



## 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 12 – PI #0017845, Fulton 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 four (4) highest firms in order of ranking are as follows:

1. **Barge Design Solutions, Inc.**
2. **KCI Technologies, Inc.**
2. **Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.**
2. **Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.**

The Selection Committee recommends the selection of the top ranked firm, **Barge Design Solutions, Inc.**

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

---

**Albert Shelby, Director of Program Delivery**

---

**Treasury Young, Chief Procurement Officer**

CS:mlh

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, 7<sup>th</sup> 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 <b>RFQ-484-051121</b>	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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](mailto: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](mailto: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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](mailto: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](mailto: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, 7<sup>th</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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
<b>OR</b>	
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
<b>OR</b>	
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
<b>OR</b>	
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
<b>OR</b>	
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
<b>OR</b>	
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) 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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
<b>OR</b>	
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) 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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
<b>OR</b>	
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) 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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
<b>OR</b>	
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) 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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
<b>OR</b>	
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) 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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
<b>OR</b>	
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) 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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
<b>OR</b>	
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) 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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
<b>OR</b>	
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) 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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
	<b>OR</b>
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
	<b>Must meet one of the Area Classes below in the 5.04 series.</b>
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

	<b>Must meet one of the Area Classes below in the 5.06 series.</b>
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.:	<b>RFQ-484-051121</b>
Solicitation/Contract Name:	<b>Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services</b>

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
	<b>DBE – Yes/No -&gt;</b>							
	<b>Prequalification Expiration Date</b>							
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  
19<sup>th</sup> 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:**

	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Answers</b>
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. <b>Please note:</b> 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: <a href="http://www.dot.ga.gov/PartnerSmart/Documents/ROW/RW-ValuationAppraiser.pdf">http://www.dot.ga.gov/PartnerSmart/Documents/ROW/RW-ValuationAppraiser.pdf</a>  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  
19<sup>th</sup> 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, 1<sup>st</sup> 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 12	
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 Engineers, Inc.	5/10/2021	2:01 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
2	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	5/11/2021	12:13 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
3	Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	5/11/2021	10:18 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
4	Bridgefarmer & Associates, Inc. - <b>Disqualified</b>	5/11/2021	9:56 AM	X	X	X	No	X	X
5	CHA Consulting, Inc.	5/11/2021	1:01 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
6	Croy Engineering, LLC	5/11/2021	12:44 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
7	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	5/11/2021	9:10 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
8	Gresham Smith	5/11/2021	11:53 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
9	Holt Consulting Company, LLC	5/11/2021	1:31 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
10	KCI Technologies, Inc.	5/11/2021	12:59 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
11	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	5/11/2021	1:22 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
12	Parsons Transportation Group Inc.	5/11/2021	1:30 PM	X	X	X	X	X	X
13	Practical Design Partners, LLC	5/11/2021	8:10 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
14	Precision Planning, Inc.	5/11/2021	9:19 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
15	R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	5/11/2021	11:38 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
16	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)	5/11/2021	11:53 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
17	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	5/11/2021	11:57 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X
18	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co. - <b>Disqualified</b>	5/11/2021	2:16 PM	X	X	X	No	X	X
19	TranSystems Corporation	5/11/2021	11:43 AM	X	X	X	X	X	X

# GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

## RFQ-484-051121

### Batch #1 – 2021 Engineering Design Services, C12

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

#### **Coordination and Communication**

Melissa Hannah 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**

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

#### **Phase II**

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

#### **Phase I Evaluation of Statements of Qualifications**

#### **Evaluation of Eligible Submittals**

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

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

#### **Directions for use of the Evaluation Preliminary Scoring Forms:**

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

**score** for each of the criteria. The Reviewer should provide comments for each section which support the rating. Reviewers should not seek to write down everything that the submittal contains. Rather, Reviewers should first determine the rating and then answer why they feel the rating is warranted.

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

### **SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATING AVAILABILITY**

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

### **Evaluation Meeting:**

**All completed Scoring Forms with the preliminary scores and comments for each criteria of each firm, must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Monday, June 21, 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 Monday, September 13, 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**

<b>Solicitation Title:</b>	<b>Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services</b>	<b>1</b>	KCI Technologies, Inc.	
<b>Solicitation #:</b>	<b>RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12</b>	<b>2</b>	Parsons Transportation Group Inc.	
<b>PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Preliminary Scoring based on Published Criteria</b>			<b>3</b>	
<b>(This Page For GDOT Use)</b>			<b>4</b>	
			<b>5</b>	
			<b>(RANKING)</b>	
			<b>Sum of</b>	
			<b>Individual</b> <b>Group</b>	
<b>SUBMITTING FIRMS</b>	<b>Rankings</b> <b>Ranking</b>	<b>6</b>	TranSystems Corporation	
		<b>7</b>	Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	
		<b>8</b>	CHA Consulting, Inc.	
		<b>9</b>	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)	
		<b>10</b>	American Engineers, Inc.	
American Engineers, Inc.	29	10	<b>11</b>	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	42	16	<b>12</b>	Holt Consulting Company, LLC
Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	18	7	<b>13</b>	Croy Engineering, LLC
Bridgefarmer & Associates, Inc. - Disqualified	55	18	<b>14</b>	R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.
CHA Consulting, Inc.	25	8	<b>15</b>	Precision Planning, Inc.
Croy Engineering, LLC	36	13	<b>16</b>	Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	30	11	<b>17</b>	Practical Design Partners, LLC
Gresham Smith	13	5	<b>18</b>	Bridgefarmer & Associates, Inc. - Disqualified
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	32	12	<b>19</b>	Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co. - Disqualified
KCI Technologies, Inc.	6	1		
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	11	3		
Parsons Transportation Group Inc.	6	2		
Practical Design Partners, LLC	46	17		
Precision Planning, Inc.	39	15		
R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	37	14		
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)	25	9		
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	12	4		
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co. - Disqualified	55	19		
TranSystems Corporation	14	6		







