydraulic and Hydrologic Studies (Soils & Foundation)
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan (ESPCP) Preparation

6. Scope:

This is an intersection improvement, safety project proposed at the intersection of SR 141 @ State Bridge Road.

The Consultant shall provide the development of the following scopes of services items. All deliverables shall be in accordance with, but not limited to the Plan Development Process (PDP), Electronic Data Guidelines (EDG), GDOT Design Policy Manual, GDOT Drainage Manual, Plan Presentation Guide (PPG), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Environmental Procedures Manual (EPM).

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Environmental Document:

- 1) Environmental Special Studies, Survey Reports, and Assessment of Effects for Air, Noise, Ecology, Aquatics, Archaeology, History, and NEPA.
- 2) Agency coordination including multiple meetings to ensure consistency of expectations, design, and clearance limits.
- 3) Preparation of Section 404 Permit Applications and Stream Buffer Variances.
- 4) Section 7 Coordination.
- 5) Protected Species Surveys including Aquatic and Terrestrial Surveys, as required.
- 6) NEPA Documents:
 - a. Environmental Approval.
 - b. NEPA Re-evaluations, as required.
- 7) Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), Constructability Review, and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
- 8) Certification for Right-of-Way.
- 9) Certification for Let.
- 10) TPro and P6 Updates.
- 11) Preparation of Environmental Commitments Table "Green Sheet" and Environmental Resource Impact Table (ERIT).

B. Preliminary Design:

- 1) Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans:
 - a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signal Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Staging and Erosion Control Plans.
- 2) Cost Estimation System (CES) Preliminary Cost estimate with annual updates.
- 3) Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews.
- 4) Location and Design Report.
- 5) PFPR participation, report, plan production and distribution, and responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 6) Traffic Studies.
- 7) Preliminary Construction Plans.
- 8) Pavement Evaluation/UST & Monitoring Wells/Soil Survey.
- 9) Pavement Type Selection.
- 10) Constructability Review Meeting.
- 11) Approved Pavement Design.
- 12) SUE Plans (Quality Level-B).

C. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:

- 1) Prepare, revise and deliver final Right-of-Way plans.
- 2) Coordinated field review of right-of-way plans and staking.
- 3) Right-of-Way revisions during acquisition.
- 4) Coordination with the GDOT Right-of-Way Office during acquisition.
- 5) Location and Design Approval.
- 6) Attend Property Owners Meeting.

D. Final Design.

- 1) FFPR participation, report, plan production and distribution, and responses (All plan sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- 2) Erosion Control Plans.
- 3) Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews.

- 4) Corrected FFPR Plans.
- 5) Cost Estimation System (CES) Final Cost Estimate.
- 6) Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) Package.
- 7) Amendments and Revisions.
- 8) Final Design Databook.

9) Complete Final Roadway Plans:

- a. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
- b. Final Signal Plans.
- c. Final Staging and Erosion Control Plans.

10) Utility Plans.

11) Update Environmental Special Studies and NEPA re-evaluation:

- a. History.
- b. Ecology.
- c. Archaeology.
- d. Air.
- e. Noise.
- f. Freshwater Aquatic and other protected species surveys, as needed.

12) Special Provisions.

E. Construction:

- 1) Use on Construction Revisions.
- 2) Site Condition Revisions.

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

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

H. All special provisions, design files, supporting documentation, analyses, and studies.

7. Related Key Team Leaders:

- A. Roadway Design Lead
- B. NEPA Lead

8. An expected schedule includes the following milestone dates:

- A. Notice to Proceed – Q3 FY 2022
- B. Right-of-Way Authorization – Q4 FY 2023
- C. Construction Authorization – Q4 FY 2024

**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 (5) 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

Consultant's Name:	
Address:	
Solicitation No./Contract No.:	RFQ-484-051121
Solicitation/Contract Name:	Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services

CONSULTANT AFFIDAVIT

By executing this affidavit, the undersigned Consultant verifies its compliance with O.C.G.A. § 13-10-91, stating affirmatively that the individual, entity or corporation which is engaged in the physical performance of services on behalf of the Georgia Department of Transportation has registered with, is authorized to use and uses 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.

Furthermore, the undersigned Consultant will continue to use the federal work authorization program throughout the contract period and the undersigned Consultant will contract for the physical performance of services in satisfaction of such contract only with sub-consultants who present an affidavit to the Consultant with the information required by O.C.G.A. § 13-10-91(b). Consultant hereby attests that its federal work authorization user identification number and date of authorization are as follows:

 Federal Work Authorization User Identification Number
 (EEV/E-Verify Company Identification Number)

 Date of Authorization

 Name of Consultant

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct

 Printed Name (of Authorized Officer or Agent of Consultant)

 Title (of Authorized Officer or Agent of Consultant)

 Signature (of Authorized Officer or Agent)

 Date Signed

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN BEFORE ME ON THIS THE

____ DAY OF _____, 20____

 Notary Public

[NOTARY SEAL]

My Commission Expires: _____

**EXHIBIT IV
Area Class Summary Example**

Respondents should complete a table similar to the below and indicate by placing an “X” in the appropriate column indicating the firm which meets each required area class for each specific project with particular emphasis on the area classes which the Prime must hold as well as the sub-consultants. The below table is a full listing of all area classes. Since no single advertisement would require every area class, Respondents should delete all the area classes which are not applicable to the project they are pursuing and only include the ones applicable. Particular attention should be paid to the date that consultants certificate expires.

Area Class #	Area Class Description	Prime Consultant Name	Sub-Consultant #1 Name	Sub-Consultant #2 Name	Sub-Consultant #3 Name	Sub-Consultant #4 Name	Sub-Consultant #5 Name	Sub-Consultant #6 Name
	DBE – Yes/No ->							
	Prequalification Expiration Date							
1.01	Statewide Systems Planning							
1.02	Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning							
1.03	Aviation Systems Planning							
1.04	Mass and Rapid Transportation Planning							
1.05	Alternate Systems Planning							
1.06(a)	NEPA Documentation							
1.06(b)	History							
1.06(c)	Air Studies							
1.06(d)	Noise Studies							
1.06(e)	Ecology							
1.06(f)	Archaeology							
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys							
1.06(h)	Bat Surveys							
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)							
1.08	Airport Master Planning (AMP)							
1.09	Location Studies							
1.10	Traffic Projections							
1.11	Traffic and Toll Revenue Studies							
1.12	Major Investment Studies							
1.13	Non-Motorized transportation Planning							
2.01	Mass Transit Program (Systems Management)							
2.02	Mass Transit Feasibility and Technical Studies							
2.03	Mass Transit Vehicle and Propulsion System							
2.04	Mass Transit Controls, Communication and Information Systems							
2.05	Mass Transit Architectural Engineering							
2.06	Mass Transit Unique Structures							
2.07	Mass Transit Electrical and Mechanical System							
2.08	Mass Transit Operations Management and Support Services							
2.09	Airport Design (AD)							
2.10	Mass Transit Program (Systems Marketing)							
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design							
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane urban Roadway Design							
3.03	Multi-Lane Urban Roadway Widening and Reconstruction							
3.04	Multi-lane Rural Interstate Limited Access Design							
3.05	Multi-lane Urban Interstate Limited Access Design							
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies							
3.07	Traffic Operations Design							
3.08	Landscape Architecture Design							

3.09	Traffic Control Systems Analysis, Design and Implementation							
3.10	Utility Coordination							
3.11	Architecture							
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)							
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians							
3.14	Historic Rehabilitation							
3.15	Highway and Outdoor Lighting							
3.16	Value Engineering (VE)							
3.17	Toll Facilities Infrastructure Design							
4.01	Minor Bridge Design							
4.02	Major Bridge Design							
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)							
4.05	Bridge Inspection							
5.01	Land Surveying							
5.02	Engineering Surveying							
5.03	Geodetic Surveying							
5.04(a)	Aerial Photography/Conventional Aircraft							
5.04(b)	Aerial Photography/Unmanned Aircraft System (Concept Grade)							
5.04(c)	Aerial Photography/Unmanned Aircraft System (Design Grade)							
5.05	Aerial Photogrammetry							
5.06(a)	Topographic Remote Sensing (LIDAR) (Conventional Aircraft, Terrestrial Sensors and Mobile Vehicle, Boat, or Rail Units) (Design Grade)							
5.06(b)	Topographic Remote Sensing (Unmanned Aircraft System LIDAR) (Design Grade)							
5.06(c)	Topographic Remote Sensing (Unmanned Aircraft System LIDAR) (Concept Grade)							
5.06(d)	Topographic Remote Sensing (Sonar)							
5.06(e)	Topographic Remote Sensing Thermal and Infrared Sensors							
5.07	Cartography							
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)							
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies							
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies							
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies							
6.03	Hydraulic and Hydrologic Studies (Soils & Foundation)							
6.04(a)	Laboratory Testing of Roadway Construction Materials							
6.04(b)	Field Testing of Roadway Construction Materials							
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies							
8.01	Construction Engineering and Supervision							
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan							
9.02	Rainfall and Runoff Reporting							
9.03	Field Inspection for Erosion Control							

ATTACHMENT 1

Submittal Formats for GDOT
Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services

	# of Pages Allowed
Cover Page	-> 1
A. Contract Consideration Checklist	-> 1
B. 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)
C. 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
D. 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

**Project Consideration Checklist –
RFQ-484-051121
Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services**

This form must be completed and included in the Statement of Qualification(s) in Section VI. A. Contract Consideration Checklist with **all** applicable boxes checked.

This form **will NOT** be counted in the maximum number of pages.

ALL The submitted team meets the prequalification requirements for **All** projects and would like to be considered on **All** projects.

OR

The submitted team meets the prequalification requirements and would like to be considered on the following checked contracts.

Contract #	PI #	Count(ies)	Project Description
1	0013064	Meriwether/Pike	SR 109 FROM SR 41/MERIWETHER TO SR 18/PIKE
2	0013591	Catoosa	SR 3 FROM SR 151 TO SR 146
3	0017729	Dawson	SR 53 @ THOMPSON CREEK
4	0017732	Habersham	SR 17/SR 115 @ SOQUEE RIVER
5	0017733	Habersham	SR 255 @ AMYS CREEK
6	0017734	Habersham/White	SR 384 @ CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER
7	0017735	Hall	SR 283 @ FLAT CREEK
8	0017736	Hart	SR 77 @ SHOAL CREEK
9	0017737	Towns	SR 17/SR 75 @ SOAPSTONE CREEK
10	0017739	White	SR 17/SR 75 @ CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER
11	0017770	Henry	SR 42 FROM CS 634/MLK JR BLVD TO CS 680/MARKETPLACE BLVD
12	0017845	Fulton	SR 141 @ CS 119/STATE BRIDGE ROAD

ADDENDUM NO. 1

ISSUE DATE: 4/28/2021

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

RFQ-484-051121 – Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services

NOTE: PLEASE REVIEW CAREFULLY! THERE MAYBE CHANGES TO THE INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED. FAILURE TO ADHERE TO ANY CHANGES ADDRESSED IN THIS ADDENDUM MAY RESULT IN DISQUALIFICATION.

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

NOTE: A signed acknowledgment of this addendum (this page) MUST be attached to your SUBMITTAL for Phase I.

Firm Name _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Typed Name and Title _____

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

This Addendum, including all 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:

	Questions	Answers
1.	Our current prequalification does not expire until August 9, 2021. We are currently prequalified in 5.06 Remote Sensing. Will this suffice for this area class for this RFQ submittal?	If a consultant is currently prequalified in 5.06, they are considered “grandfathered in” and are prequalified in area classes 5.06(a), 5.06(b), 5.06(c), 5.06(d) and 5.06(e). When it comes time for the consultant to renew their prequalification status, they will have to choose which new area classes to apply for (5.06(a), 5.06(b), 5.06(c), 5.06(d), 5.06(e) since 5.06 has been discontinued. Please note: if the consultant wishes to apply for 5.06(b) they will have to fly and pass the GDOT UAS test site.
2.	Exhibit I-1, Section 6.A Part 4 states: “Right-of-way cost estimates must be completed by a GDOT prequalified right-of-way consultant.” The prequalification area classes listed in Sections 5.A. and 5.B do not include right-of-way consultant area classes. What right-of-way consultant area class is required to perform this service? Is this area class a requirement of the Prime Consultant or the Team? If it is required, will the prime consultant be required to demonstrate this prequalification as required by submission instructions?	Right-of-Way (ROW) area classes are not required as part of project delivery. Firms just need to make sure when submitting the annual ROW cost estimate, it is performed by a consultant prequalified by GDOT to perform this task. The prequalified list can be found here: http://www.dot.ga.gov/PartnerSmart/Documents/ROW/RW-ValuationAppraiser.pdf ROW cost estimates will not be accepted if not performed by a firm or individual from this list.

3.	Should survey area classes be included as part of Contract #12?	No. Survey will be completed by GDOT and is not required as part of this contract.
4.	No Database phase is listed in the scope (Exhibit I-12). Please confirm if an approved database is being provided by the Department.	See Answer to Question 3.
5.	In reference to Contract 12, PI # 0017845 / Fulton County, SR 141 at CS 119/State Bridge Road: Are we able to add a Key Team Member resume for Traffic Operations and Design?	No. A Key team lead resume for Traffic Operations and Design is not required for this Contract.
6.	Contract 12 (Exhibit I-12) does not require a Traffic Key Team Lead. Are traffic studies being provided by the Department or through another contract? It seems the traffic studies/analysis would be a major role in this type of alternative intersection project.	See Answer to Question #5. Traffic studies will be completed by GDOT.
7.	In reference to Contract 12, PI # 0017845 / Fulton County, SR 141 at CS 119/State Bridge Road: Will concept validation be a part of the scope since concept development is not included?	No, the approved concept will be provided by GDOT.
8.	No Concept Development phase is listed in the scope (Exhibit I-12). Please confirm if an approved Concept Report being provided by the Department.	See Answer to Question #7.

ADDENDUM NO. 2

ISSUE DATE: 5/24/2021

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

RFQ-484-051121 – Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services

NOTE: PLEASE REVIEW CAREFULLY! THERE MAYBE CHANGES TO THE INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED. FAILURE TO ADHERE TO ANY CHANGES ADDRESSED IN THIS ADDENDUM MAY RESULT IN DISQUALIFICATION.

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

NOTE: THIS ADDENDUM IS FOR NOTIFICATION PURPOSES ONLY FOR:

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

The purpose of this addendum is to provide an update to the RFQ to confirm the following:

RFQ Section X: GDOT Terms and Conditions, Item H. Right to Cancel or Change RFQ, 1st paragraph states:

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.

Therefore, Exhibit I-11, Project/Contract 11, PI Number: 0017770, SR 42 FROM CS 634/MLK JR BLVD TO CS 680/MARKETPLACE BLVD, is being DELETED in its entirety.