Evaluation Criteria



Experience and Qualifications

Resources and Workload Capacity

# Evaluator 1


<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	Phase One Evaluator 1 Individual	
<b>SUBMITTING FIRMS</b>	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Engineers, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	200	15
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Adequate	Marginal	175	16
Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	Excellent	Good	425	1
Bridgefarmer & Associates, Inc. - Disqualified	Poor	Poor	0	18
CHA Consulting, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	8
Croy Engineering, LLC	Good	Adequate	300	8
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Gresham Smith	Adequate	Good	325	6
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Good	Good	375	2
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Good	Good	375	2
Parsons Transportation Group Inc.	Good	Good	375	2
Practical Design Partners, LLC	Adequate	Marginal	175	16
Precision Planning, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	8
R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	Good	Good	375	2
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co. - Disqualified	Poor	Poor	0	18
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Good	325	6
<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	500	%







GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	American Engineers, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
<i>Firm referenced wrong project in KTL write ups; need to do a better job at QA/QC-ing; Lacking adequate innovative/alternative intersection design examples across the KTLs; Enviro KTL did not provide urban design projects for their experience; Overall Prime Experience did not include various intersection projects that show unique designs or presented challenges.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Org chart presented an adequate staff and KTLs availability was acceptable</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Atlas Technical Consultants		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Missing more unique or innovative intersection designs for all the KTLs. PM KTL listed a couple of projects where they were not the actual PM. Overall Prime Experience shows adequate design experience.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
<i>Looking for a more robust traffic team on the org chart. Questionable availability for the Rdwy KTL</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Barge Design Solutions, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Excellent</b>
<i>Provided a breadth of examples of unique traffic projects by the PM KTL and he also possesses his PTOE which will aid in his understanding of the project and his ability to keep the project moving forward. Env KTL will be developing the concept report for the project under a separate contract. Overall Prime experience given provided a breadth of innovative/alternative design examples.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>Org chart and additional resources provided good depth and information. KTL availability is acceptable</i>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	CHA Consulting, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>KTLs did provide examples of various types of intersection improvement projects (not all unique or innovative). Prime Experience references their involvement in the study completed to develop this project's conceptual plan.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Org chart was adequate but needs to be more robust in certain areas (i.e. QA/QC, Traffic). Overall adequate information provided for the additional resources and the KTL's availability is acceptable.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Croy Engineering, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>PM KTL showed good examples of innovative projects that he has worked on. Overall the Rdwy and Env KTL have years of experience working on various types of projects that will benefit the project. The Prime Experience shows a breadth of experience with the PM and Rdwy KTLs having experience working together.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Org chart is not very deep and did not give specific list of personnel. The Additional resources information was not detailed. KTL availability is acceptable.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	EXP US Services Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Provided adequate examples of projects by the PM KTL and he also possesses his PTOE which will aid in his understanding of the project and his ability to keep the project moving forward. Env KTL only provided experience with bridge replacement projects. Overall Prime experience provided studies for alternative design examples but no project design completed for those.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Adequate org chart and in the additional resources section focused mainly on how they will meet the schedule with their overall staff/team. KTL availability is acceptable.</i>			



GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Gresham Smith</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM KTL showed examples of innovative projects that he has worked on. Overall the Rdwy and Env KTL have years of experience working on various types of projects but didn't provide good examples of innovative traffic type projects. The Prime Experience shows experience with unique/innovative designs.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>Overall org chart has good depth to it and the additional resources section provided clarity on how the team will work together and have worked together in the past. KTL availability is acceptable.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Holt Consulting Company, LLC</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM KTL showed relevant engineering experience with intersection type projects but only provided bridge replacement projects for his PM experience. The Rdwy and Env KTLs did not provide intersection improvement projects for their experience. The overall Prime Experience also did not provide experience with innovative traffic projects (i.e. roundabouts, congested intersection improvements).</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Org chart was adequate but needs to be more robust in certain areas (i.e. QA/QC, Traffic). Overall adequate information provided for the additional resources and the KTL's availability is acceptable.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>KCI Technologies, Inc.</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>PM KTL provided examples of innovative intersection design projects for her relevant engineering and PM experience. Rdwy and Env KTLs also provided examples of relevant project types for their experience.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>Org chart showed good depth and the additional resources information provided a well rounded breakdown of how they will help deliver the project. KTL availability is good.</i>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>PM KTL provided examples of innovative intersection design projects for her relevant engineering and PM experience. Rdwy and Env KTLs also provided examples of relevant project types for their experience. Overall Prime experience is acceptable for this type of project.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>Org chart shows an alternative intersection design group and advisory team. QA/QC could be more robust for this type of project. The additional resources information provided shows that the Prime has an understanding of what the project is and how to deliver it. KTLs availability is acceptable.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Parsons Transportation Group Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>PM KTL provided good examples of alternative intersection design experience. Env KTL also showed experience delivering enviro docs for alternative intersection projects as the NEPA Planner. The overall Prime Experience exhibits the KTLs working history together on a few projects and also their breadth of knowledge for delivering various alternative intersection design types of projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>Prime has a local traffic operations to aid with the design of this alternative intersection project. The org chart shows good depth for each discipline. The KTLs availability is acceptable.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Practical Design Partners, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM KTL has years of experience with various types of projects including alternative intersection projects. The Rdwy and Env KTLs also provided adequate examples of projects to represent their depth of experience. The overall Prime's experience was lacking as far as providing specific examples of completed alternative intersection projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
<i>Org chart does not include a QA/QC team. Also it did not provide a breakdown of the actual staff but just listed one person per discipline with a general number of "staff" that would be working with them. Additional resources section was lacking in conveying how the overall team would provide adequate support to the KTLs and others included on the org chart. Didn't appear to be well thought out in the approach.</i>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Precision Planning, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>PM KTL has 47 years of experience with various types of projects including alternative intersection projects. The Rdwy has 35 years of experience and Env KTLs both provided examples of projects to represent their depth of experience. The overall Prime's experience showed experience with various types of projects</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>The overall org chart was lacking in depth and information. The additional resources was not completely thought out or developed. KTLs availability is adequate.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	R.K. Shah & Associates, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM KTL has 14 years of experience and provided some relevant experience with being a PM but did not include more than adequate examples of alternative intersection designs. Rdwy KTL has 20 years of experience and provided adequate examples of various project experience. The overall Prime's experience shows adequate examples of various intersection/interchange projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Overall org chart provided adequate staffing. Could be more robust with traffic and QA/QC. The additional resources section focused on details of how the staff will meet the schedule and how they have managed projects in the past. KTLs availability is acceptable.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM KTL provided examples of large scale projects but didn't focus on alternative intersection improvement projects specifically as his PM experience. Rdwy KTL also did not provide specific experience with alternative intersection projects but also has 28 years of experience. The Env KTL provided adequate examples of experience working on intersection improvement projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>The overall org chart was lacking in depth for some disciplines (i.e. QA/QC). The additional resources provided depth to the overall staff and focused on how they will work together with the KTLs to deliver this project. KTLs availability is adequate.</i>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Stantec Consulting Services Inc.</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>PM KTL has 41 years of experience and provided good examples of relevant experience. His PM experience also reflects his ability to deliver projects on schedule, budget and within scope. Rdwy and Env KTLs also provided good examples of relevant experience.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>Org chart was very detailed and showed good depth. The additional resources section provided good information on how the team will work together to deliver the project. KTLs availability is acceptable.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>TranSystems Corporation</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM has 26 years of experience and provided adequate examples of various projects for relevant experience. Rdwy and Env KTLs have adequate experience. Overall Prime experience is adequate for this type of project.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>Prime's ability to develop an org chart that encompasses the needs of the project was good. They also provided a very detailed discussion of how the project will be delivered with the additional resources and methods developed. A screenshot of the conceptual layout for the project was also provided. The KTLs availability is acceptable.</i>			