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	May 11, 2021
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm



No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Exhibit II - Certification	Exhibit III - GSICAA	Signed Addendum If Applicable	Compliant with Page # Limitations	Compliant with Required Format	Consideration Checklist
1	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	5/11/2021	11:32 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
2	Arcadis U.S., Inc.	5/11/2021	1:31 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
3	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	5/11/2021	12:20 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
4	BCC Engineering, LLC	5/11/2021	11:20 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
5	Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.	5/11/2021	1:56 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
6	Croy Engineering, LLC	5/11/2021	12:43 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
7	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	5/11/2021	9:08 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
8	Gresham Smith	5/11/2021	11:50 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
9	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	5/11/2021	1:31 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
10	Holt Consulting Company, LLC	5/11/2021	11:55 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
11	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	5/11/2021	10:19 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
12	KCI Technologies, Inc.	5/11/2021	12:58 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
13	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	5/11/2021	12:20 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
14	Long Engineering, LLC	5/11/2021	1:34 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
15	Lowe Engineers, LLC	5/11/2021	11:23 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
16	Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.	5/10/2021	4:49 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
17	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	5/11/2021	12:06 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
18	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	5/11/2021	11:04 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
19	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	5/11/2021	1:26 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
20	Practical Design Partners, LLC	5/11/2021	8:13 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
21	Precision Planning, Inc.	5/11/2021	9:21 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
22	R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	5/11/2021	11:36 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
23	RS&H, Inc.	5/11/2021	8:07 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
24	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)	5/11/2021	11:50 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
25	STV Incorporated	5/11/2021	10:52 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
26	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.	5/11/2021	12:01 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
27	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	5/11/2021	2:09 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
28	Thompson Engineering, Inc.	5/11/2021	12:49 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
29	TranSystems Corporation	5/11/2021	11:47 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
30	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	5/11/2021	8:19 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
31	WSP USA, Inc.	5/11/2021	12:39 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X

GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

RFQ-484-051121

Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services

Contract 10 – PI #0017739

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

Coordination and Communication

Charnele Dobbins 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, Proposals, 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

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

Phase II

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

Phase I Evaluation of Statements of Qualifications

Evaluation of Eligible Submittals

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

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

Directions for use of the Evaluation Preliminary Scoring Forms:

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

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

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

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATING AVAILABILITY

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

Evaluation Meeting:

All completed Scoring Forms with the preliminary scores and comments for each criteria of each firm, must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Tuesday, June 22, 2021. The completed forms must be turned in at the conclusion of the meeting.

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

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

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

Phase II

Evaluation of Technical Approach and Past Performance

- Finalists will be required to submit a written response which must detail the Technical approach (including design concepts and use of alternative methods).
- **Past Performance - Procurement will be checking references and will provide the results of the reference checks to the Selection Committee for review. The Selection Committee will also be allowed to share and review any other documented information made available for consideration regarding the Firm's performance on any project/contract, along with the reference checks to provide a group rating with comments.**

With the increased lack of responses to the reference checks, Procurement is requesting that prior to attending the Phase II meeting that each of the selection committee members perform the following action to add to the past performance discussion.

- The Selection Committee should be prepared to share personal work experience while working with each shortlisted firm, provide project P.I. number and any performance issues, concerns and/or positive feedback about the Prime Consultant and its team that may hinder or improve their overall rating for past performance.
- Selection committee members that do not have any personal prior work experience with any of the shortlisted firms, must seek additional documented material through discussion with their Office Management, CMIS (Vendor evaluation), inter-office documentation (emails, written correspondence, cure letters, etc.) to help aid in the discussion during the Phase II meeting.

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

Evaluation Meeting:

All notes must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Tuesday, September 14, 2021. The Selection Committee will discuss and determine a final committee rating for each criteria and will provide summary comments as to why the Committee feels the rating is warranted. The Committee will assign the following ratings:

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

FINAL SCORING AND SELECTION

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

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE PRELIMINARY SCORING AND RANKING OF SUBMITTALS

Solicitation Title:	Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services	1	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	
Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	2	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	
PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Preliminary Scoring based on Published Criteria		3	TranSystems Corporation	
(This Page For GDOT Use)		4	Holt Consulting Company, LLC	
		5	STV Incorporated	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING)		6	Arcadis U.S., Inc.
	Sum of		7	KCI Technologies, Inc.
	Individual	Group	8	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.
	Rankings	Ranking	9	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC
		10	RS&H, Inc.	
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	33	12	11	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Arcadis U.S., Inc.	21	6	12	American Consulting Professionals, LLC
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	28	9	13	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC
BCC Engineering, LLC	58	22	14	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.
Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.	53	19	15	Gresham Smith
Croy Engineering, LLC	72	27	16	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	47	17	17	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.
Gresham Smith	42	15	18	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	5	1	19	Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	16	4	20	Lowe Engineers, LLC
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	36	13	21	WSP USA, Inc.
KCI Technologies, Inc.	26	7	22	BCC Engineering, LLC
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	32	11	23	Long Engineering, LLC
Long Engineering, LLC	63	23	24	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)
Lowe Engineers, LLC	55	20	25	Thompson Engineering, Inc.
Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.	76	28	26	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	27	8	27	Croy Engineering, LLC
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	44	16	28	Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	7	2	29	Practical Design Partners, LLC
Practical Design Partners, LLC	81	29	30	R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.
Precision Planning, Inc.	107	31	31	Precision Planning, Inc.
R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	103	30		
RS&H, Inc.	29	10		
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)	63	24		
STV Incorporated	16	5		
T.Y. Lin International, Inc.	38	14		
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	68	26		
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	65	25		
TranSystems Corporation	7	3		
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	47	18		
WSP USA, Inc.	55	21		

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications
Resources and Workload Capacity

Evaluator 1

<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	Phase One Evaluator 1 Individual	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Good	Good	375	1
Arcadis U.S., Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
BCC Engineering, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	17
Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
Croy Engineering, LLC	Good	Marginal	225	31
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Gresham Smith	Adequate	Good	325	11
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Good	Good	375	1
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	Marginal	Good	275	21
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	11
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	17
Long Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	17
Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	11
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Practical Design Partners, LLC	Adequate	Good	325	11
Precision Planning, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
RS&H, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
STV Incorporated	Good	Good	375	1
T.Y. Lin International, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	Adequate	Good	325	11
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	11
TranSystems Corporation	Good	Good	375	1
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
WSP USA, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	17
<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	500	%

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	American Consulting Professionals, LLC		
-------------------	--	--	--

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

All KTL's listed relevant projects. Firm listed projects I which 3 KTL's worked together.

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

Firm has capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	Arcadis U.S., Inc.		
-------------------	--------------------	--	--

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

All KTL's listed relevant projects including bridge bundles. Firm referenced projects with which all KTL's worked together.

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

Firm has more than enough capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC		
-------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

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

All KTL's and firm worked on relevant projects

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

Firm has capacity to handle load

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	BCC Engineering, LLC		
-------------------	----------------------	--	--

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

All KTL's listed relevant experience. Firm listed extensive relative experience involving 2 KTL's. Although most of the work is in FL, the PM is gaining GDOT knowledge by working on GA on-call design contract.

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

Firm has capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.		
-------------------	---	--	--

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

All KTL's listed some relevant projects. Firm listed relevant projects involving 2 KTL's

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

Firm has capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	Croy Engineering, LLC		
-------------------	-----------------------	--	--

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

All KTL's worked on relevant projects. Firm listed relevant projects in which a one or all KTL's worked together

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

Flow chart could show more resources however KTL's have capacity to handle load.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.		
-------------------	-------------------------	--	--

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

All KTL's listed relevant experience

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

Extensive QA/QC Team. Team has more than enough capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	Gresham Smith		
-------------------	---------------	--	--

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

KTL's listed some relevant experience

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

Firm has more than enough capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.		
-------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

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

KTL's listed relevant experience

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

Extensive QA/QC Team. Team has more than enough capacity to handle load

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	Holt Consulting Company, LLC		
-------------------	------------------------------	--	--

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

KTL's listed relevant experience and 3 of them worked on projects together in the past

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

Team has more than enough capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		
-------------------	---	--	--

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

KTL's listed some relevant experience but mostly design build projects

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

Firm has more than enough capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	KCI Technologies, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------	--	--

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

KTL's listed relevant projects. Firm projects didn't involve any of the KTL's

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

Only one QA/QC reviewer however firm has more than enough capacity to handle the load

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
-------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

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

All KTL's listed relevant experience including bridge bundles. Firm listed relevant experience with All KTL's working on bridge bundle 1, contract 6

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

Firm has more than enough capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	Long Engineering, LLC		
-------------------	-----------------------	--	--

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

All KTL's listed relevant experience. Firm listed relevant project with 2 KTL's

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

Firm has more than enough capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	Lowe Engineers, LLC		
-------------------	---------------------	--	--

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

Listed relevant experience and two KTL's worked together in the past

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

2 QC/QA reviewers and capacity to handle load

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------	--	--

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

Comments:

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

Comments:

Firm Name:	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.		
-------------------	---------------------	--	--

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

Mostly design build experience. KTL's worked together in the past.

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

Has capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.		
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--	--

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

KTL's worked together and listed relevant projects.

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

Has capacity to handle load

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

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

All KTL's listed extensive relevant experience. Firm listed projects with 2 KTL working together.

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

Firm has more than enough capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	Practical Design Partners, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate

All KTL's listed relevant experience. Firm listed relevant project with 2 KTL's

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

Firm has more than enough capacity to handle load

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

All KTL's listed relevant experience

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

Firm has capacity to handle load

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

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

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

KTL's and firm listed some relevant experience.

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

Firm has some capacity to handle project load

Firm Name:	RS&H, Inc.		
-------------------	------------	--	--

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

All KTL's listed extensive relevant experience. Firm listed projects with 3 KTL working together.

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

Firm has more than enough capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)		
-------------------	------------------------------------	--	--

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

KTL's and firm listed relevant experience. A few projects were design build.

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

Firm has enough capacity to handle load

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	STV Incorporated		
-------------------	------------------	--	--

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

KTL's list relevant experience including bridge bundles. Firm listed relevant projects that includes 3 KTL's.

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

Firm has capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------------	--	--

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

KTL's listed some relevant experience. Firm listed all relevant experience on ongoing projects in which some KTL's are working together.

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

Firm has the capacity to handle the load

Firm Name:	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.		
-------------------	---------------------------------	--	--

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

KTL's listed some relevant projects

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

Firm has capacity to handle load

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	Thompson Engineering, Inc.		
-------------------	----------------------------	--	--

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

KTL's listed relevant experience and Firm listed relevant project in which 2 KTL's worked together.

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

Team has more than enough capacity to carry load

Firm Name:	TranSystems Corporation		
-------------------	-------------------------	--	--

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

All KTL's listed extensive relevant experience. Firm listed projects with 2 KTL working together.

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

Firm has more than enough capacity to handle load

Firm Name:	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.		
-------------------	-------------------------------	--	--

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

KTL's and firm listed relevant projects

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

Firm has capacity to handle load

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 1			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	WSP USA, Inc.		
-------------------	---------------	--	--

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

All KTL's listed extensive relevant experience. Firm referenced relevant projects in which 2 KTL's worked together

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

Firm has the capacity to handle the load









Evaluator 2









Evaluation Criteria









Experience and Qualifications
Resources and Workload Capacity





<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	Phase One	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Evaluator 2	Individual
			Total Score	Ranking
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	17
Arcadis U.S., Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	17
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Good	Good	375	1
BCC Engineering, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	17
Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	17
Croy Engineering, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	17
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	Good	Marginal	225	31
Gresham Smith	Good	Adequate	300	17
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Good	Good	375	1
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	Good	Good	375	1
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Long Engineering, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	17
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Good	375	1
Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	17
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Practical Design Partners, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	28
Precision Planning, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	28
R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	28
RS&H, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)	Good	Adequate	300	17
STV Incorporated	Good	Good	375	1
T.Y. Lin International, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	Good	Adequate	300	17
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	17
TranSystems Corporation	Good	Good	375	1
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
WSP USA, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	500	%

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25% of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects = 75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	American Consulting Professionals, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 27 years experience (10 projects presented, 10 standalone bridges, over water); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 25 years experience (3 bridge projects presented, over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, PE, 19 years experience (3 bridge projects presented, over water); ENV Lead = BA Anthropology, MS International Affairs, MHP, 21 years experience (3 bridge projects presented, multiple, over water); Prime (5 bridge projects presented, over water); The PM, Roadway and Bridge key team leads worked on 2 projects presented for the Prime; the Roadway and Bridge key team leads worked on 1 project for the Prime; the Bridge key team lead worked on the other 2.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: PM = 65/160 Committed = 59% Available; Roadway Lead = 85/160 Committed = 47% Available; Bridge Lead = 30/160 Committed = 81% Available; ENV Lead = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; Firm + Resources = 4 structures, 4 roadway, 3 hydraulics, 4 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	Arcadis U.S., Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BS Math, BSCE, MSSE, PE, SE, 17+ years experience (6 projects presented, 4 bridge bundles, 2 standalone bridges, over water, RR); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 24+ years experience (5 bridge projects presented, 3 bridge bundles, 1 multiple, 1 standalone, over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, MSCE, PE, SE, 25+ years experience (5 bridge projects presented, 1 bundle, 2 multiple, 1 standalone, 1 interchange, over water); ENV Lead = BA Env Studies, MS Urban Planning, 6+ years experience (5 bridge projects presented, over water); Prime (4 projects presented including bridges, 2 bridge bundles, 1 bypass, 1 widening, over water); The PM worked on all 4 projects presented for the Prime; 2 included all key team leads, 2 included the Bridge team lead.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: PM = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; Roadway Lead = 72/160 Committed = 55% Available; Bridge Lead = 36/160 Committed = 78% Available; ENV Lead = 77/160 Committed = 52% Available; Firm + Resources = 4 structures, 4 roadway, 1 hydraulics, 3 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCET, PE, 22 years experience (8 projects presented, 1 standalone bridge, 6 interchange and widening projects with bridges over water); Roadway Lead = BSCE, MSCE, PE, 24+ years experience (4 bridge projects presented including all over water); Bridge Lead = BCE, MSCE, PE, SE, 28 years experience (Former State Bridge Engineer, 1000 bridge reviews, 5 bridge projects presented, all over water); ENV Lead = BS, MS Env Science, 6 years experience (5 projects w/ bridges presented, over water); Prime (5 projects presented including bridges, over water); Only the ENV team leads have worked on projects presented for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 48/160 Committed = 70% Available; Roadway Lead = 64/160 Committed = 60% Available; Bridge Lead = 72/160 Committed = 55% Available; ENV Lead = 28/160 Committed = 83% Available; Firm + Resources = 3 structures, 5 roadway, 1 hydraulics, 4 QA/QC support staff			
Firm Name:	BCC Engineering, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 25 years experience (17 projects presented, Design Review Services, Widening, Pedestrian Bridge, multiple and stand alone bridges, over water); Roadway Lead = BS Zoology, BSCE, PE, 18 years experience (6 projects presented, corridor, 1 widening, 3 stand alone, 1 multiple, over water, RR); Bridge Lead = BSCE, MSCE, PE, 10 years experience (30 bridges, 6 projects presented, 2 widenings, 2 stand alone, 1 multiple, over water); ENV Lead = BS Geology/ Marine Science, 24+ years experience (6 projects presented, pedestrian bridge, 4 widenings, 1 stand alone bridge over water); Prime (6 projects presented including bridges, 4 widenings, 2 stand alone bridges, over water); Only the PM and Bridge team lead have worked on projects presented for the Prime, and only 1 together.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: PM = 52/160 Committed = 68% Available; Roadway Lead = 50/160 Committed = 69% Available; Bridge Lead = 96/160 Committed = 40% Available; ENV Lead = 20/160 Committed = 88% Available; Firm + Resources = 5 structures, 3 roadway, 2 hydraulics, 2 QA/QC support staff.			









GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, MBA, PE, 37 years experience (6 projects presented, 2 bridge bundles, multiples, bridges over water); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 9 years experience (6 projects presented, 3 bridges, 2 over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, MSCE, PE, SE, 21 years experience (3 bridge projects presented, 1 batch, 2 stand alone, over water); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 18 years experience (3 bridge projects presented, 1 multiple, 1 bundle, over water); Prime = 6 projects presented, roundabout, bypass, bridges, over water. PM and KTLs have not worked together on any of the 6 projects presented for the Prime. Roadway KTL worked on 4 projects for the Prime with QC/QA Manager.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: PM = 40/160 Committed = 75% Available; Roadway Lead = 70/160 Committed = 56% Available; Bridge Lead = 80/160 Committed = 50% Available; ENV Lead = 144/160 Committed = 10% Available; Firm + Resources = 4 roadway, 3 bridge, 2 hydraulics, 1 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	Croy Engineering, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, ?? years experience (5 projects presented: 3 roads over, road, RR, 2 bridges, over water); Roadway Lead = BSCET, PE, 15+ years experience (3 projects presented:2 widenings, 1 connector with bridges); Bridge Lead = BSCE, MSSE, PE, 8+ years experience (3 projects presented: 3 bridge bundles, 1 roadway with bridges, over water); ENV Lead = BA Geography/ English, 25 years experience (3 widening projects presented, extension, widenings); Prime = 4 projects presented, extension, connector bridge over road, 2 bridges over water. The PM and KTLs have worked together on the presented for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: PM = 28/160 Committed = 83% Available; Roadway Lead = 28/160 Committed = 83% Available; Roadway Lead = 44/160 Committed = 73% Available; ENV Lead = 8/160 Committed = 95% Available; Firm + Resources = 2 roadway, 1 bridge, 2 QA/QC support staff. Could not tell depth from org chart.			
Firm Name:	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCET, MSCE, PE, PTOE, 25 years experience (6 projects presented, 1 realignment, 5 bridges over water); Roadway Lead = BSCET, PE, 30+ years experience, Former GDOT Design/Preconstruction Engineer (3 projects presented, bridges over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, PE, 29+ years experience (6 projects presented, widening, big bridges, bridges over water); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 18+ years experience (4 bridges presented, 1 bundle, 3 over water); Prime (5 projects presented, bridges over water); The PM and Roadway key team leads have worked together on all projects presented for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
Comments: PM = 28/160 Committed = 83% Available; Roadway Lead = 4/160 Committed = 98% Available; Bridge Lead = 36/160 Committed = 78% Available; ENV Lead = ??/160 Committed = ??% Available; Heather Edwards' project work load is listed but Josh Earhart is listed as the ENV KTL; Firm + Resources = 5 structures, 7 roadway, 2 hydraulics, 8 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	Gresham Smith		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 13 years experience (6 projects presented, 1 multiple bridges, 1 standalone bridge over water, 2 interchanges, 1 widening, 1 intersection improvement); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 10 years experience (4 projects presented, 3 stand alone bridges, over water, 1 interchange); Bridge Lead = BSCE, PE, 29 years experience (6 projects presented, bypass, 1 big bridge, 3 stand alone bridges, 1 multiple over water); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 17 years experience (4 bridge projects presented, 1 bundle, 1 multiple, 2 stand alone, over water); Prime (6 projects presented, 1 interchange, 5 stand alone bridges, over water, RR); The PM and Bridge team lead have worked on 3 projects presented for the Prime, the Bridge team lead worked on all projects presented for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: PM = 26/160 Committed = 78% Available; Roadway Lead = 120/160 Committed = 25% Available; Bridge Lead = 50/160 Committed = 69% Available; ENV Lead = 64/160 Committed = 60% Available; Firm + Resources = 7 structures, 7 roadway, 3 hydraulics, 2 QA/QC support staff.			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25% of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 23 years experience (6 projects presented, 2 widenings, 1 multiple and 3 standalone bridges, over water); Roadway Lead = BSCET, PE, 24 years experience (4 projects presented, 1 interchange, 3 stand alone bridges, over water); Bridge Lead = BSAGe, PE, SE, 18 years experience (4 bridge projects presented, 1 batch, 3 stand alone, over water); ENV Lead = BS Ag, ?? years experience (4 projects presented, passing lanes, roundabout, 2 multiple bridges, over water, RR); Prime (6 projects presented, stand alone bridges, over water, RR); The PM, Roadway and Bridge team leads have worked on 2 projects together presented for the Prime; The PM and Roadway team lead worked on 2 other projects together presented for the Prime; The PM and Bridge team lead worked on 1 other project together presented for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 54/160 Committed = 66% Available; Roadway Lead = 56/160 Committed = 65% Available; Bridge Lead = 64/160 Committed = 60% Available; ENV Lead = 29/160 Committed = 82% Available; Firm + Resources = 4 structures, 5 roadway, 1 hydraulics, 5 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	Holt Consulting Company, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 22 years experience (6 bridge projects presented, 6 over water); Roadway Lead = BSCET, PE, 24 years experience (3 bridge projects presented, 1 widening, 2 stand alone, over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, PE, 13 years experience (4 bridge projects presented, over water); ENV Lead = BS Geology/ Marine Science, 25 years experience (3 projects presented, bridges over water); Prime (4 bridge projects presented including 4 over water); The PM, Roadway and ENV key team leads worked together on 4 projects for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 48/160 Committed = 70% Available; Roadway Lead = 46/160 Committed = 71% Available; Bridge Lead = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; ENV Lead = 27/160 Committed = 83% Available; Firm + Resources = 5 structures, 5 roadway, 4 hydraulics, 2 QA/QC support staff			
Firm Name:	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCET, PE, 20+ years experience (5 projects presented, 1 bundle, 3 stand alone, over water, widening); Roadway Lead = BSCET, PE, 14 years experience (4 projects presented, 2 bundles, over water, interchange, widening); Bridge Lead = BSCE, MSSE, PE, 16 years experience (4 projects presented, 2 bundles, over water, interchange, widening); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 18+ years experience (4 projects presented, 1 bundle, 1 stand alone, 1 multiple, over water, over road); Prime (5 projects presented including 3 bridge bundles and 2 widenings, over water); The PM, Roadway and Bridge key team leads worked together on 1 project for the Prime. The Roadway and Bridge key team leads worked together on the other 4 projects for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 24/160 Committed = 85% Available; Roadway Lead = 32/160 Committed = 80% Available; Bridge Lead = 90/160 Committed = 44% Available; ENV Lead = 64/160 Committed = 60% Available; Firm + Resources = 4 structures, 4 roadway, 4 hydraulics, 3 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	KCI Technologies, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BCE, PE, 22 years experience (5 projects presented, 2 widenings, 2 stand alone bridges over water); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 23 years experience (4 projects presented, widening, 3 stand alone bridges over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, PE, 19 years experience (3 projects presented, corridor, 2 stand alone bridges over water); ENV Lead = BA ENV Studies, MS Urban Planning, ?? years experience (3 projects presented, express lanes, 2 bridges over water); Prime (4 bridge projects presented, 2 bundles, 2 stand alone, over water), The PM, Roadway and Bridge key team leads worked together on 1 of the projects for the Prime. The PM and Roadway key team leads have worked together on 1 additional project.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 38/160 Committed = 76% Available; Roadway Lead = 56/160 Committed = 65% Available; Bridge Lead = 44/160 Committed = 73% Available; ENV Lead = 69/160 Committed = 57% Available; Firm + Resources = 4 structures, 8 roadway, 5 hydraulics, 3 QA/QC support staff.			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25% of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More 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:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 18 years experience (8 projects presented, 2 bridge bundles, corridor, widening, extension, 1 stand alone, over water); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 16 years experience (4 bridge projects presented, stand alone, over water, RR); Bridge Lead = BSCE, MSCE, PE, 25 years experience (1 multiple, 2 bridge bundles presented, over water); ENV Lead = BA English, MA Anthropology, M Env Mgmt, 27 years experience (4 bridge bundles, 1 big bridge, 1 stand alone bridge project presented, over water, RR); Prime (2 bridge bundles, 2 widenings with bridges presented, over water, extension). The PM, Roadway, Bridge and ENV KTLs worked together on 1 project presented by the Prime; all but Roadway worked on another; the PM and Bridge KTL worked on the other 3.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 78/160 Committed = 51% Available; Roadway Lead = 32/160 Committed = 80% Available; Bridge Lead = 32/160 Committed = 80% Available; ENV Lead = 60/160 Committed = 63% Available; Firm + Resources = 5 structures, 4 roadway, 4 hydraulics, 3 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	Long Engineering, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 32 years experience (12 projects presented, 3 bundles, 2 multiple, stand alone, over water); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 28 years experience (4 projects presented, 1 bundle, 2 stand alone, 1 review services, over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, PE, 38 years experience (7 projects presented, multiple, stand alone, over water); ENV Lead = BS Ecology, 18+ years experience (5 bridges projects presented, over water); Prime (5 bridge projects presented, culvert, over water); The PM, Roadway and Bridge key team leads have worked together on 2 projects for the Prime. The Roadway and Bridge key team leads have worked together on 1 project for the Prime. The PM has worked with the Bridge KTL on 1 project for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: PM = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; Roadway Lead = 80/160 Committed = 50% Available; Bridge Lead = 78/160 Committed = 51% Available; ENV Lead = 72/160 Committed = 55% Available; Firm + Resources = 3 structures, 2 roadway, 2 hydraulics, 2 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	Lowe Engineers, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 24+ years experience (11 projects managed: 5 bridge projects presented, stand alone, over water); Roadway Lead = BS Construction, BSCE, PE, 23 years experience (4 bridge projects presented, stand alone, over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, PE, 20 years experience (3 bridge projects presented, stand alone, over water); ENV Lead = BS ENV Econ, 22 years experience (former GDOT NEPA section chief, 4 bridge projects presented, stand alone, over water); Prime = 5 bridge projects presented, stand alone, over water. The PM and all KTLs worked together on 3 projects. The PM and the Roadway and ENV KTLs worked together on 1 project presented for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 58/160 Committed = 64% Available; Roadway Lead = 58/160 Committed = 64% Available; Bridge Lead = 80/160 Committed = 50% Available; ENV Lead = 80/160 Committed = 50% Available; Firm + Resources = 4 structures, 8 roadway, 5 hydraulics, 2 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BCE, PE, ?? years experience (6 projects presented, widening, 1 standalone bridge, multiple widening, interchange and corridor projects with bridges over water); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 15 years experience (4 projects presented, 2 widenings, 2 stand alone bridges, over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, PE, 35+ years experience (5 bridge projects presented, stand alone, over water); ENV Lead = BS Env Econ, 22 years experience (5 projects presented, stand alone bridges over water, RR); Prime (4 projects presented, 3 bridge bundles, over water, 1 stand alone over RR); The PM and Bridge team lead worked together on 2 projects presented for the Prime; the Roadway and Bridge team leads worked together on 1 project presented for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: PM = 8/160 Committed = 95% Available; Roadway Lead = 120/160 Committed = 25% Available; Bridge Lead = 88/160 Committed = 45% Available; ENV Lead = 90/160 Committed = 44% Available; Firm + Resources = 3 structures, 4 roadway, 3 hydraulics, 3 QA/QC support staff.			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More 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:	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BCE, PE, 29 years experience (10 projects presented, 2 bridge batches, interchange, drainage, bridge over RR, widenings with bridges, over water); Roadway Lead = BSCET, PE, 29 years experience (5 projects presented, 2 batches, bridge over RR, drainage, over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, PE, 15+ years experience (6 bridge projects presented, 3 batches, 1 stand alone, over RR, over water); ENV Lead = BS Geology, Marine Science, 20+ years experience (12 projects presented, 1 batch, stand alone, widenings w/ bridges, over water); Prime (6 projects presented 3 bridge batches, stand alone, over water, RR); The PM and all key team leads have worked together on 3 or more projects for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 25/160 Committed = 84% Available; Roadway Lead = 15/160 Committed = 91% Available; Bridge Lead = 50/160 Committed = 69% Available; ENV Lead = 20/160 Committed = 88% Available; Firm + Resources = 5 structures, 5 roadway, 2 hydraulics, 4 QA/QC support staff			
Firm Name:	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCET, PE, 31+ years experience (6 projects presented, 2 bridge bundles, 4 widenings with bridges, over water); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 13+ years experience (5 projects presented, 4 stand alone bridges, 1 multiple, over water); Bridge Lead = BSCET, PE, 26 years experience (3 projects presented, widening, 2 stand alone, over water); ENV Lead = BSCE, PE, 30 years experience (4 projects presented, 2 bridge bundles, intersection, bridge over RR, over water); Prime (4 projects presented, 4 bridge bundles, over water); The PM, Roadway and ENV KTLs have worked together on 3 projects for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 70/160 Committed = 56% Available; Roadway Lead = 60/160 Committed = 63% Available; Bridge Lead = 36/160 Committed = 78% Available; ENV Lead = 44/160 Committed = 73% Available; Firm + Resources = 5 structures, 5 roadway, 2 hydraulics, 3 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCT, MSRP, PE, 17 years experience (7 bridge projects presented, 2 stand alone, 5 bundles, over water); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 22 years experience (6 bridge projects presented, 6 bundles, over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, MSCE, PE, SE, 11 years experience (5 bridge projects presented, 3 bundles, 2 stand alone, over water); ENV Lead = BS Geology, Marine Science, 24 years experience (12 projects presented, stand alone bridges, 1 bundle, over water); Prime (6 bridge projects presented, over water); The PM, Roadway, Bridge and ENV key team leads worked together on 3 projects for the Prime. The PM and Roadway and Bridge key team leads worked together on the other projects for the Prime. (Buddy Covington does not have a BSCE degree.)			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 44/160 Committed = 73% Available; Roadway Lead = 64/160 Committed = 60% Available; Bridge Lead = 64/160 Committed = 60% Available; ENV Lead = 20/160 Committed = 88% Available; Firm + Resources = 8 structures, 17 roadway, 6 hydraulics, 4 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	Practical Design Partners, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 16 years experience (11 projects presented, interchange, widenings, connector, multiple, stand alone bridges, over water); Roadway Lead = SCE, PE, 17+ years experience (multiple widening, widening, 1 stand alone bridge, over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, MSCE, PE, 20 years experience (6 bridge projects presented, 1 bundle, 2 stand alone, over water, interstate, interstate bridges); ENV Lead = BS Ag, 15 years experience (3 projects presented, stand alone bridges, over water); Prime (7 projects presented, operations, widenings, culverts, 3 sidewalks). The PM and Roadway key team lead worked together on all projects for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: PM = 16/160 Committed = 90% Available; Roadway Lead = 40/160 Committed = 75% Available; Bridge Lead = 66/160 Committed = 59% Available; ENV Lead = 29/160 Committed = 82% Available; Firm + Resources = 5 structures, 6 roadway, 3 hydraulics, ? QA/QC support staff. The PDF could not be opened in BlueBeam and was difficult to read. Additional staff listed number but no names.			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More 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:	Precision Planning, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
Comments: PM = BSCE/EE, PE, 47+ years experience (8 projects presented, interchange, bypass, widenings, extensions); Roadway Lead = BS Urban/EnvE, PE, 35+ years experience (4 projects presented, extension, corridor, widenings); Bridge Lead = BSCE, MSSE, PE in 35 States!, 37+ years experience (3 projects presented, extension, stand alone, corridor with bridges); ENV Lead = BAIR, MHP, ?? years experience (3 projects presented, pedestrian bridge, sidewalks, on-call services); Prime (4 projects presented, extension, interchange, bypass, operations); The PM and Roadway key team lead worked together on 2 projects for the Prime. The PM worked on the other projects for the Prime. Not much presentation on bridges or culverts over water.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
Comments: PM = 44/160 Committed = 73% Available; Roadway Lead = 80/160 Committed = 50% Available; Bridge Lead = 76/160 Committed = 53% Available; ENV Lead = 10/160 Committed = 94% Available; Firm + Resources = 70 employees? Not enough detail on org chart.			
Firm Name:	R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 14+ years experience (5 projects presented: Express Lanes, 2 widenings, On-call engr services, bridge over water); Roadway Lead = BCE, PE, 26+ years experience (3 projects presented: widening, bridge over water, Interchange); Bridge Lead = BSCE, PE, SE, 27+ years experience (4 projects presented: express lanes, Interchange, 2 bridges over water); ENV Lead = BS, MA Geography, 15 years experience (5 projects presented - widening, passing lane); Prime = 4 projects presented, interchange, bridge over water, 2 widenings with bridges. The PM and Roadway KTL worked together on 4 projects presented for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
Comments: PM = 86/160 Committed = 46% Available; Roadway Lead = 60/160 Committed = 63% Available; Bridge Lead = 108/160 Committed = 33% Available; ENV Lead = 24/160 Committed = 85% Available; Firm + Resources = 3 roadway, 4 bridge, 2 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	RS&H, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 27 years experience (8 projects presented: 1 bridge bundle, 2 bridge work orders, bridges over water, interstate widening, median barrier, work order, widening); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 18 years experience (3 projects presented: bridge bundle, 2 stand alone bridges over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, MCE, PE, 13 years experience (3 projects presented: bridge bundle, bridge over water, bridge widening); ENV Lead = BS Geology, Marine Science, 24 years experience (3 projects presented, 2stand alone bridges, 1 widening, over water); Prime (6 bridge projects presented, over water); Prime = 4 projects presented, 1 bridge bundle, 3 bridges over water. The PM, Roadway and Bridge KTLs worked together on 2 projects presented for the Prime. The Roadway KTL worked on the other 2.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
Comments: PM = 60/160 Committed = 63% Available; Roadway Lead = 80/160 Committed = 50% Available; Bridge Lead = 40/160 Committed = 75% Available; ENV Lead = 20/160 Committed = 88% Available; Firm + Resources = 5 roadway, 5 bridge, 3 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, ?? years experience (10 projects presented, 5 widenings, connector, CD system, turn lanes, 1 multiple, 1 standalone bridge, over water); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 31+ years experience (3 projects presented including bridges, widening, new roadway, 1 standalone bridge, over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, PE, 30+ years experience (5 bridge projects presented, 1 bridge bundle, 4 stand alone, over water, roadway); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 18+ years experience (2 projects presented, 1 stand alone bridge, over water, 1 roadway); Prime (4 projects presented including bridges, widening, new roadway, 1 standalone bridge, over water); The Roadway team lead have worked on 3 projects presented for the Prime; the PM worked on the other one.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
Comments: PM = 10/160 Committed = 94% Available; Roadway Lead = 46/160 Committed = 71% Available; Bridge Lead = 80/160 Committed = 50% Available; ENV Lead = 64/160 Committed = 60% Available; Firm + Resources = 6 structures, 4 roadway, 5 hydraulics, 1 QA/QC support staff.			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More 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:	STV Incorporated		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 29 years experience (6 projects presented: 1 bridge bundle, 3 stand alone bridges over RR, water, extension, interchanges); Roadway Lead = BCE, PE, 12 years experience (4 projects presented: 4 stand alone bridges over water, RR); Bridge Lead = BSCE, MSCE, PE, SE, 16+ years experience (4 projects presented: 1 bridge batch, 3 stand alone bridge over water, RR); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 18+ years experience (4 projects presented, 1 bridge bundle, 1 multiple, 2 stand alone, over water, roadway); Prime = 5 projects presented, stand alone bridges over water, RR, widening, passing lane. The PM, Roadway and Bridge KTLs worked together on 3 projects presented for the Prime. The PM and Roadway KTL worked together on the other 2.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 36/160 Committed = 78% Available; Roadway Lead = 72/160 Committed = 55% Available; Bridge Lead = 48/160 Committed = 70% Available; ENV Lead = 64/160 Committed = 60% Available; Firm + Resources = 5 roadway, 4 bridge, 3 hydraulics, 1 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 19+ years experience (4 projects presented: 1 bridge bundle, 1 interchange, 3 corridor bridges over water, connector); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 23+ years experience (4 projects presented: 1 bridge bundle, roadway with bridges over water, connector, stand alone bridge over RR); Bridge Lead = BSCE, MSCE, MBA, PE, 23+ years experience (6 projects presented: interchanges, expressway bridge, bridge repairs, 2 stand alone bridges over water, RR); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 17 years experience (4 projects presented, widenings, bypass); Prime = 5 projects presented, stand alone bridges over water, RR, interchange. The PM and Roadway KTL worked together on 4 projects presented for the Prime. The PM worked together on the other one.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 48/160 Committed = 70% Available; Roadway Lead = 48/160 Committed = 70% Available; Bridge Lead = 55/160 Committed = 66% Available; ENV Lead = 64/160 Committed = 60% Available; Firm + Resources = 3 roadway, 3 bridge, 1 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BCE, MSCE, PE, 35+ years experience (GA Safe Dams Program - registered. 4 projects presented: bypass, widening, 1 bridge over water, connector); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 10+ years experience (3 projects presented: bypass, widening, 1 bridge over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, PE, 19 years experience (3 projects presented: 2 stand alone bridges over water, widening); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, ?? years experience (3 projects presented, widenings, bypass); Prime = 3 projects presented, 2 widenings, culvert replacement. The PM and Roadway KTL worked together on 1 projects presented for the Prime. The PM worked on the other two.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: PM = 134/160 Committed = 16% Available; Roadway Lead = 82/160 Committed = 49% Available; Bridge Lead = 28/160 Committed = 83% Available; ENV Lead = 64/160 Committed = 60% Available; Firm + Resources = 4 roadway, 1 bridge, 2 hydraulics, 2 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	Thompson Engineering, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, MS Structures, PE, 30 years experience (11 projects presented: bypass, 2 culvert replacements, bridges over water); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, ?? years experience (5 projects presented: widening, 4 bridges over water); Bridge Lead = BSCE, PE, 35+ years experience (4 projects presented: 4 stand alone bridges over water); ENV Lead = BS Geology, Marine Science, 24+ years experience (6 projects presented, 3 stand alone bridges, pedestrian, 2 over water, 3 widenings); Prime = 5 projects presented, widening, bypass, bridge retrofit, multiple bridges over water, stand alone bridge over water. The PM and Roadway KTL worked together on 2 projects presented for the Prime. The Roadway and Bridge KTLs worked together on the other two.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
Comments: PM = 35/160 Committed = 78% Available; Roadway Lead = 32/160 Committed = 80% Available; Bridge Lead = 88/160 Committed = 45% Available; ENV Lead = 20/160 Committed = 88% Available; Firm + Resources = 3 roadway, 3 bridge, 2 hydraulics, 6 QA/QC support staff.			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name:	TranSystems Corporation		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 27 years experience (8 projects presented: 1 big bridge, stand alone bridges over water, widening); Roadway Lead = BCE, PE, 26 years experience (3 projects presented: 3 stand alone bridges over water); Bridge Lead = BSCET, PE, 27 years experience (3 projects presented: 2 stand alone bridges over water, widening); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 18 years experience (3 projects presented, stand alone bridge, bridge bundle, multiple, over water); Prime = 3 projects presented, stand alone bridges over water and 21 additional bridges listed. The PM and Bridge KTL worked together on 3 projects presented for the Prime.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 48/160 Committed = 70% Available; Roadway Lead = 52/160 Committed = 68% Available; Bridge Lead = 36/160 Committed = 78% Available; ENV Lead = 52/160 Committed = 68% Available; Firm + Resources = 5 roadway, 5 bridge, 3 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, MSCE, PE, 33 years experience (6 projects presented, 4 standalone bridges, 1 new roadway, 1 widening, projects with bridges over water); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 12 years experience (3 projects presented, new roadway, 2 stand alone bridges, over water, RR); Bridge Lead = BSCET, PE, 16 years experience (3 bridge projects presented, over water); ENV Lead = BAIR, MHP, 15 years experience (2 projects presented, bridge batches, over water); Prime (6 projects presented, roadway, 5 stand alone bridges, over water, RR); The PM worked on all projects presented for the Prime; 1 with both Roadway and Bridge team leads; 1 other with Roadway only; and 1 other with Bridge only.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 40/160 Committed = 75% Available; Roadway Lead = 50/160 Committed = 69% Available; Bridge Lead = 20/160 Committed = 88% Available; ENV Lead = 20/160 Committed = 88% Available; Firm + Resources = 5 structures, 7 roadway, 2 hydraulics, 1 QA/QC support staff.			
Firm Name:	WSP USA, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 36 years experience (7 projects presented, widening, 6 standalone bridges, 1 over interstate, over water); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 33 years experience (4 projects presented, widening, 3 bridges over water, bridge maintenance); Bridge Lead = BECE, MSCE, PE, 30 years experience (4 bridge projects presented, widening, 2 multiple, over water, on-call bridges); ENV Lead = BS Env Health, ?? years experience (4 projects presented, 2 stand alone bridges, over water, interchange, ramps); Prime (4 projects presented, widenings, multiple bridges, 1 stand alone water); The PM, Roadway and Bridge team leads have worked on 1 projects together presented for the Prime; the PM worked on 2 others; the Bridge team lead worked on 1 other.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
Comments: PM = 63/160 Committed = 61% Available; Roadway Lead = 104/160 Committed = 35% Available; Bridge Lead = 44/160 Committed = 73% Available; ENV Lead = 48/160 Committed = 70% Available; Firm + Resources = 5 structures, 7 roadway, 2 hydraulics, 3 QA/QC support staff.			

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications
Resources and Workload Capacity

Evaluator 3

<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	Phase One Evaluator 3 Individual	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Adequate	Good	325	2
Arcadis U.S., Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	2
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Adequate	Good	325	2
BCC Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Croy Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	2
Gresham Smith	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Excellent	400	1
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Long Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	2
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	Adequate	Marginal	175	29
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	2
Practical Design Partners, LLC	Adequate	Marginal	175	29
Precision Planning, Inc.	Poor	Marginal	75	31
R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	27
RS&H, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	2
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
STV Incorporated	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
T.Y. Lin International, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	2
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	Marginal	Adequate	200	27
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Good	325	2
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
WSP USA, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	500	%

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 3			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	American Consulting Professionals, LLC		
-------------------	--	--	--

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

PM has 27 YOE; shows BR replacement projects, but role is of a rdwy designer on first bath of projects shown, then second batch shows PM. RDWY has 25 YOE; shows BR replacement exp. BR has 19 YOE; shows Br replacement exp. NEPA has 21 YOE; shows BR replacement project exp. Prime show BR replacement exp. three of four KTLs have work on preivous projects together.

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

Org chart has ample staff. Narrative provide focus on project approach and describes challenges. Mentioned communication and schedule (use of bleubeam and teams). Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	Arcadis U.S., Inc.		
-------------------	--------------------	--	--

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

PM has 17 plys YOE; shows Br replacement exp. RDWY has 24 YOE; shows BR replacement exp. BR has 25 YOE; shows Br replacement exp. NEPA has 6 YOE; shows BR replacement exp. All KTLs have work together on projects. Prime show BR replacment exp.

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

Org chart shows sufficient staffing #. Shows all KTLs. A plus on showing constructability review and multiple QC/QA team. Narrative provides a good focus on environmental, ROW and constructability challenges. Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC		
-------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

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

PM 22 year of experience (YOE); has some PM experience with a bridge replacement project. RDWY 24 YOE with bridge replacement exp. BR 28 YOE; extensive GDOT BR projects exp. NEPA 6 YOE; good amount of exp with bridge replacements. Prime shows ample projects with bridges. Does not look like teams has work on same projects previously.

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

sufficiently staff org chart; all KTLs shown. Addition of a scheduler & constructability reviewer a plus. Also mentioned staying on top of schedule for nepa; another plus. QC/QA mentioned. Workload shows avaiability.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 3			
----------------	--	--	--

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

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
 Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
 Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
 Good = More 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:	BCC Engineering, LLC		
-------------------	----------------------	--	--

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

PM 25 year of experience (YOE); has some PM experience with a bridge replacement project; should clarify what is meant by "task manager"/show equivalency to a PM role. BR has 10 YOE; shows BR replacement projects. RDWY KTL has 18 YOE; shows BR replacement projects. NEPA has 24 YOE; unclear if environmental lead equal NEPA; shows on BR replacement project. Prime shows BR replacement projects

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

sufficiently staff org chart; all KTLs shown. Narrative mentioned QC/QA and staying on top with schedule. Would have been good to mention constructability in narrative. Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.		
-------------------	---	--	--

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

PM has 37 YOE, shows exp with Br replacement project; unsure why a bridge maintenance project was included on the PM list for a replacement project. RDWY has 5 YOE; shows exp with BR replacement projects. BR has 21 YOE; shwos BR replacement exp. NEPA has 18 YOE; shows BR replacement exp. Prime shows exp with BR replacment. Team looks like they have not work together on many projects.

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

sufficiently staff org chart; all KTLs shown; would have been good to represent utilities. Narrative mentioned QC/QA, constructability and staying on top with schedule. May be good to provide a little more on the approach to mitigating the challenges of the project. Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	Croy Engineering, LLC		
-------------------	-----------------------	--	--

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

PM section did not show total YOE; shows BR replacement exp. RDWY has 8 YOE; showing no exp with bridges over water. BR has 15 YOE; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA has 25 YOE; shows one BR replacement project exp. KTLs do not have many projects working together in the past. Prime shows BR replacement projects.

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

Org chart has sufficient staffing #s. Suggest providing details of project specific approach. Workload shows availability.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 3			
----------------	--	--	--

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

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
 Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
 Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
 Good = More 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:	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.		
-------------------	-------------------------	--	--

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

PM has 25 YOЕ; mix exp with some BR replacement projects. RDWY has 30 plys YOЕ; shows BR replacement project exp, but role on those projects are PM. BR has 29 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA has 18 YOЕ; shows some BR replacement projects. Prime shows one BR replacement. Another one states a bridge crossing that must be designed (need more detail).

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

Org chart shows ample staffing; pls to have scheduler and team of QC/QA; would have been good to show utility staff. Narrative lacks some discussion on approach to project. Workload show availability.

Firm Name:	Gresham Smith		
-------------------	---------------	--	--

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

PM has 13 YOЕ, shows BR replacement exp. RDWY has 10 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. BR has 29 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA has 17 YOЕ (other proposer documents range from 17 to 19); shows BR replacement exp. All KTLs except NEPA have worked together on previous projects. Prime shows BR replacement exp.

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

Org chart is sufficiently staffed. Narrative focused on constructability and early coordination to ensure schedule. Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.		
-------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

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

PM has 23 YOЕ; shows project management role on various BR replacement projects. RDWY has 27 YOЕ; shows RDWY role on various BR replacement projects. BR has 18 YOЕ; shows BR role on various BR replacement projects. NEPA states several years of exp (total not shown); has one Br replacement exp. Prime shows ample BR replacement projects. All other KTL except NEPA have worked on similar projects.

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

Ample staffing of Org chart. May have been better to show some utility staffing. Narrative eloquently discusses, effectively scheduling, constructability, stake holder engagement, QC.QA & practical design. Org chart supports narrative. Workload shows availability.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 3			
----------------	--	--	--

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

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
Good = More 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:	Holt Consulting Company, LLC		
-------------------	------------------------------	--	--

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

PM has 22 YOЕ, RDWY has 24 YOЕ, BR has 13 YOЕ, and NEPA has 25 YOЕ. PM, RDWY , and BR all show BR replacement exp. Note on NEPA, on this proposal his role is designated as NEPA; shows BR replacement exp. RDWY and NEPA have worked on past projects together. Prime shows BR replacement exp.

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

Org chart is sufficiently staffed; a plus showing constructability review staff. Suggest provided project approach details in narrative. Workload shows availability. GDOT PM scores on prime project shows average of 80 out of 100. What is considered a "passing" grade/performance?

Firm Name:	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		
-------------------	---	--	--

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

PM has 20 YOЕ; shows BR replacment project exp. RDWY has 15 YOЕ; has BR replacement exp. BR has 16 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA has 18 YOЕ; shows BR replacement project exp. Prime has BR replacement project exp. ICE KTLs have worked together in the past.