Evaluation Criteria







Experience and Qualifications

Resources and Workload Capacity

# Evaluator 2







SUBMITTING FIRMS	200	300	Phase One Evaluator 2 Individual	
			Total Score	Ranking
American Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	200	14
Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
Bridgefarmer & Associates, Inc. - Disqualified	Poor	Poor	0	18
CHA Consulting, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
Croy Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Marginal	175	15
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	2
Gresham Smith	Adequate	Good	325	2
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	2
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	7
Parsons Transportation Group Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	2
Practical Design Partners, LLC	Marginal	Marginal	125	17
Precision Planning, Inc.	Adequate	Marginal	175	15
R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co. - Disqualified	Poor	Poor	0	18
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Good	325	2
<b>Maximum Points allowed =</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>%</b>

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>American Engineers, Inc.</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<p><i>PM - 23 years of exp., has managed 60 standalone intersection improvement projects, lists a variety of SR, CR Int. improvement projects. The write up references the wrong project (SR6/SR101 @ Coots Lake??) Roadway - 23 years of exp., The write up references the wrong project (SR6/SR101 @ Coots Lake??), she served as roadway design engineer (Not KTL or LEad) on several int. improvement jobs of similar scope and scale. NEPA - 36 years of exp., has managed env. documentation/analysis on 2 widening projects and has managed on call contract for environmental services. Prime - lists several similar scope projects where PM and ROADway lead collaborated.</i></p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<p><i>Org chart is well staffed, QA/QC team is not specified by discipline. PM/KTL's have capacity.</i></p>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Atlas Technical Consultants</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
<p><i>PM - 22 years of exp., has eng. Exp on int. improvements, has been PM on county Int. Imp., widening and BR. He appears to have more engineer exp. than he does PM. Roadway - 7 years of exp., his exp. Lacked any lead or KTL involmment as it appears he was just a design engineer assisting with the projects. NEPA - 6 years of exp., has been ecology lead, nepa lead on widening projects and has been env. manager on a county on call. PRIME - mainly list widening projects, and coordior study.</i></p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<p><i>Org chart is staffed at an appropriate level. PM/KTL's have capacity.</i></p>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Barge Design Solutions, Inc.</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<p><i>PM - 22 years of exp., has been PM on several intersection improvement projects, as well widening and BR projects. Roadway - 22 years of transportation design exp., has been roadway engineer, PM, Principal Design engineer on roundabout, DDI, and other intersection improvments. NEPA - 22 years of exp., has been env. KTL on two roundabouts, and a widening project, he has also lead the GEC for region 2. PRIME - Has mostly out of state exp. with intersection improvements, widenings where atleast 1 of the PM/KTL were involved.</i></p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<p><i>Org chart is well staffed. Has a QC/QA team; however, its not discipline specific.</i></p>			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points			
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points			
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points			
Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points			
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	CHA Consulting, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM - 14 years of exp., Pm exp on rr bridge crossing, county on call, widening project. Was deputy or roadway engineer on local road improvement project, and on roundabout. Roadway - 9 years of exp., has been lead roadway/transportation lead on DDI, widening projects, and an intersection improvement project. NEPA - Env. Lead on several intersection improvement projects. Prime - Firm does list relevant project exp; however, only one of the PM/KTLs were listed on any one of the projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Org Chart is staffed at appropriate levels. Has QC/QA but does not list disciplines. PM/KTL's appear to have capacity. The narrative provides additional SME resource on intersections.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Croy Engineering, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM - has been PM on multiple roundabout/intersection improvement projects, as well as a new location roadway project. Roadway - 9 years of exp., lead roadway/engineer on roubabout, operational improvement and widening projects. NEPA - 25 years of exp., has been NEPA lead on wideing, new alignment projects. PRIME - firm list similar scope projects where at least 2 of 3 PM/KTL's collaborated together.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
<i>Org chart is not adequately staffed. Doesn't show individual resources for env., lighting, sue, soils. Firm did not demonstrate the ability to deliver project with resources.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	EXP US Services Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM - 25 years of exp., has been PM on interchange, widening, safety improvement projects in GA, TN and AL. Roadway - 30 years of exp., while has vast exp, the engagements listed are as PM and not Roadway Design Led or KTL. NEPA - 18 years of exp., NEPA planner for several BR over water (not really relevant project exp.). PRIME - lists interchange, new location, maint. and an int. improvement project.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>Org chart is well staffed. Has a huge QC/QA team with multidisipline. Additional narrative discusses commitment to schedules, GDOT PDP, constructability, practical design. PM/KTL - have capacity.</i>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points			
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points			
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points			
Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points			
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Gresham Smith</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM - 13 years of exp., has been deputy PM/lead roadway design int. improvement, interchange, BR and widening. Roadway - 28 years exp, has DLT exp., bypass exp., BR over RR, NWC, express lanes working as PM/Roadway engineer mostly. NEPA - listed as PM (assuming Env. PM) on bypass, interchange, new construction roadway. PRIME - list intersection improvment projects of similar scale, widening projects where at least one of the PM/KTL participated.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>Firm provided a huge org chart, has multidiscipline QC/QA team. Very well staffed for this project. PM/KTL have capacity.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Holt Consulting Company, LLC</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM - 22 years of exp., lists int. improvement, widening, BR projects where he acted ass PM or lead Roadway engineer. Roadway - 24 years of exp., has been lead roadway engineer on safety improvement, corridor improvement and a widening project. NEPA - 16 years of exp., has been Env. PM on one way pair, bypass, and interchange. PRIME - only lists no relevant BR projects in thier exp.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Org chart demonstrates appropriate resources for this project. Only has 1 (roadway) QC/QA. PM/KTLS appear to have capacity (NEPA does have a lot of proejects.)</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>KCI Technologies, Inc.</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM - 22 years of exp., PM or Deputy PM on roadway widening , turn lane, roundabout projects. Roadway - 23 years of exp., Lead Roadway Eng on On call contract traffic operations contract, interesection improvements that include roundabouts. NEPA - has been env. pm on major SR intersection improvement, SR widening project as well as an interchange project. PRIME - list similar scope scale projects where PM and Roadway KTL collaborated together.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>Org chart is well staffed. Has QC/QA for NEPA/Roadway. PM/KTL appear to have capacity. Additional narrative provided a traditional 8 step project delivery method and identified constructibility SME's that are local to the area.</i>			



GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>PM - 27 years of exp., PM on 2 DDI's, TO manager SR int. improvement, median enhancements. Roadway - has been rdwy lead on DDI, widening. Was bridge Design PM on interchange project. NEPA - 27 years of exp., has been env. Lead on several int. improvements, ATMS and TIA program manager. PRIME - Lists a couple of relevant projects where PM/KTLs collaborated.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Org chart is staffed appropriately. PM and Roadway have capacity; however, NEPA has a lot of project commitments.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Parsons Transportation Group Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM - 24 years of exp., has been PM/Rdwy lead on DDI, PM on widening projects, PM on roundabout. Roadway - 24 years of exp., rdwy lead on urban widening projects that included several intersections. NEPA - 16 years of exp., has NEPA lead/planner exp. On one way pair, operational improvements, bypass and interchange reconstruction. Prime - lists several similar scope projects, not all projects had PM/KTL involment.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>Org chart - is well staffed and has roadway and env. Qc/Qa. PM/KTL appear to have capacity. NEPA - does list a lot of project commitments.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Practical Design Partners, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
<i>PM - 16 years of exp., has been PM on DDI, roundabout, widenings. Also has been lead engineer on similar scope projects. Roadway - 17 years of exp., all engagment listed she acted as PM not Roadway Lead, need to see her design exp. listed instead of PM exp. NEPA - 16 years of exp., listed as PM (assuming NEPA) on interchange, bypass and a reconstruction project. Prime - firm does lack the project exp., however, they have completed some operational improvement projects and smaller scale projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
<i>Org chart does not show individual resources for Roadway, geo, traffic, etc. Need to see individual resources instead of total number of support staff. Also no QC/QA listed for Roadway and NEPA.</i>			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points			
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points			
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points			
Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points			
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Precision Planning, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM - 47 years of exp., has been PM on bypass, interchange, safety improvements. Roadway - 35 years of exp., most exp. Is listed as PM, was EOR on safety improvements and a roadway extension on new location. NEPA - projects listed are ped. Bridge, sidewalks, and on call services contract all acting as env. PM/deputy PM. Not much relevance to this scope of work. PRIME - Bypass projects, interchange, widening projects.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
<i>Org chart only shows one individual resource for Roadway, geo, traffic, etc. Need more staff numbers for this project. Also no QC/QA listed for Roadway and NEPA.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	R.K. Shah & Associates, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM - 14 years of exp., PM/Deputy PM for costing plans, bridge replacement, county on call, widening and reconstruction project. Roadway - 26 years of exp., has been lead on a BR and a rural widening project. NEPA - 16 years of exp., passing lanes, widenings as coordinator of NEPA activities. PRIME- lists widenings, interchange projects where 2/3 collaborated together.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Org Chart is staffed at appropriate levels. Does not have env. QC/QA but does not list disciplines. PM/KTL's appear to have capacity.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM - has been pm on multiple widening, bridge replacement, turn lane projects. Roadway - 28 years of exp., list DB bridge exp. From SC, county turn lane, a widenign project from NC and a BR project where he acted as design manager or trans. Manager(unsure if thats the same as Rdvwy KTL. NEPA - 22 years of exp., has been nepa lead on several int. improvement projects. PRIME - lists several similar scope projects where atleast 1 out of the 3 participated.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>org chart is staffed appropriately. Only list one qc/qa individual and unsure of discipline. PM/KTLs appear to have capacity.</i>			







GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points			
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points			
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points			
Good = More then meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points			
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Stantec Consulting Services Inc.</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>PM - 41 years of exp., demonstrated knowledge and exp as a traffic design lead, he does list several projects where he acted as PM but not of similar scope or scale. Roadway - 30 years of exp., has lead roadway exp with complex int. design such as DDI and CFI. NEPA - 10 years of exp, has BR, int. section project exp. acting as env. lead. PRIME - Flrm list several similar scope projects but not all KTL participated.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>Org chart is well staffed. Has NEPA and Rdway qc/qa. PM/KTL's have capacity. Narrative is informative and firm understands the type of project they are applying to receive.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>TranSystems Corporation</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM - 26 years of exp., listed several interchanges, widening projects where he acted as PM and lead roadway. Roadway - 27 years of exp., has been lead on several rural widening projects, and BR project and one local widening that involved roundabouts. NEPA - 18 years of exp., bypass, one way pair and an interchange acting as NEPA lead. Prime - firm did provide similar scope projects however none of the KTL's participated.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>org chart is staffed appropriately, provided qc/qa for roadway, nepa and intersection design(which is a benefit). Firm demonstrated ability to deliver this type of projects in other states. PM/KTL appear to have capacity.</i>			



Evaluation Criteria





Experience and Qualifications  
Resources and Workload Capacity

# Evaluator 3

<i>Maximum Points allowed =</i>	200	300	Phase One	
			Evaluator 3 Individual	
<b>SUBMITTING FIRMS</b>	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Engineers, Inc.	Good	Adequate	300	5
Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	200	11
Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
Bridgefarmer & Associates, Inc. - Disqualified	Poor	Poor	0	18
CHA Consulting, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
Croy Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Marginal	175	12
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	Marginal	Marginal	125	16
Gresham Smith	Adequate	Good	325	4
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Marginal	175	12
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Parsons Transportation Group Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Practical Design Partners, LLC	Adequate	Marginal	175	12
Precision Planning, Inc.	Good	Poor	150	15
R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	Marginal	Poor	50	17
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)	Good	Adequate	300	5
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
Thomas & Hutton Engineering Co. - Disqualified	Poor	Poor	0	18
TranSystems Corporation	Good	Adequate	300	5
<b><i>Maximum Points allowed =</i></b>	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>%</b>







GDOT Solicitation #:	<b>RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12</b>	Phase of Evaluation:	<b>PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings</b>
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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>American Engineers, Inc.</b>		
<b>A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%</b>	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
Comments:PM - 23 yrs exp. Tom has managed 60 standalone intersection improvement projects, 3 have won awards. Cites 27 intersection impv. proj as PM. Road - 23 yrs exp. Cites 13 intersection impv proj. with varying complexity. NEPA - 36 yrs exp. has completed over 250 proj for GDOT. Cites experience with 2 widenings and contract management. Exp includes: env documentation (including EA), avoidance and minimization, community outreach, and agency coordination. Details lacking Prime - Cites 5 int imp proj. Experience includes, PI, new signals, culvert exertions, turn lanes, ICE, 404 ecology impacts			
<b>B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%</b>	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
Comments:Orgchart - Env SMEs not listed by area class Resources - conducted over 119 inter impv proj. Mostly re-hash of KTL experience. Avail - has availability			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Atlas Technical Consultants</b>		
<b>A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%</b>	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
Comments:PM - 22 yrs exp. Engineering Exp with inter improvement projects. PM experience cited includes, 3 inter improv proj, 1 widening, and 1 bridge replacement. PM exp includes, utility coord, traffic signal design, erosion control, MS4 permitting, ICE, and env permitting. Road - 7 yrs exp. Cites 3 inter improv proj. and a connector. inter improv proj vary in complexity. NEPA - 6 yrs exp. Cites a variety of project types, none are inter improv proj. 2 as eco lead. Experience includes, ecology assessments, NEPA docs, and PI. Detail lacking regarding NEPA lead exp. Prime - Cites 4 widening proj. Exp includes, ICE, traffic study, local gov coord, ecology permitting,			
<b>B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%</b>	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
Comments:Orgchart - lists an Env QA/QC. Resources - experienced constructability review team - all other sections lack details. Avail - has availability			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Barge Design Solutions, Inc.</b>		
<b>A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%</b>	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
Comments:PM - 22 yrs exp. Cites 11 projects as PM, including widenings, intersection improvs. Exp includes, PI, env coord, local coord, traffic study. Road - 22 yrs exp. Cites traffic opps, widening, interchange projects. NEPA - 22 yrs exp. Proj exp cites includes roundabout, widening, and env lead on on-call contract. Exp includes, PI, 4f, completing CE level docs. Proj exp lack details. Prime - Cites 5 traffic opps projects None are in GA, are they familiar with GDOT policies and procedures? Experience includes, PI, RCUT, Roundabout, complex staging, ICE,			
<b>B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%</b>	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
Comments:Orgchart - No env QA/QC Resources - Spann, national expert in alternative intersection design. KAI has developed various intersection guidebooks for FHWA. Team member have experience working on this intersection. Recognize stakeholder engagement may be needed. Avail - has availability			





GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>CHA Consulting, Inc.</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
Comments: PM - 14 yrs exp. . Cites multiple traffic opps projects and a widening. Exp includes, complex staging, SUE, mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) walls, avoidance and min for env resources. Road - 9 yrs exp. Cite 2 widenings, DDI, and intersection improvements. NEPA - 27 yrs exp. Cites 4 traffic opps projects. Exp includes, CE level documentation, virtual PI, A3M. Exp lack details. Prime - Cites 1 intersection improv, two interchanges, a corridor study and a connector. Experience includes, traffic study, complex staging, env site assessments, PI			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
Comments: Orgchart - No env QA/QC. Why is Env GEPA lead? know funding? Resources - Lenters, leading expert in RABs. Has completed traffic studies on SR 141 @ Statebridge Rd. Have experience working with john:s Creek. Avail - has availability			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Croy Engineering, LLC</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
Comments: PM - ? yrs exp. Cites 3 RABs, Int improv, and extension. Exp includes, 2020 GTPQ award for traffic safety and intersection design, ICE, traffic forecasting, and experience with changing from NEPA to GEPA process. Road - 9 yrs exp. Cites RAB, Traffic Opps, and Widening. NEPA - 25 yrs exp. Cites 2 widenings and an extension. Exp includes, NEPA-GEPA, EA, PI, EJ mitigation plan. Prime - Cites 1 intersection improv, and 2 roundabout projs.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
Comments: Orgchart - No env QA/QC. Many SMEs listed by company, not name of person Resources - In-house traffic engineering group. Nothing of note in this section. QA/QC is vague. Avail - has availability			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>EXP US Services Inc.</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
Comments: PM - 25 yrs exp. Cites PM exp with widening, safety, and interchange projects. Exp cites is mostly a project description, not his role as PM Road - 30 yrs exp. Cites three widening projects all as PM. NEPA - 18 yrs exp. Focused on bridge replacement projects?? Only experience list is with CE. Prime - Exp includes - traffic study, new location roadway, urban widening, paving/resurfacing, and intersection. Exp included minimization for eco resources, traffic studies,			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
Comments: Org Chart - no QA/QC for Env Resources - Very general information Availability - has availability			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Gresham Smith</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
Comments:PM - 12 yrs exp. Cites a wide diversity of project experience, including intersection improvements. Exp cited is mainly project description, and not role as PM Road - 28 yrs exp. Cites traffic opps, widening, bridge replacement, and managed lanes. NEPA - 16 yrs exp. Cites bypass, reconstruction, and interchange projects. Exp includes, SME coordination, PI, CE and EA level docs. Exp description is vague. Prime - Exp cited traffic opps and widening projects. Exp includes, PI, local coord, VERG. Mostly proj description.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
Comments:Org Chart -QA/QC for Env! Robust Org Chart Resources - Recent Exp with similar project type. ROW lead to reduce impacts to businesses. Dedicated staff to review design, env, and constructability at every milestone to keep project on schedule and within budget. Availability - has availability			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Holt Consulting Company, LLC</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
Comments:PM - 22 yrs exp. Design Exp cited includes traffic opps, widening. PM exp includes, 3 bridge replacement projects. Exp includes, local coord, PI, and RR coord. Road - 24 yrs exp. Cites two traffic opps proj, and 1 widening. NEPA - 16 yrs exp. Cites bypass, reconstruction, and interchange projects. Exp includes, SME coordination, PI, CE and EA level docs. Exp description is vague. Prime - Exp cited is 4 bridge replacement projects. Exp includes PI, RR coord, A3M,			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
Comments:Org Chart -QA/QC for roads only. Resources - exp mostly bridges. QA/QC for design only. Availability - has availability			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>KCI Technologies, Inc.</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
Comments:PM - 22 yrs exp. PM Exp cited includes, traffic opps, widening, new location. Exp cited includes, PI, design, RR coord, and traffic analysis. Road - 23 yrs exp. Cites numerous traffic opps projects. NEPA - ?? yrs exp. Cites 2 traffic opps and an interchange for experience. Exp includes, leading env SMEs, avoidance and min, PI, and supervision of NEAP docs. Prime - Exp cited is 3 widenings and an interchange. Exp includes, traffic analysis, NEPA process, complex staging, PI, RR coord, avoid an min for env resources,			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
Comments:Org Chart -QA/QC incules env. extensive team listed. Resources - exp with intersection imp. Important to avoid and minimize impact to env resources. Traffic maintenance and constructability important part of the process. robust QA/QC process Availability - has availability			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
Comments:PM - 27 yrs exp. PM Exp cited includes, interchanges, median improvement, and intersection improvement. Exp includes, complex staging, PI, signal permitting, no-rise cert, and RCUTs. Road - ?? yrs exp. Cites DD, bridge , and widening project. NEPA - 27 yrs exp. Cites multiple traffic opps projects. Exp includes, CE level documentation, virtual PI, A3M. Exp lack details. Prime - Exp cited is on-call in NC and traffic opps projects. Exp includes, local gov coord, traffic analysis, signal permitting, FEMA coord, PI, CSS.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
Comments:Org Chart -QA/QC incules env. Resources - Pm has a lot of exp with intersection imp proj. Hybrid CFI experience on team, and traffic maintenance. QA/QC vauge Availability - has availability			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Parsons Transportation Group Inc.</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
Comments:PM - 24 yrs exp. Pm exp includes 2 widenings, RAB, and managed lanes. Exp includes, complex env coordination, stakeholder outreach, innovative design, and local/agency coordination. Road - 24 yrs exp. Cites 4 intersection improvs. NEPA - 16 yrs exp. Cites intersection improv, bypass, interchange, and reconstruction. Exp includes, coordination of SMEs, CE level docs, EA reval, stakeholder outreach, PI. Prime - Exp cited is widening and intersection improvements. Exp includes, PI, utility coord, traffic analysis,			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
Comments:Org Chart -QA/QC includes env. Team has extensive resources. Resources - Team has extensive intersection exp. Use modeling at various stages for MOT to ensure road performs during construction. 3D used for stakeholder engagement. Will address access issues. Availability - has availability			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Practical Design Partners, LLC</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
Comments:PM -16 yrs exp. Cite traffic opps, widening, and interchange projects. Exp includes, signal mods, CFI, utility coord, practical design. Road - 17 yrs exp. Cites 1 widening, RAB, and intersection improvement. NEPA - 16 yrs exp. Cites intersection improv, bypass, interchange, and reconstruction. Exp includes, coordination of SMEs, CE level docs, EA reval, stakeholder outreach, PI. Prime - New firm. Team members have extensive exp with intersection improvement projects			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
Comments:Org Chart - no QA/QC on org chart. Resources - Team has experience delivery similar projects in the John's Creek area. recognize need to limit impacts to private property. This section lacks details overall. Availability - has availability			



GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Precision Planning, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
Comments:PM - 47 yrs exp. PM experience cited on, widenings, interchange, bypass, intersections. Exp includes RR coord, Utility coord, signal design, MS4, Road - 35 yrs exp. Cites extension and 3 widenings. NEPA - ?? yrs exp. Cites a ped bridge, sidewalks, and on-call contract management. Exp includes, SME management, PI, env permitting, avoid and min for resources, and sub management. Prime - Cite bypass, traffic opps, interchange, and extension. Exp includes, MS4, interchange study, SUE, signal design, PI, utility coord,			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Poor</b>
Comments:Org Chart - no QA/QC on org chart. No SMEs listed from env Resources - no substance Availability - has availability			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	R.K. Shah & Associates, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
Comments:PM - 14 yrs exp. PM experience cited on, 4 widenings, a bridge and on-call contract. details on experience are lacking. Road - 26 yrs exp. Cites widening, bridge replacement, and interchange. NEPA - 15 yrs exp. provided env oversight on sidewalk, RAB, widening, and passing lane projects. details lacking Prime - Cites 2 widenings, new interchange, and intersection improv. Exp includes avoidance and min, storm water man, MSE walls to avoid properties.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Poor</b>
Comments:Org Chart - QA/QC for road only. Env KTL is over 6 area classes?? lacking env resources. Resources - no substance Availability - has availability			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
Comments:PM - ?? yrs exp. PM experience cited on, widenings, bridges, and intersection improvements. Exp includes, QA/QC roadway plans, project coord, traffic studies, CSD, MOT, and avoid and min. Road - 28 yrs exp. Cites widening, bridge replacement, and intersections. NEPA - 22 yrs exp. Proj exp cites includes traffic opps projects. Exp includes, EJ, PI, 4f, completing CE level docs. Proj exp lack details. Prime - Cites 3 traffic opps and 1 widening. exp includes, traffic forecasting, traffic and safety analysis, signal design, ICE, FEMA, CSD, signal design,			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
Comments:Org Chart - QA/QC for road only. Resources - Team member s have experience working on this intersection. have members to address traffic and signal. NEPA KTL will support GDOT's PI efforts. QA/QC is vaue. Availability - has availability			

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	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			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>Stantec Consulting Services Inc.</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<p>Comments: PM - 41 yrs exp. PM experience cited on, 2 feasibility studies, interchange, and ITS improvements. Exp on interchange includes, traffic forecasts, traffic analysis, traffic simulation modeling (CORSIM) - detail lacking on other projs.</p> <p>Road - 30 yrs exp. Cites 5 traffic opps projects, 4 with CFI.</p> <p>NEPA - 10 yrs exp. cites experience leading PI, and being NEPA lead on bridge projects and a widening. Exp includes, virtual PI, 4F, and agency coord. Other details lacking.</p> <p>Prime - Cites 6 traffic opps projects, exp includes, CFI, design for: roadway, drainage, erosion control, construction phasing, traffic signals, and signing/pavement marking designs. PI</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<p>Comments: Org Chart - QA/QC for person for env.</p> <p>Resources - inhouse CFI experts and experience with Thru-U. Lot of experience with both. Important to ID early on env resources that will require A&amp;M. ISO 9001 certified.</p> <p>Availability - has availability</p>			
<b>Firm Name:</b>	<b>TranSystems Corporation</b>		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<p>Comments: PM - 26 yrs exp. PM experience cited on, traffic opps, interchanges, RR crossing, and relocation. Exp includes, coord with env and bridge team members, PI. Other details lacking</p> <p>Road - 27 yrs exp. Cites 3 widenings, new location, and bridges.</p> <p>NEPA - 18 yrs exp. Cites intersection improv, bypass, interchange, and reconstruction. Exp includes, coordination of SMEs, CE level docs, EA reval, stakeholder outreach, PI.</p> <p>Prime - cites widening, interchange, and connector. exp includes, ICE, PI, traffic analysis, and CFI</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<p>Comments: Org Chart - QA/QC for person for env.</p> <p>Resources - extensive innovative intersection design experience. design must be sensitive to property impacts,</p> <p>Availability - has availability</p>			

Solicitation Title:	Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services	1	KCI Technologies, Inc.
Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	1	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria FOR TOP 15 SUBMITTALS			1
<b>(This Page For GDOT Use)</b>			1
			5
<b>SUBMITTING FIRMS</b>	(RANKING)	5	Parsons Transportation Group Inc.
		5	Gresham Smith
	Group	8	TranSystems Corporation
	Score	8	CHA Consulting, Inc.
	Ranking	8	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)
		8	American Engineers, Inc.
		8	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.
		8	Holt Consulting Company, LLC
		13	Croy Engineering, LLC
		13	R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.
	13	Precision Planning, Inc.	
KCI Technologies, Inc.	375	1	
Parsons Transportation Group Inc.	325	5	
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	375	1	
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	375	1	
Gresham Smith	325	5	
TranSystems Corporation	325	5	
Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	375	1	
CHA Consulting, Inc.	250	8	
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)	250	8	
American Engineers, Inc.	250	8	
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	250	8	
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	250	8	
Croy Engineering, LLC	175	13	
R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	175	13	
Precision Planning, Inc.	175	13	

Evaluation Criteria				
		Experience and Qualifications	Resource and Workload Capacity	
<b>Maximum Points allowed =</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>Phase One Scores and Group Ranking</b>	
<b>SUBMITTING FIRMS</b>	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Parsons Transportation Group Inc.	Adequate	Good	325	5
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
Gresham Smith	Adequate	Good	325	5
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Good	325	5
Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
CHA Consulting, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
American Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
EXP U.S. Services, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	8
Croy Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Marginal	175	13
R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	Adequate	Marginal	175	13
Precision Planning, Inc.	Adequate	Marginal	175	13
<b>Maximum Points allowed =</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>%</b>