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

Org chart is staff sufficiently; a;; KTLs listed. Suggest adding scheduler staff as a plus. Narrative is details of proposed project approach; key challenges. Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	KCI Technologies, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------	--	--

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

PM has 22 YOЕ; shows projects with BR replacement exp. RDWY has 23 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. BR has 19 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA does not show total YOЕ (other documents did); shows BR replacement exp. Prime exp shows BR replacement project. KCI KTLs have worked on previous projects together.

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

Org chart is sufficiently staffed; plus on showing QC/QA staff, breakdown of ENV disciplines. Narrative discusses project challenges, procurement, ENV, & constructability. Suggest discussing details on project approach.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 3			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
-------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

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

PM has 18 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. RDWY has 16 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. BR has 25 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA has 27 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. Prime shows BR replacement exp. All KH KTLs have worked together on previous projects.

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

Org chart sufficiently staffed; plus to shows QC/QA; all KTLs shown. Add some more details on project approach. Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	Long Engineering, LLC		
-------------------	-----------------------	--	--

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

PM has 32 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. RDWY has 28 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA has 24 YOЕ; not clear if exp shown is as NEPA; shows BR replacement exp. BR has 38 YOЕ; show Br replacement exp (most are older projects; suggest showing more recent worked on or completed projects). Prime show BR replacement projects. Note that the BR KTL has roles as PM on some of the prime projects. KTL except NEPA have worked on similar projects in the past.

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

Suggest showing breakout of environmental (ENV) specialist. Suggest provide some project approach. Good mentions of QC/QA, constructability, and schedule. Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	Lowe Engineers, LLC		
-------------------	---------------------	--	--

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

PM has 24 YOЕ; has BR replacement exp. RDWY has 23 YOЕ; has BR replacement exp. BR has 20 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA has 22 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA has 22 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. Prime shows BR replacement exp. KTLs have past and ongoing projects working together.

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

Org chart is sufficiently staffed; all KTLs shown. Plus to mention constructability in narrative. Suggest adding some more project specific discussions. Workload shows availability.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 3			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------	--	--

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

PM has 20 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. RDWY has 15 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. BR has 35 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA has 22 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. Prime KTLs have worked together in previous project. Prime exp shows BR replacement projects.

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

Org chart show sufficient staffing #s and shows all KTLs. Narrative provides approaches to constructability reviews (section 20), schedule focus (early tasks), and performing QC/QA. Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.		
-------------------	---------------------	--	--

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

PM has 29 YOЕ; shows some project exp with Br replacements. RDWY has 20 YOЕ; shows mix exp as PM & RDWY on projects; shows some BR replacement exp. BR has 15 YOЕ; shows BR replacement project exp. NEPA has over 20 YOЕ; shows BR replacement project exp (Note: is environmental lead = NEPA?). Prime shows some BR replacement project exp. KTLs have worked on previous projects together.

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

Org chart is sufficiently staff; shows all KTLs; plus on multi-member QC/QA team and constructability reviewer. Detailed narrative pin pointing project challenges and some possible solutions. To even elevate the narrative would require discussion on procurement and schedule management. Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.		
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--	--

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

PM has 31 YOЕ; has BR replacement exp. RDWY has 13 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. BR has 26 YOЕ; has BR replacement exp. NEPA has 30 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. Prime shows BR replacement exp. NV5 KTLs have worked together on ongoing projects.

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

Org chart is sufficiently staffed, but did not list 4.04 area class. All KTLs shown. Suggest provide some discussion in narrative about the project challenges.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 3			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------------------	--	--

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

PM has 17 plus YOE; shows BR replacement exp. RDWY has 22 YOE; shows BR replacement exp. BR has 11 YOE; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA has 19 YOE, shows BR replacement exp. All KTLs except NEPA have worked on previous/ongoing projects. Prime shows Br replacement exp.

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

Org chart show ample staffing; showing all KTLs. A plus for showing constructability reviews, team of QC/QA, and project schedulers. Detailed narrative focus on challenges of procurement, schedule, environmental, constructability and practical design. Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	Practical Design Partners, LLC		
-------------------	--------------------------------	--	--

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

PM has 16 YOE; shows some BR replacement exp. RDY has 17 YOE; shows BR replacment exp. BR has 20 YOE; shows BR replacement project exp. NEPA states several YO, but total # is not shown; shows BR replacement exp. Prime exp is not showing any BR replacement exp; most likely due to short history of firm. PM & RDWY KTLs have worked together on previous projects. NOTE: document format needs some work; BR and NEPA KTLs had a different format from the PM & RDWY; choice of proposal cover would have been benefical to show the project bridge.

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

Org chart is sufficiently staff. Suggest showing QC/QA staff; recommend showing breakdown of ENV fields. Narrative pin points project challenges; mentioned ABC but offers no details. Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	Precision Planning, Inc.		
-------------------	--------------------------	--	--

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

PM has 47 YOE; interesting note that the PM project exp centers around gwinnett/barrow counties for the most part; shows BR replacement exp. RDWY has 35 YOE; project exp shows role more to be PM.; does not show BR replacement exp. BR has 37 YOE, shows mostly BR interchange exp (project is br replacement over water). NEPA YOE not stated. Difficult to tell if project exp is for NEPA role. Prime exp does not show br replacement over water.

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

Org chart seems to be showcasing the prime staff versus what the project needs. No breakdown of environmental (ENV) disciplines. All KTLs shown. Narrative lacking in approach of project; discuss the project specifics more. Work load shows availability.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 3			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

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

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

PM has 14 YOE; has BR replacement exp. RDWY has 26 YOE; shows BR replacement exp. BR has 27 YOE; has mix exp as a PM & KTL on some BR replacement exp. NEPA has 15 YOE; shows ENV exp but no BR replacement exp. Prime shows BR replacement exp. All RKS KTLs show experience with working together in past projects.

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

Org chart is sufficiently staff. Note that the RDWY KTL is shown also as RDYW QC; all KTLs shown. Suggest to add discussion about the project challenges.

Firm Name:	RS&H, Inc.		
-------------------	------------	--	--

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

PM has 27 YOE; shows some older BR replacement exp. RDWY has 18 YOE; shows BR replacement exp (mentions section 20 coordination). BR has 13 YOE; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA has 24 YOE; shows BR replacement exp. Prime shows BR replacement exp. RSH KTLs have worked together on past projects.

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

Org chart is sufficiently staff; a plus to show project control staff. Narrative provide discussion on project challenges (ENV historic & cultural). Mention using metal shell pile in NE region is of interest (predominately use steel H piles for piling type in this region). Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)		
-------------------	------------------------------------	--	--

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

PM does not state his total years of experience (YOE) description of experience, but shown on org chart. (other KTL states YOE; inconsistent format) - experience (exp) is mixed of DB and DBB with bridges. RDWY 31 YOE mix exp with more DB than DBB of with bridges involved. BR 30 YOE; GDOT BR projects. NEPA 18 YOE; showing only two projects. Prime shows projects with bridges. Does not look like teams has work on same projects previously.

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

sufficiently staff org chart; all KTLs shown. Available to do the work. Would have been good to mention bridge constructability, schedules and QC/QA items on narrative. Workload shows availability.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 3			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	STV Incorporated		
-------------------	------------------	--	--

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

PM has 29 YOЕ; provides BR replacement exp. RDWY has 12 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. BR has 16 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA has 18 YOЕ; show BR replacement exp. All KTL except NEPA have worked on previous projects together. Prime shows BR replacement projects.

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

Org chart shows sufficient staff & shows all KTLs. Narrative focus on environmental challenges. Suggest mentioning constructability. Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------------	--	--

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

PM has 19 YOЕ; seems to be serving dual role on stated project exp (PM & BR) & role in some projects are unclear; shows BR replacement projects. BR has 23 YOЕ; has BR replacement projects. NOTE: PM And BR KTLs have show two projects on each exp list where it is not clear what role each did on the projects (SR 14 & 75 DDI). RDWY KTL has 23 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. NEAP (interesting no pic) has 17; project exp listed do not involved BR replacements. Note Nepa KTL also on RKK team and show 18 YOЕ. NEPA KTL has not work on alot of the same project exp with the other KTL. Prime exp show all BR replacement projects. None have been completed.

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

Org chart looks to have sufficient staff with all KTLs listed. Narrative regarding the approach of the project included discussions on constructability, schedule, and QC/QA. Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.		
-------------------	---------------------------------	--	--

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

PM has 35 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. RDWY has 10 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. BR has 19 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA did not show the total # of YOЕ (other documents have shown 17 to 19 YOЕ); does not show BR replacement projects (other documents did). Prime shows one BR replacement project exp. Suggest showing one or two more similar projects to proposal.

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

Org chart sufficiently staffed; all KTLs shown; plus to show multi-staff QC/QA; ENV breakdown shown. Note: why show a QC/QA staff that can not be part of the project due to conflicts? Suggest providing some focus on project challenges on narrative.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 3			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	Thompson Engineering, Inc.		
-------------------	----------------------------	--	--

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

PM has 30 YOE; roles have been more Structural KTL than PM; shows BR replacement exp. RDWY looks to have 32 YOE (not stated, but inferred by statements on proposal); shows BR replacement exp. BR has 35 YOE; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA has 24 YOE; shows BR replacement exp. Prime shows BR replacement exp. KTLS have some experience working together in the past.

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

Org Chart is sufficiently staffed; all KTLS shown. Narratives points out use of ABC next beam without providing details on challenges of installation due to heavier weight of these units. Plus on early coordination with ENV and construction (section 20). Workload shows availability.

Firm Name:	TranSystems Corporation		
-------------------	-------------------------	--	--

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

Pm has 27 YOE; shows exp with BR replacement projects; several in D1 counties adjacent to this project. RDWY has 26 YOE; shows exp with BR replacement projects; BR has 27 YOE; shows exp with BR replacement projects. NEPA has 18 YOE, shows exp with BR replacement projects. Prime shows BR replacement project exp.

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

Sufficiently staff org chart. Workload shows availability. Narrative displayed understanding of challenges of the project and the need to work hand in hand with the district.

Firm Name:	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.		
-------------------	-------------------------------	--	--

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

PM has 28 YOE; shows BR replacement project exp. RDWY has 12 YOE; has Br replacement exp. BR has 16 YOE; has BR replacement exp. NEPA has 15 YOE; has BR replacement exp. Prime shows BR replacement project exp. PM, RDWY & BR KTLs have worke together in the past.

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

Org chart is sufficiently staffed; all KTLs shown. Narrative lists project challenges such as cultural resources (Nacoochee Mound) and historic Hardman Farm. Suggest also discussing importance of procurement and early coordination of environmental tasks; constructability. Workload shows availability.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 3			
----------------	--	--	--

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

Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points
Good = More 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:	WSP USA, Inc.		
-------------------	---------------	--	--

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

PM has 36 YOЕ; shows Br replacement exp. RDWY has 33 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. BR has 30 YOЕ; shows BR replacement exp. NEPA does not show total # YOЕ; show BR replacement exp. Prime shows Br replacement exp; most of the KTLs have worked together on previous projects.

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

Org chart show sufficient staffing #s. Narrative only talks about additional resource; no project approach or key task items. Workload shows availability.

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications
Resources and Workload Capacity

Evaluator 4

<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	Phase One	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	200	13
Arcadis U.S., Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
BCC Engineering, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	200	13
Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Croy Engineering, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	200	13
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	13
Gresham Smith	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	2
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Long Engineering, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	200	13
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Marginal	Marginal	125	26
Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.	Marginal	Marginal	125	26
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	13
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	13
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Practical Design Partners, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	200	13
Precision Planning, Inc.	Marginal	Marginal	125	26
R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	Marginal	Marginal	125	26
RS&H, Inc.	Adequate	Marginal	175	25
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)	Marginal	Adequate	200	13
STV Incorporated	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
T.Y. Lin International, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	13
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.	Marginal	Adequate	200	13
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Marginal	Marginal	125	26
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	13
WSP USA, Inc.	Marginal	Marginal	125	26
<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	500	%

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 4			
----------------	--	--	--

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 Professionals, LLC		
-------------------	--	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	Arcadis U.S., Inc.		
-------------------	--------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime each demonstrate considerable experience with similar projects.

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime exceed the minimum qualifications for available resources and workload capacity.

Firm Name:	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC		
-------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: Up to snuff

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

Comments: Up to snuff

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 4			
----------------	--	--	--

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:	BCC Engineering, LLC		
-------------------	----------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	Columbia Engineering and Services, Inc.		
-------------------	---	--	--

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

Comments: Up to snuff

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	Croy Engineering, LLC		
-------------------	-----------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: Up to snuff

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 4			
----------------	--	--	--

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:	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.		
-------------------	-------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	Gresham Smith		
-------------------	---------------	--	--

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

Comments: Up to snuff

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.		
-------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: Up to snuff

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime exceed the minimum qualifications for available resources and workload capacity.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 4			
----------------	--	--	--

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:	Holt Consulting Company, LLC		
-------------------	------------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: Up to snuff

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		
-------------------	---	--	--

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

Comments: Up to snuff

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	KCI Technologies, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: Up to snuff

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

Comments: Up to snuff

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 4			
----------------	--	--	--

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:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
-------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: Up to snuff

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	Long Engineering, LLC		
-------------------	-----------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	Lowe Engineers, LLC		
-------------------	---------------------	--	--

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

Comments:

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

Comments: PM, KTL, and Prime lack sufficient available resources and workload capacity.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 4			
----------------	--	--	--

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:	Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: PM, KTL, and Prime lack sufficient available resources and workload capacity.

Firm Name:	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.		
-------------------	---------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.		
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: Up to snuff

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 4			
----------------	--	--	--

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.		
-------------------	------------------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: Up to snuff

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	Practical Design Partners, LLC		
-------------------	--------------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	Precision Planning, Inc.		
-------------------	--------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: PM, KTL, and Prime lack sufficient available resources and workload capacity.

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 4			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

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

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: PM, KTL, and Prime lack sufficient available resources and workload capacity.

Firm Name:	RS&H, Inc.		
-------------------	------------	--	--

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

Comments: Up to snuff

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

Comments: PM, KTL, and Prime lack sufficient available resources and workload capacity.

Firm Name:	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)		
-------------------	------------------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: Up to snuff

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 4			
----------------	--	--	--

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:	STV Incorporated		
-------------------	------------------	--	--

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

Comments: Up to snuff

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.		
-------------------	------------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co.		
-------------------	---------------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: Up to snuff

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 4			
----------------	--	--	--

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

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

Firm Name:	Thompson Engineering, Inc.		
-------------------	----------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: PM, KTL, and Prime lack sufficient available resources and workload capacity.

Firm Name:	TranSystems Corporation		
-------------------	-------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: Up to snuff

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

Comments: Up to snuff

Firm Name:	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.		
-------------------	-------------------------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: Up to snuff

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

Evaluator #: 4			
----------------	--	--	--

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:	WSP USA, Inc.		
-------------------	---------------	--	--

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

Comments: PM, KTLs, and Prime lack sufficient relevant experience.

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

Comments: Generally the necessary SME's are shown to be available but taken as a whole the team does not inspire confidence.

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

Solicitation Title:	Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services	1	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.
Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	1	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria FOR TOP 15 SUBMITTALS		1	TranSystems Corporation
(This Page For GDOT Use)		1	Holt Consulting Company, LLC
		1	STV Incorporated
		1	Arcadis U.S., Inc.
		7	KCI Technologies, Inc.
		7	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING)			
	Score	Ranking		
			10	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC
			10	RS&H, Inc.
			10	American Consulting Professionals, LLC
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	375	1	10	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	375	1	10	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.
TranSystems Corporation	375	1	10	Gresham Smith
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	375	1		
STV Incorporated	375	1		
Arcadis U.S., Inc.	375	1		
KCI Technologies, Inc.	325	7		
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	325	7		
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	250	10		
RS&H, Inc.	250	10		
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	300	9		
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	250	10		
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	250	10		
T.Y. Lin International, Inc.	250	10		
Gresham Smith	250	10		

Evaluation Criteria →				
	Experience and Qualifications		Resources and Workload Capacity	
<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	Phase One Scores and Group Ranking	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
TranSystems Corporation	Good	Good	375	1
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Good	Good	375	1
STV Incorporated	Good	Good	375	1
Arcadis U.S., Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	7
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	7
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	10
RS&H, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	10
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	9
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	10
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	10
T.Y. Lin International, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	10
Gresham Smith	Adequate	Adequate	250	10
<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	500	%

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Heath & Lineback's PM has 23 years of project management experience, inclusive of various engineering and transportation projects, and bridge replacements over water. The PM listed 6 projects, which included 2 widenings, 1 multiple, and 3 standalone bridges over water, all in similar scale of this project. The Roadway KTL has 24 years of experience, and listed 4 projects, which included 1 interchange and 3 stand alone bridges over water. The Bridge KTL has 18 years experience and listed 4 bridge projects, which 3 were stand alone bridge projects over water. The NEPA KTL has a Bachelor of Science degree in Agricultural Engineering, but did not provide exact years of experience. The NEPA listed 4 projects highlighting passing lanes, roundabouts, and multiple bridges over water and railroads, which were similar in scale to this project. In addition, the NEPA KTL has a history of presenting NEPA work early in project which strategy aids in preventing challenges to delay the schedule. The Prime completed projects of similar scale, such as stand alone bridges over water and railroad, and all have familiarity with GDOT's policies and procedures. The PM, Roadway and Bridge KTL's have worked on 2 projects together, the PM and Roadway KTL worked on 2 projects together, and the PM and Bridge KTL on 1 project together for the Prime.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Heath & Lineback's PM and KTL's have ample availability and time dedication to this project. The Prime organized their chart with the following resources: delegating 4 personnel to structures, 5 for roadway, 1 for hydraulics, and 5 QA/QC support staff. The evaluation team suggests showing some utility staffing. Overall, their narrative eloquently discusses effectively scheduling, constructability, stakeholder engagement, use of QC/QA, and practical design.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Parson's PM has 17 years of experience and listed 7 bridge projects, which included 2 stand alone, and 5 bridge bundles projects over water. The Roadway KTL has 22 years experience and listed 6 bridge projects, all were resulting from bundles over water and similar in scales to this project. In addition, the Roadway KTL has experience with impact minimization and environmental permitting following GDOT process on bridges over waterways. The Bridge KTL has 11 years of experience, listed 5 bridge projects, which 2 were stand alone bridges over water. The NEPA Lead has 19 years experience, and listed 4 bridge projects, which 3 of the projects consisted of stand alone bridges over water and railroad. The Prime and KTLs have worked on similar projects of this scale, which they listed 6 bridge over water, PM and all KTL's have extensive knowledge of GDOT policies and procedures, and the PM, Roadway, Bridge KTL's previously worked together on projects for the Prime.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Parson's organizational chart shows ample workload availability and staffing for PM and KTL's; showing all KTLs. In addition, the Prime included a role for constructability reviews, QC/QA team, and project schedulers. The Prime had a detailed narrative that focuses on procurement, schedule, environmental, constructability and practical design challenges and how each would be mitigated. Lastly, the Prime listed QA/QC for each discipline, in addition to, project controls and a constructability and cost estimating team.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	TranSystems Corporation		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>TranSystems PM has 27 years of experience and listed 8 projects of relevant scope, and were inclusive of standalone bridges over water and bridge widening. The Roadway KTL has 26 years experience and served as the Lead on 3 stand alone bridges over water, which were relevant to this project and high in technicality. The Bridge Lead has 27 years experience and completed 2 stand alone bridges over water and 1 bridge widening. In addition, the Bridge KTL is experienced in modeling complicated bridge hydraulics, highly knowledgeable of FEMA requirements, and has been responsible for the geometry and final design of multiple bridge types, including steel beam widenings, reinforced deck girder bridges, and prestressed (PSC) beam bridges. The NEPA KTL lead has 18 years experience consisting of a variety of bridge types, such as stand alone bridges, bridge bundles, and multiple bridges over water. The Prime listed 3 stand alone bridges over water and 21 additional bridges listed. The PM and KTL's are very knowledgeable of GDOT policies and procedures, and the PM and Bridge KTL have worked together on 3 projects.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Transystems' PM and all KTL's have ample availability to work on this project. The Prime's organizational chart assigns 5 staff to Roadway, 5 to Bridge, and 3 QA/QC support staff, which is sufficient. Lastly, the Prime's narrative demonstrated understanding of project challenges, and addressed the steps and importance of working directly with the GDOT district.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Holt Consulting Company, LLC		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Holt's PM has 22 years of experience and listed 6 bridge projects, all over water, and similar to scale as this project. The Roadway KTL has 24 years of experience, listed 3 relevant bridge projects -1 widening and 2 stand alone over water, and the projects included public involvement, raising bridges to meet Hydraulic Design Criteria, 404 Permitting, and utility coordination. The Bridge KTL has 13 years of experience, listed 4 bridge projects over water, which included raising and lengthening existing bridge, rural environments, stream crossings, milestone cost estimates, and turn-key projects. The NEPA KTL has 25 years of experience and completed 3 projects with bridges over water. The Prime and KTL's are knowledgeable of GDOT policies and procedures, and have listed 4 bridge projects all over various water types. The PM, Roadway, and NEPA KTL's previously worked together on 4 projects for the Prime.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Holt's PM and all KTL's have availability for this project. The organizational chart is complete with 5 personnel for structures, 5 for roadway, 4 for hydraulics, and 2 QA/QC support staff, which overall is sufficiently staffed. The Prime also included a constructability review staff. Proposal would have been stronger if Prime provided project approach details in narrative.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	STV Incorporated		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>STV's PM has 29 years experience, 20 of those years serving as a project manager for GDOT and local roadway design projects, managing multidisciplinary teams of roadway, bridge, NEPA planners, and environmental specialists. The PM listed 6 bridge replacement projects of varying types, such as 1 bridge bundle, 3 stand alone bridges over water, extension, and interchanges. The Roadway KTL has 12 years of experience and was the lead on 4 projects listed, which included 4 stand alone bridges over water and railroad. The Bridge KTL has over 16 years of experience and was the lead for 4 projects listed, which included 1 bridge batch, and 3 stand alone bridges over water and railroad. The NEPA KTL has over 18 years of experience and served as an environmental project manager and as NEPA/GEPA planner on transportation-related projects, including roadway improvements and widenings, and bridge replacements and improvements. The NEPA KTL listed 4 projects, including of 1 bridge bundle, 1 multiple, and 2 stand alone bridges over water and roadway. The Prime and all KTL's are very knowledgeable of GDOT's policies and procedures. Additionally, the Prime has worked on 5 projects in similar scale to this project, in which, the PM, Roadway and Bridge KTLs worked together on 3 projects, and the PM and Roadway KTL worked together on the other 2.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>STV's PM and all KTL's have ample workload availability to designate time to this project. The organizational chart has 5 roadway personnel, 4 for bridge, 3 for hydraulics, and 1 QA/QC support staff. The evaluation team prefers if there was additional QA/QC as it would be necessary for this project. The narrative did focus on environmental challenges, but the evaluation team also suggests mentioning constructability.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Arcadis U.S., Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Arcadis' PM has over 17 years of experience, previously managed projects using design-bid-build (DBB) and design-build (DB) delivery, completed numerous GDOT projects including bridge replacements, bridge hydraulics, widenings, inspections, and rehabilitation/reconstruction. The PM listed 6 projects, including 4 bridge bundles and 2 standalone bridges over water and railroad. The Roadway KTL has over 24 years of experience and served as a lead for 4 GDOT projects and 1 FDOT project, these projects consisted of 3 bridge bundles, 1 multiple, and 1 standalone bridge over water. The Bridge KTL has over 25 years of experience and served as a lead on 5 bridge projects that were listed including 1 bundle, 2 multiple, 1 standalone, and 1 interchange, all over water. The NEPA KTL has over 6 years experience and served as an environmental lead for 5 bridge projects, all over water. The Prime completed 4 projects, which included bridges, 2 bridge bundles, 1 bypass, 1 widening, all over water. The PM worked on all 4 projects for the Prime; 2 included all KTL's and 2 included the Bridge team lead. Overall, the PM and KTL's possess the complex knowledge, technical ability, previously used GDOT policies and procedures, and experience to complete this project.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Arcadis' PM and KTL's have the capacity to complete the project. The organizational chart showed sufficient staffing, having 4 roles for structures, 4 for roadway, 1 for hydraulics, and 3 QA/QC support staff. As a plus, the Prime included staff for constructability reviews and a multiple QC/QA team. Proposal could be stronger in this section there was redundancy for bridge hydraulic staff.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	KCI Technologies, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>KCI's PM has 22 years of experience and served as a project manager on 5 GDOT bridge projects, including 2 widenings, and 2 stand alone bridges over water. The Roadway KTL has 23 years of experience and served as a lead on 4 projects, including 1 bridge widening and 3 stand alone bridges over water. The Bridge KTL has 19 years of experience, and was a lead for 3 projects listed: 1 corridor and 2 stand alone bridges over water. The NEPA lead did not list years of experience but served as an environmental lead on 3 projects listed such as 1 express lanes project and 2 bridges over water. The Prime previously completed 4 bridge projects: 2 bridge bundles, and 2 stand alone bridges over water. The PM and KTL's have knowledge of GDOT policies and procedures. Additionally, the PM, Roadway and Bridge KTL are currently working on 1 bridge project, which is still in progress. The PM and Roadway KTL have worked together on 1 past project.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>KCI's PM and KTL's have ample availability to work on this project. The organizational chart outlines 4 staff for structures, 8 for roadway, 5 for hydraulics, and 3 QA/QC support staff. As a plus, the QC/QA chart was detailed and showed redundancy. Additionally, the Prime's narrative discusses project challenges, procurement, environmental, and constructability and details their approach to handling such challenges. Lastly, they included 1 construction personnel to work with GDOT District 1 construction staff.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Neel-Schaffer's PM has over 29 years of experience and previously managed and listed 10 projects, which included a variety of 2 bridge batches, interchanges, drainages, bridges over railroad, bridge widenings, and bridges over water. The Roadway KTL has 29 years of experience, listed and served as a lead on 5 bridge projects inclusive of 2 batches, bridge over railroad, drainage, and over water. The Bridge KTL has over 15 years of experience and served as a lead for 6 bridge projects, including 3 batches, 1 stand alone, 1 over railroad, and 1 over water. The NEPA Lead has over 20 years of experience and listed 12 projects providing environmental work and NEPA documentation expertise, some included 1 bridge batch, stand alone, widenings with bridges, and bridges over water. The Prime listed 6 projects including 3 bridge batches, stand alone, over water, and railroad. The PM and KTL's have the experience and knowledge of GDOT policies and procedures from past work. The PM and all KTL's have worked together on 3 or more projects for the Prime. Lastly, the evaluation team suggests while past involvement in Design-Build projects is relevant, it would be beneficial to demonstrate past experience with similar projects under a Design-Bid-Build delivery mechanism.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Neel-Schaffer's PM and KTL's have a high level of availability to commit to this project. The organizational chart lists 5 roles in structures, 5 in roadway, 2 in hydraulics, and 4 QA/QC support staff. As a plus, there is multi-member QC/QA team and constructability reviewer. Also, the Prime has a detailed narrative outlining project challenges and possible solutions..</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Atlas' PM has 22 years of experience and listed 8 projects, which included 1 standalone bridge, 6 interchange and widening projects with bridges over water. The Roadway KTL has over 24 years of experience and served as a lead on 4 bridge projects which were all over water. The Bridge KTL has 28 years of experience, was a former GDOT State Bridge Engineer, completed over 1000 bridge reviews, and listed and served as a lead on 5 bridge projects, all over water. The NEPA Lead has 6 years experience and completed NEPA documentation for 5 bridge projects, all over water. The PM and KTL's are knowledgeable of GDOT processes and procedures. The Prime listed 5 bridge projects over water, but only the PM and NEPA KTL previously worked on projects with the Prime.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Atlas has a sufficiently staffed organizational chart, and included 4 members for QA/QC. The evaluation team suggests adding a project scheduler, but overall their narrative addresses their proposed project approach and key challenges.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	RS&H, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>RS&H's PM has 27 years of experience and listed 8 projects, which were inclusive of various bridge types, such as 1 bridge bundle, 2 bridge work orders, bridges over water, interstate widening, median barrier, work order, and widening. The Roadway KTL has 18 years of experience and served as a lead on 3 bridge projects for 1 bridge bundle, and 2 stand alone bridges over water. The Bridge KTL has 13 years of experience and served as a lead on 3 projects, such as 1 bridge bundle, bridge over water, and bridge widening. The NEPA KTL has 24 years experience and served as a lead on 3 projects, 2 stand alone bridges, and 1 widening over water. The Prime completed 6 bridge projects over water, and the PM and KTL's possess the knowledge of GDOT policies and procedures. The PM, Roadway and Bridge KTLs worked together on 2 projects presented for the Prime. The Roadway KTL worked 2 past bridge projects.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>RS&H's PM and KTL's have availability to work on this project. The organizational chart lists 5 roles for roadway, 5 for bridge, and 3 QA/QC support staff. Overall, the narrative could have provided more specifics in its approach.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Kimley-Horn's PM has 18 years of experience and served as a PM on 8 projects listed, such as 2 bridge bundles, corridor, widening, extension, and 1 stand alone over water. The Roadway KTL has 16 years experience and served as a lead for 4 bridge projects, which were stand alone, over water, and over railroad. The Bridge KTL has 25 years experience and served as a lead on 1 multiple, 2 bridge bundles, which all were over water. The NEPA lead has 27 years experience, and provided environmental documentation for 4 bridge bundles, 1 big bridge, and 1 stand alone project over water and railroad. The PM and KTL's have extensive knowledge from previous work, which were in scale and relevance to this project, and are very knowledgeable of GDOT's policies and procedures. The Prime completed work on 2 bridge bundles, and 2 widenings with bridges over water and an extension. The PM and all KTLs worked together on a past project, and several projects listed had prior mix of PM and KTL involvement.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Kimley-Horn's PM and all KTL's have sufficient availability to commit to this project. The organizational chart is complete with 5 roles for structures, 4 for roadway, and 4 for hydraulics. The evaluation team suggests the Prime to consider breakout for bridge hydraulics. Also, there are 3 QA/QC support staff and is detailed with all KTL's shown. However, the details on project approach could have been more specific.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	American Consulting Professionals, LLC		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>American Consulting Professionals' PM has 27 years of experience, managed and worked on 10 bridge projects of varying types, such as 10 standalone bridges over water, few were in scale to this project. The Roadway KTL has 25 years of experience and served as a lead for 3 bridge projects over water. The Bridge Lead has 19 years of experience and served as a lead on 3 bridge projects over water. The NEPA KTL has 21 years of experience and completed 3 bridge projects, including a multiple and 1 over water. The Prime listed 5 bridge projects over water, in which the PM, Roadway and Bridge KTL's were on 2 projects; the Roadway and Bridge KTL's were on 1 project, and The PM and Bridge KTL were on the other 2. The PM and KTL's have sufficient knowledge of the project and are knowledgeable of GDOT policies and procedures.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>American Consulting Professionals' PM and KTL's have availability to work on this project. The organizational chart has 4 roles for structures, 4 for roadway, 3 for hydraulics, and 4 QA/QC support staff. The narrative did provide a focus on project approach and described challenges.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Infrastructure's PM has over 20 years of experience, listed and served as PM on 5 bridge projects: 1 bundle, 3 stand alone over water and 1 widening. The Roadway KTL has 14 years experience and has served as a lead on 4 bridge projects, such as 2 bundles over water, 1 interchange, and 1 widening. The Bridge KTL has 16 years of experience and served as a lead on 4 projects, such as 2 bundles over water, 1 interchange, and 1 widening. The NEPA KTL has over 18 years experience with and provided environmental documentation for 4 bridge projects, 1 bundle, 1 stand alone, 1 multiple over water and over railroad. The Prime listed 5 projects, including 3 bridge bundles, and 2 widenings over water. The PM, Roadway and Bridge key team leads worked together on 1 project for the Prime. The Roadway and Bridge key team leads worked together on the other 4 projects for the Prime, but none with NEPA involvement. Overall, the PM and KTL's possess ability to work on this type of project and has knowledge of GDOT policies and procedures.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Infrastructure's PM and KTL's have availability to work on this project. The organizational chart has 4 roles for structures, 4 for roadway, 4 for hydraulics, and 3 QA/QC support staff, which is sufficient. The narrative does describe their project approach and key challenges.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	T.Y. Lin International, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>TY Lin's PM has over 19 years of experience and completed various bridge project types, such as 1 bridge bundle, 1 interchange, and 3 corridor bridges over water and connector. Additionally, the PM has served as an Engineer of Record, Task Lead, Owners representative, and PM for conventional and complex bridges, rail bridges, bridge flyovers, bridge restoration, bridge widenings, guideway rail bridges, bridge inspections and bridge load rating. The Roadway KTL has over 23 years of experience and listed 4 bridge projects, some FDOT projects, including 1 bridge bundle and roadway with bridges over water, connector, stand alone bridge over railroad, but mostly as a designer. The Bridge KTL has over 23 years of experience and served as a lead for 4 bridge projects listed, which included interchanges, expressway bridge, bridge repairs, and 2 stand alone bridges over water and railroad. The NEPA KTL has over 17 years of experience, and provided NEPA documentation and assessed environmental impacts for 4 bridge projects listed including bridge widenings and bypass. The Prime has experience with 5 bridge projects listed. including stand alone bridges over water and railroad, and interchange. The PM and KTL's possess knowledge of GDOT policies and procedures. The PM and Roadway KTL worked together on 4 projects presented for the Prime.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>TY Lin's PM and KTL's have availability to commit to this project. The organizational chart consisted of 3 roadway staff, 3 bridge staff, and 1 QA/QC support staff. Lastly, the narrative stated their project approach and included discussions on constructability, schedule, and QC/QA.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Gresham Smith		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Gresham Smith's PM has 13 years experience and listed 6 bridge type projects such as 1 multiple set of bridges, 1 standalone bridge over water, 2 interchanges, 1 widening, and 1 intersection improvement. The Roadway Lead has 10 years experience and served as lead for 4 bridge projects presented, such as 3 stand alone bridges over water, and 1 interchange. The Bridge KTL has 29 years of experience and presented 6 various bridge type projects, including 1 bypass, 1 big bridge, 3 stand alone bridges, and 1 multiple over water. The NEPA Lead has 17 years of experience and provided environmental assessments for 4 bridge projects, including 1 bundle, 1 multiple, and 2 stand alone over water. The Prime has worked on 6 bridge projects, including 1 interchange, 5 stand alone bridges over water and railroad. The PM and Bridge KTL have worked on 3 projects presented for the Prime, the Bridge KTL worked on all projects presented for the Prime. Overall, the PM and KTL's possess knowledge of GDOT policies and procedures from past projects that can be translated to work on this type of bridge project.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Gresham Smith's PM, Bridge and NEPA KTL have ample availability, except for the Roadway KTL who has 25% availability. The organizational chart is sufficiently staffed with 7 roles under structures, 7 on roadway, 3 on hydraulics, and 2 QA/QC support staff. The narrative did highlight constructability and early coordination to ensure schedule.</p>			

SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST

Solicitation #: RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10

Solicitation Title: Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services

Primes and Subconsultants		1.06(a)	1.06(b)	1.06(c)	1.06(d)	1.06(e)	1.06(f)	1.06(g)	1.07	1.10	3.04	3.12	4.01(a) or (b)	5.01	5.02	6.01(a)	6.01(b)	6.02	6.05	9.01	Certificate Expires	
2	Arcadis U.S., Inc.	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	6/7/2023	
	Accura Engineering and Consulting Services, Inc.										X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7/31/2022	
	United Consulting, LLC															X	X	X	X		7/13/2023	
	GPI Geospatial, Inc.													X	X						11/9/2023	
	Southeastern Archaeological Research, Inc.		X				X														8/7/2023	
	New South Associates, Inc.		X				X														6/11/2023	
	Ecological Solutions, Inc.	X				X		X													2/23/2022	
9	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.										X	X	X							X	5/29/2023	
	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X							X	3/11/2024	
	CCR Environmental, Inc.					X		X													4/14/2023	
	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	X				X				X		X		X	X						12/31/2021	
	Columbia Engineering & Services, Inc.										X	X		X	X					X	6/11/2023	
	MC Squared, Inc.															X	X	X	X		11/9/2023	
10	Holt Consulting Company, LLC										X	X	X							X	11/10/2022	
	Michael Baker International, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X		X	11/9/2023	
	Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group, LLC	X	X	X	X	X			X											X	7/17/2021	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X												3/12/2023	
	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	X				X				X		X		X	X						12/31/2021	
	United Consulting, LLC															X	X	X	X		7/13/2023	
19	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X							X	12/14/2023	
	CHB Acquisition Services, LLC																				5/19/2022	
	Contour Engineering, LLC															X	X	X	X		3/12/2023	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X						X	3/12/2023
	Settimio Consulting Services, Inc.													X	X						2/28/2022	
25	STV Incorporated	X		X	X				X	X	X	X	X							X	4/30/2022	
	CPL Architects, Engineers, Landscape Architect and Surveyor								X	X	X	X	X							X	4/11/2023	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X												3/12/2023	
	Platinum Geomatics, LLC													X	X						4/30/2022	
	NOVA Engineering & Environmental, LLC															X	X	X	X		3/14/2022	
29	TranSystems Corporation								X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	6/11/2023	
	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X												3/12/2023	
	United Consulting, LLC															X	X	X	X		7/13/2023	



SELECTION OF FINALISTS

**RFQ-484-051121
Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services,
Contracts 1 – 12**

The Georgia Department of Transportation is pleased to announce the selection of the following firms as finalists regarding the above RFQ:

Contract 1 - PI #0013064, Meriwether/Pike Counties

CHA Consulting, Inc.
HNTB Corporation
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.
WSP USA, Inc.

Contract 2 - PI #0013591, Catoosa County

KCI Technologies, Inc.
Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.
Mott MacDonald, LLC
Qk4, Incorporated
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

Contract 3 – PI #0017729, Dawson County

Alfred Benesch & Company
KCI Technologies, Inc.
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
Practical Design Partners, LLC

Contract 4 – PI #0017732, Habersham County

KCI Technologies, Inc.
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
WSP USA, Inc.

Contract 5 – PI #0017733, Habersham County

Alfred Benesch & Company
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC
Lowe Engineers, LLC
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.
Southeastern Engineering, Inc.

Contract 6 – PI #0017734, Habersham/White Counties

Alfred Benesch & Company
Arcadis U.S., Inc.
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

Contract 7 – PI #0017735, Hall County

Alfred Benesch & Company
Holt Consulting Company
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

Contract 8 – PI #0017736, Hart County

Infrastructure Consulting and Engineering, PLLC
KCI Technologies, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
RS&H, Inc.
Thompson Engineering, Inc.
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.

Contract 9 – PI #0017737, Towns County

Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC
Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
NV5 Engineers and Consultants, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

Contract 10 – PI #0017739, White County

Arcadis U.S., Inc.
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.
Holt Consulting Company, LLC
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
STV Incorporated
TranSystems Corporation

Contract 11 – PI #0017770 Cancelled

Contract 12 – PI #0017845, Fulton County

Barge Design Solutions, Inc.
KCI Technologies, Inc.
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.



Russell R. McMurry, P.E., Commissioner
 One Georgia Center
 600 West Peachtree Street, NW
 Atlanta, GA 30308
 (404) 631-1000 Main Office

August 17, 2021

NOTICE TO SELECTED FINALISTS

To: Arcadis U.S., Inc.; Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.; Holt Consulting Company, LLC; Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.; STV Incorporated; and TranSystems Corporation

Please send an e-mail confirming receipt of this notice to Charnele Dobbins (cdobbins@dot.ga.gov).

Re: RFQ-484-051121 – Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services, Contract 10 - PI #0017739, White County

On behalf of the Selection Committee for the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) referenced above, we congratulate you and your firm on being selected as a finalist for further consideration. This notice shall serve as an official request for additional required information and action from finalists. **Please refer to the original solicitation (RFQ-484-051121), pages 8&9, VII. Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response – Phase II Response, A&B and pages 10&11, IX. Instructions for Submittal for Phase II – Technical Approach and Past Performance Response, A-D for instructions to submit your package.** As a finalist, your firm is required to comply with the written instructions and remaining schedule below:

A. Technical Approach - 40%

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

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

1. 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.
2. Identify any unique challenges of the project and how your firm intends to mitigate these challenges, including quality control, quality assurance procedures.
3. Provide any specific qualifications, skills, knowledge of the project and project area which may uniquely benefit the firm and project, and your ability and willingness to meet time requirements.

B. Past Performance - 10%

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

Remaining Schedule

d. GDOT completes evaluation and issues notification and other information to finalist firms.	08/17/2021	-----
e. Deadline for submission of written questions from finalists	08/24/2021	2:00 PM
f. Phase II Response of Finalist firms due	09/01/2021	2:00 PM

C. Finalist Selection

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

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

Please address any questions you may have to Charnele Dobbins, and congratulations again to each of you!

Charnele Dobbins
cdobbins@dot.ga.gov
404-631-1425

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services	
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	September 1, 2021	
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm	

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Meets Required Area Classes	Compliant with Page # Limitations
1	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	9/1/2021	1:14 PM	X	X
2	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	9/1/2021	12:17 PM	X	X
3	TranSystems Corporation	9/1/2021	1:04 PM	X	X
4	Holt Consulting Company, LLC	9/1/2021	11:19 AM	X	X
5	STV Incorporated	9/1/2021	10:37 AM	X	X
6	Arcadis U.S., Inc.	9/1/2021	11:44 AM	X	X

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF SUBMITTALS

Solicitation Title:	Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services	1	TranSystems Corporation
Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	2	Holt Consulting Company, LLC
PHASE I AND PHASE II - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria		2	Arcadis U.S., Inc.

(This Page For GDOT Use)

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING)	
	Sum of	Group
	Total	Ranking
	Score	
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	625	5
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	650	4
TranSystems Corporation	850	1
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	750	2
STV Incorporated	625	5
Arcadis U.S., Inc.	750	2

Evaluation Criteria	PHASE I		PHASE II		Group Scores and Ranking	
	200	300	400	100	Total Score	Ranking
Experience and Qualifications	Good	Good	Adequate	Adequate	625	5
Resources and Workload Capacity	Good	Good	Adequate	Good	650	4
Technical Approach	Good	Good	Excellent	Good	850	1
Past Performance	Good	Good	Good	Good	750	2
	Good	Good	Adequate	Adequate	625	5
	Good	Good	Good	Good	750	2
Maximum Points allowed =	200	300	400	100	1000	%

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Heath and Lineback's technical approach included a project development plan (PDP) and use of an environmental subconsultant. The firm has the capability to handle the environmental area of the project, however, the evaluation team is concerned with the firm's capacity due to the nature of the complicated cultural resource area. In addition, along with section 4F coordination, this could pose as a challenge for the environmental subconsultant. And, the firm stated in their submittal that a "biological assessment is likely required" which is incorrect. The firm did propose a challenge, such as imposing a detour, which can cause a lack of access to local businesses, but no solutions. The evaluation team would have liked to see the firm expand on their constructability narrative for this project. The firm identified work tasks, but lacked details on execution. Overall, the firm's approach provided minimal detail to how deliverables will be handled and how work will be completed.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Heath and Lineback received an overall score 5.00 out of 5.00 from one (1) past performance review. From GDOT Office of Bridge Design, their average plan score was 73 out of 100%, and their average hydraulic design score was 81 out of 100%, and cited their scores tend to be above average and their bridge team is satisfactory. From the GDOT Office of Program Delivery, for PI#132610- which included a bridge replacement, received mixed reviews. In 2019 their firm started with a 93 and overall ended with 78 of 100%. It was noted that the firm managed resources appropriately, was responsive, completed deliverables within budget.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Parsons technical approach highlighted the following: Creation of task orders involving bridge work to be submitted early, which would save time with procurement; creation of an internal work plan, which included a timeline for each phase; the possibility of using ABC construction; conducting preliminary research of current geo-tech conditions; and plans to review milestones 6-months in advance to submission. The firm stated they overcame and recovered from a 10-month delay from a past project. In addition, the firm stated that they would initiate stakeholder involvement to determine the acceptability for the use of an off-site detour and listed two (2) other design alternatives that could be investigated. However, the firm provided a minimal description of their environmental resources, which can play a major role in the project's timeline. Also, there was no mention of rock jetties when the project document mentioned rocks being near the surface.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Parsons received a 5.00 out of 5.00 score based on five (5) past performance reviews, but all from one (1) contact person on each project. From GDOT Office of Bridge Design, the firm received an average score of 67.6 of 100% on final plans from eleven (11) projects, and an average of 81.2 out of 100% on nine (9) projects. From GDOT Office of Program Delivery, the firm met expectations.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	TranSystems Corporation		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Excellent
<p>TranSystems' technical approach outlined a detailed design approach and discussion of a preferred alternative that included three (3) options for Stage 2 construction that would need to be evaluated for benefit/cost effectiveness. The firm presented several design constraints from a site visit and discussed solution options, which included details of their design procedure. The firm acknowledged the potential need of a design exception and several design variances to be able to avoid impacts to environmental resources. The firm's maintenance of traffic strategy was well thought out. Additionally, the firm included a procurement plan, which would minimize delays in task order scope; concept development; and cost saving initiatives. The firm previously managed and designed twelve (12) bridge replacements in GDOT Districts 1 & 7, and prior working history with GDOT's District 1 construction office. Lastly, the firm appropriately mentioned the need to study usage of rock jetties.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>TranSystems did not receive any past performance reviews from GDOT Procurement due to the PM's outlined in their Phase I SOQ no longer working at GDOT and did not work on the project listed. Based on GDOT Office of Program Delivery, the firm met expectations and exceeded department goals, based upon thirteen (13) reviews in various phases, from preliminary to final. From GDOT Office of Bridge Design, the firm's average final plans score was 89 out of 100% on one (1) project; and their hydraulic plans score average for eight (8) projects is 75 out of 100%.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Holt Consulting Company, LLC		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Holt's technical approach correctly assessed the site; proposed local detour instead of pass through detour; added incentive to community outreach coordination beforehand; included a procurement plan, which stated a proactive 6 to 9 month early start on task orders; conducted geotech assessment; demonstrated their previous recovery of 9-month delay on projects, PI#'s 0015631 and 0015642. The firm stated that they have conducted preliminary coordination with the project stakeholders and listed each of their concerns against having an off-site detour. The firm presented a feasible alternative for the use of a single lane signal configuration that would allow local traffic to continue to use the bridge during construction without queueing and an off-site detour for regional traffic. The firm showed a layout and specific bridge staging for this alternative that would also minimize impacts to environmental resources. Additionally, their approach mentions using steel beams as a preferred alternative to reduce the need to raise the profile and project footprint, but it did not acknowledge the increase in cost for steel up front and for future maintenance. Also, there were minimal details under their constructability narrative.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Holt received an overall score of 3.40 out of 5.00 based upon four (4) past performance reviews. GDOT Office of Program Delivery reviews stated "firm met expectations" and received a favorable review on PI# 0016507 that a "concept team meeting was held 3 months ahead of baseline schedule, which is very impressive". The firm is very responsive to emails and all deliverables were submitted on time. One of the evaluation team members had previous working experience with the firm's project manager and agreed with the overall performance noted above.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	STV Incorporated		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>STV's technical approach included plans to analyze off-site vs. on-site detours, as well as use of ABC construction. The firm mentioned environmental resources and provided a map of all of the environmental resources near the project, however, no minimal implications were stated. The firm presented a concise and thoughtful design approach; and discussed use of three (3) design alternatives for which they concluded that a new bridge should be constructed to the west of the existing bridge. The firm did not provide any details related to their project schedule delivery approach, but stated they will add staff when necessary to avoid potential delays. Lastly, the firm did provide a preliminary bridge span arrangement to clear span the waterway to reduce substructure within the stream.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>STV received an overall score of 3.90 out of 5.00 based on four (4) past performance reviews, but all were completed by one (1) respondent. Based on GDOT Office of Program Delivery reviews, the firm was above average, slightly exceeding Department expectations. The firm received a superior rating on PI# 0014073, which met aggressive ROW authorization schedule, and on PI#0014131, the firm delivered FFPR ahead of schedule. Overall, the firm is responsive, and delivered on a project during holiday season. The firm went above and beyond to meet project schedule. However, from GDOT Office of Bridge Design, the firm received an average final plans score of 49 out of 100% from two (2) projects, one of which included 1-hydraulic report which scored 14 out of 100% (it caused concerned from the evaluation team because this project will include a hydraulic bridge design).</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Arcadis U.S., Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Arcadis' technical approach included a preliminary risk assessment table, plans to add design staff as necessary, has previous working experience with stage plans, mentioned seismic study may be required, will conduct workshops to evaluate detour options, and provided examples of Section 4F evaluations from two (2) past projects - PI#'s 0013745 and 0013599. Furthermore, the firm's PM developed a successful schedule mitigation strategy which helped achieve milestones for PI#'s 0015605, 0015620, 0015641, and 0015660. The firm presented a risk matrix to identify specific project elements that would cause schedule delays, and emphasized early identification and coordination as their key approach to ensure that the project is delivered on schedule. The firm also highlighted their experience in the areas of hydrologic and hydraulic analyses, and provided insight into possibly having to do a 2D bridge hydraulic analysis due to site constraints. They also provided a list of QC/QA personnel, but no detail of their QC/QA process. Lastly, the firms environmental section addressed de minimis Section 4F, which was thoroughly described, had redundancy among subconsultant team for cultural resources, and had a sufficiently staffed environmental team to capture Section 20.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Arcadis did not receive any past performance reviews from GDOT Procurement due to the PM's outlined in their Phase I SOQ no longer working at GDOT and did not work on the project listed. GDOT's Office of Environmental Services has had positive working experience with the firm. Based on GDOT Office of Bridge Design, the firm received an average final plans score of 74.5 out of 100% from six (6) projects, and a hydraulic bridge score of 86.5 out of 100% from eleven (11 projects). From GDOT Office of Program Delivery, the firm met expectations.</p>			

Reference Check Summary for
RFQ-484-051121, Contract 10
Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services

	Arcadis U.S., Inc. *	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	STV Incorporated	TranSystems Corporation *
Questions answered on a 1, 3, 5 scale.						
1 = Below Expectations, 3 = Met Expectations, 5 = Exceeded Expectations						
1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project.						
Reference 1		5	3	5	5	
Reference 2			3	5	5	
Reference 3			5	5	3	
Reference 4			5	5	5	
Reference 5				5		
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
Section Average	0.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.50	0.00
2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.						
Reference 1		5	3	5	5	
Reference 2			3	5	5	
Reference 3			3	5	3	
Reference 4			3	5	5	
Reference 5				5		
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
Section Average	0.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.50	0.00
3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.						
Reference 1		5	3	5	3	
Reference 2			3	5	3	
Reference 3			3	5	3	
Reference 4			3	5	5	
Reference 5				5		
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
Section Average	0.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	3.50	0.00
4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management.						
Reference 1		5	5	5	3	
Reference 2			5	5	5	
Reference 3			3	5	5	
Reference 4			3	5	3	
Reference 5				5		
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
Section Average	0.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	0.00
5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.						
Reference 1		5	3	5	3	
Reference 2			3	5	3	
Reference 3			3	5	3	
Reference 4			3	5	3	
Reference 5				5		
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
Section Average	0.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	0.00
Overall Average	0.00	5.00	3.40	5.00	3.90	0.00

Note: * No Survey responses received for Arcadis U.S., Inc. and TranSystems Corporation

Respondent

< >

03:00
Time to complete

1. Name *

Phil Mallon

2. Organization *

Fayette County Public Works

3. Address *

115 McDonough Road

4. City, State Zip Code *

Fayetteville, GA 30215

5. Email Address *

pmallon@fayettecoutyga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

H&L maintained project scope, schedule, and budget and addressed issues in a timely and thorough manner. Their submittals were high quality and required few edits.

Respondent

< Anonymous >

02:31
Time to complete

1. Name *

Sean Pharr

2. Organization *

GDOT/AECOM

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree Street, NW, 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, Georgia 30308

5. Email Address *

spharr@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Project is let to construction, consultant has met obligations to through the entire PDP process.

Respondent

< Anonymous >

01:57
Time to complete

1. Name *

Sean Pharr

2. Organization *

GDOT/AECOM

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree Street, NW, 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Camp CreeAtlanta, Georgia 30308

5. Email Address *

spharr@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Project had a scope change, not at cause of consultant. Consultant worked efficiently to incorporate new scope and project is on a new baseline schedule to be delivered soon.

Respondent

< Anonymous >

03:06
Time to complete

1. Name *

Sean Pharr

2. Organization *

GDOT/AECOM

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree Street, NW, 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, Georgia 30308

5. Email Address *

spharr@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Project is let to construction. Consultant project manager assisted in delivering all milestones to letting.

Respondent

< Anonymous >

07:59
Time to complete

1. Name *

2. Organization *

3. Address *

4. City, State Zip Code *

5. Email Address *

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

This project is under construction so the consultant delivered the project through all PDP milestones. There were multiple submissions related to the BFI and final bridge plans, however the consultant project manager was a steady presence on the project.

Respondent

< >

01:17
Time to complete

1. Name *

Derrick Cameron

2. Organization *

GDOT - Office of Program Delivery

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree Street, 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, Georgia 30308

5. Email Address *

dcameron@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

 Yes No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

 1 - Did not meet expectations 3 - Met expectations 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Parsons is extremely knowledgeable of the Departmental processes and procedures. The team was very responsive and managed the project well throughout the preliminary phase.

Respondent

< >

01:22
Time to complete

1. Name *

Derrick Cameron

2. Organization *

GDOT - Office of Program Delivery

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree Street, 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, Georgia 30308

5. Email Address *

dcameron@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Parsons is extremely knowledgeable of the Departmental processes and procedures. The team was very responsive and managed the project well throughout the preliminary phase.

Respondent

< Anonymous >

02:33
Time to complete

1. Name *

Derrick Cameron

2. Organization *

GDOT - Office of Program Delivery

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree Street, 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, Georgia 30308

5. Email Address *

dcameron@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

 Yes No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

 1 - Did not meet expectations 3 - Met expectations 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Parsons is extremely knowledgeable of the Departmental processes and procedures. The team was very responsive and is doing a great job of managing the project.

Respondent

< >

01:22
Time to complete

1. Name *

Derrick Cameron

2. Organization *

GDOT - Office of Program Delivery

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree Street, 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, Georgia 30308

5. Email Address *

dcameron@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

 Yes No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

 1 - Did not meet expectations 3 - Met expectations 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Parsons is extremely knowledgeable of the Departmental processes and procedures. The team was very responsive and is doing a great job of managing the project.

Respondent

< >

01:40
Time to complete

1. Name *

Derrick Cameron

2. Organization *

GDOT - Office of Program Delivery

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree Street, 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, Georgia 30308

5. Email Address *

dcameron@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

 Yes No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

 1 - Did not meet expectations 3 - Met expectations 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Parsons is extremely knowledgeable of the Departmental processes and procedures. The team was very responsive and managed the project well throughout the preliminary phase.

Respondent

< >

05:31
Time to complete

1. Name *

Matthew Sanders

2. Organization *

Consultant PM for GDOT Office of Program Delivery on the Bridge Program

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree St. NW 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, GA 30308

5. Email Address *

MSanders@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

This project has been delayed by ENV approval of items not originally scoped so that is not a reflection on this firm's performance in the questions.

Respondent

< >

03:47
Time to complete

1. Name *

2. Organization *

3. Address *

4. City, State Zip Code *

5. Email Address *

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

The acceptance of the BFI report took an extraordinary amount of time to receive and required a lot of iterations with this firm's Sub which delayed the In-House bridge plans to be developed. These did not affect my rating of this firm in the questions.

Respondent

< >

04:53
Time to complete

1. Name *

Matthew Sanders

2. Organization *

Consultant PM for the GDOT Office of Program Delivery on the Bridge Program

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree St. NW, 25th Floor

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta, GA 30308

5. Email Address *

MSanders@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

This project has been delayed for ARCH Phase II issues which has impacted the schedule and prevented me from ranking the firm higher since much of the design work has been on hold. However, that does not negatively affected my view of this firm.

Respondent

< >

20:51
Time to complete

1. Name *

Nona Guilford

2. Organization *

TIA Office

3. Address *

600 West Peachtree St

4. City, State Zip Code *

Atlanta GA 30308

5. Email Address *

nguilford@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed *



8. A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey? *

Yes

No

9. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project *

1 - Did not meet expectations

3 - Met expectations

5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

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

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

12. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

13. Rate the overall success of the project thus far *

- 1 - Did not meet expectations
- 3 - Met expectations
- 5 - Exceeded expectations

14. Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings.

Overall, STV was great to work with on the referenced project, which was small in scope but still had all of the same components of a larger more complex project. The STV team was flexible and open to learning the TIA standard of project management as well as meeting the financial demands of a TIA project, which are essentially design to budget. The project manager was efficient, responsive and made every effort to communicate with our team. This bid accepted was slightly under STV's final construction estimate, leaving TIA in good fiscal position as the project transitioned to construction. This project is complete and was done so with minimal supplementals and additional costs. Our office as well as the local partners are pleased with this project and feel it has met the intended scope and stated benefits for that region. It was great working with STV.

An official website of the United States government
[Here's how you know](#)



Search

e.g. 1606N020Q02



Search Results

Saved Searches

Select Domain
Entity Information



All Entity Information

Entity Registrations

Disaster Response Registry

Entity UEI (not registered)

Exclusions

Filter By



Keywords

Classification



Excluded Individual



Excluded Entity



Entity Name

TRANSSYSTEMS CORPORATION (029563397) ×

Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc. (926622598) ×

United Consulting Engineers Inc (093231900) ×

DUNS Unique Entity ID

e.g. 123456789 ▼

SAM Unique Entity ID

e.g. HTYR9YJHK65L ▼

CAGE / NCAGE

▼

Federal Organizations



Exclusion Type



Exclusion Program



Location



Dates



Reset



No matches found

We couldn't find a match for your search criteria.

Please try another search or go back to previous results.

[Go Back](#)



Feedback

[Our Website](#)

[Our Partners](#)

[Policies](#)


[Customer Service](#)



General Services Administration

This is a U.S. General Services Administration Federal Government computer system that is **"FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY."** This system is subject to monitoring. Individuals found performing unauthorized activities are subject to disciplinary action including criminal prosecution.

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	DISPOSITION DATE	EXPIRATION DATE
TRANSYSTEMS CORPORATION 260 Peachtree Street, NW, Suite 800 Atlanta, GA 30308	January 15, 2021	June 11, 2023
SIGNATURE		
		
1. Transportation Planning _ 1.01 State Wide Systems Planning _ 1.02 Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning _ 1.03 Aviation Systems Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.04 Mass and Rapid Transportation Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.05 Alternate System and Corridor Location Planning _ 1.06 Unknown _ 1.06a NEPA Documentation _ 1.06b History _ 1.06c Air Studies _ 1.06d Noise Studies _ 1.06e Ecology _ 1.06f Archaeology _ 1.06g Freshwater Aquatic Surveys _ 1.06h Bat Surveys _ 1.07 Attitude, Opinion and Community Value Studies _ 1.08 Airport Master Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.09 Location Studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.10 Traffic Studies _ 1.11 Traffic and Toll Revenue Studies _ 1.12 Major Investment Studies _ 1.13 Non-Motorized Transportation Planning	3 Highway Design Roadway (continued) _ 3.09 Traffic Control System Analysis, Design and Implementation _ 3.10 Utility Coordination _ 3.11 Architecture <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.12 Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.13 Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians _ 3.14 Historic Rehabilitation _ 3.15 Highway Lighting _ 3.16 Value Engineering _ 3.17 Design of Toll Facilities Infrastructure	
2 Mass Transit Operations _ 2.01 Mass Transit Program (Systems) Management _ 2.02 Mass Transit Feasibility and Technical Studies _ 2.03 Mass Transit Vehicle and Propulsion System _ 2.04 Mass Transit Controls, Communications and Information Systems _ 2.05 Mass Transit Architectural Engineering _ 2.06 Mass Transit Unique Structures _ 2.07 Mass Transit Electrical and Mechanical Systems _ 2.08 Mass Transit Operations Management and Support Services _ 2.09 Aviation _ 2.10 Mass Transit Program (Systems) Marketing	4 Highway Structures <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.01a Minor Bridges Design _ 4.01b Minor Bridges Design CONDITIONAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.02 Major Bridges Design <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.03 Movable Span Bridges Design <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.04 Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.05 Bridge Inspection	
3 Highway Design Roadway <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.01 Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Rural Generally Free Access Highway Design <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.02 Two-Lane or multi-Lane with Curb and Gutter Generally Free Access Highways Design Including Storm Sewers <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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.04 Multi-Lane, Limited Access Expressway Type Highway Design <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.05 Design of Urban Expressway and Interstate _ 3.06 Traffic Operations Studies _ 3.07 Traffic Operations Design _ 3.08 Landscape Architecture	5. Topography <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.01 Land Surveying <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.02 Engineering Surveying <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.03 Geodetic Surveying _ 5.04 Aerial Photography _ 5.04a Aerial Photography/Conventional Aircraft _ 5.04b Aerial Photography Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Concept Grade _ 5.04b Aerial Photography Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Design Grade _ 5.05 Aerial Photogrammetry <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.06 Topographic Remote Sensing _ 5.06a Topographic Remote Sensing (LIDAR) (Conventional Aircraft, Terrestrial Sensors and Mobile Vehicle, Boat, or Rail Units) (Design Grade) _ 5.06b Topographic Remote Sensing (Unmanned Aircraft Systems LIDAR) (Design Grade) _ 5.06c Topographic Remote Sensing (Unmanned Aircraft Systems LIDAR) (Concept Grade) _ 5.06d Topographic Remote Sensing (SONAR) _ 5.06e Topographic Remote Sensing Thermal and Infrared _ 5.07 Cartography _ 5.08 Subsurface Utility Engineering	
	6. Soils, Foundation & Materials Testing _ 6.01a Soil Surveys _ 6.01b Geological and Geophysical Studies _ 6.02 Bridge Foundation Studies _ 6.03 Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Soils and Foundation) _ 6.04a Laboratory Materials Testing _ 6.04b Field Testing of Roadway Construction Materials _ 6.05 Hazard Waste Site Assessment Studies	
	8. Construction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8.01 Construction Supervision	
	9. Erosion and Sedimentation Control <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9.01 Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control and Comprehensive Monitoring Program _ 9.02 Rainfall and Runoff Reporting _ 9.03 Field Inspections for Compliance of Erosion and Sedimentation Control Devices Installations	