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	KCI Technologies, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>KCI's Project Manager (PM) has 22 years of experience which includes railroad coordination, and traffic analysis. Was Deputy PM on roadway widening, new location, turn lane, and roundabout projects. She provided examples of innovative intersection design projects for her relevant engineering and PM experience. Roadway Lead has 23 years of experience. Has on-call contract, traffic operations contract, and intersection improvements that include roundabouts experience. NEPA Lead years of experience is questionable. She has been environmental PM on major SR intersection improvement, with SR widening project as well as an interchange project experience. Experience includes leading environmental Subject Matter Experts (SME's), public involvement, and supervision of NEPA documents. Prime's experience includes traffic analysis and shows a list of similar scope scale projects and three widening and an interchange projects. The PM and Roadway Lead have collaborated together before.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>KCI's organizational chart is well staffed with an extensive team listed. Firm provided a well-rounded breakdown of how they will help deliver the project. Shows QC/QA for NEPA and Roadway. The PM and Key Team Leads appear to have capacity. Additional narrative provided a traditional eight step project delivery method and identified constructability Subject Matter Experts (SME's) that are local to the area. Resources experience has intersection improvement. States it is important to avoid and minimize impact to environmental resources. Traffic maintenance and constructability important part of the process.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Parsons Transportation Group Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Parsons' PM has 24 years of experience and provided good examples of alternative intersection design experience. He has been PM and Roadway Lead on Diverging Diamond Interchange. His experience includes two widening projects and managed lanes. Was PM on roundabout. PM also has experience with complex environmental coordination, stakeholder outreach, innovative design, and local/agency coordination. Roadway Lead has 24 years of experience and has been the Roadway lead on urban widening projects that included four intersection improvements. NEPA lead has 16 years of experience. She has NEPA Lead and planner experience on one way pair, operational improvements, bypass and interchange reconstruction. Also, has experience with intersection improvement bypass, interchange, and reconstruction. Experience includes, coordination of Subject Matter Experts (SME's), Categorical Exclusion (CE) and environmental documents, and stakeholder outreach. NEPA Lead also has experience that includes public involvement, utility coordination, and traffic analysis. Prime lists several similar scope projects, but not all projects had PM and Key Team Leads involvement. The overall Prime experience exhibits the Key Team Leads working history together on a few projects and also their range of knowledge for delivering various alternative intersection design types of projects.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Parsons' organizational chart is well staffed and shows good depth for each discipline. Has roadway and environmental QC/QA. PM and Key Team Leads appear to have capacity and availability is acceptable. NEPA Lead does list a lot of project commitments. Team has extensive resources with extensive intersection experience. Used modeling at various stages for maintenance of traffic (MOT) to ensure road performs during construction. 3D used for stakeholder engagement. Firm will address access issues. Prime has a local traffic operations to aid with the design of this alternative intersection project.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	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 27 years of experience. PM experience includes two Diverging Diamond Interchanges, Task Order Manager, SR intersection improvement, and median enhancements. Experience includes, complex staging, public involvement, signal permitting, completed no-rise modeling, and Reduced Conflict U-Turns (RCUT's). Provided examples of innovative intersection design projects for his relevant engineering and PM experience. Roadway Lead years of experience is questionable. Has been Roadway Lead on Diverging Diamond Interchanges, widening and was Bridge Design PM on interchange project. Provided examples of relevant project types for their experience. NEPA Lead has 27 years of experience and has been Environmental Lead on several intersection improvements, Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS). and Transportation Investment Act program manager. Experience includes multiple traffic operation projects, Categorical Exclusion (CE) level documentation, virtual public involvement, Avoidance &amp; Minimization Measures Meetings (A3Ms). Experience lack details. Prime lists a couple of relevant projects where PM and Key Team Leads collaborated. Experience cited on-call contract with North Carolina DOT and traffic operation projects. Experience includes, local government coordination, traffic analysis, signal permitting, FEMA coordination, public involvement, and context sensitive solutions (CSS). Overall, Prime's experience is acceptable for this type of project.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Kimley-Horn's organizational chart is staffed appropriately and shows an alternative intersection design group and advisory team. PM and Roadway have capacity; however, NEPA Lead has a lot of project commitments. The organization chart has QA/QC for environmental, but it is vague for this type of project. Resources for PM has a lot of experience with intersection improvement projects. Hybrid continuous flow intersection (CFI) experience on team, and traffic maintenance. The additional resources information provided shows that the Prime has an understanding of what the project is and how to deliver it.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Stantec's PM has 41 years of experience. Has demonstrated knowledge and experience as a traffic design lead. He does list several projects where he acted as PM, but not of similar scope or scale. Experience with two feasibility studies, interchange, and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) improvements. His PM experience also reflects his ability to deliver projects on schedule, budget and within scope. Experience on interchange includes, traffic forecasts, traffic analysis, traffic simulation modeling (CORSIM). Also, detail lacking on other projects. Roadway Lead has 30 years of experience and has lead roadway experience with complex intersection design such as Diverging Diamond Interchanges and continuous flow intersection (CFI). NEPA Lead has 10 years of experience. Acting as environmental lead on bridge projects and public involvement. Has widening project, agency coordination, virtual public involvement, full 4(f) impact to archaeological and historic resources experience. Prime lists several similar scope projects, six traffic operation projects. Experience includes continuous flow intersection (CFI), design for: roadway, drainage, erosion control, construction phasing, traffic signals, and signing/pavement marking designs. Not all Key Team Leads have worked together.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Stantec's organizational chart is well staffed and very detailed and showed good depth. Has NEPA and Roadway QC/QA. PM and Key Team Leads have capacity and is acceptable. The narrative is informative and firm understands the type of project they are applying to receive. The Resources are in-house continuous flow intersection (CFI) experts and experienced with ThrU Intersection. Firm is ISO 9001 certified. Provided good information on how the team will work together to deliver the project.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Gresham Smith		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Gresham Smith's PM has 13 years of experience. Has been Deputy PM and lead for roadway design improvement, interchange, bridge and widening. Cites a wide diversity of project experience, including intersection improvements. Experience listed is mainly project description, and not role as PM. Showed examples of innovative projects that he has worked on. Roadway Lead has 28 years of experience, has displaced left-turn (DLT), bypass, bridge over railroad, and express lanes working as PM and Roadway engineer experience. Cites traffic operations, widening, bridge replacement, and managed lanes. Have years of experience working on various types of projects but did not provide good examples of innovative traffic type projects. NEPA Lead has 16 years of experience. Listed as PM on bypass, interchange, new construction roadway, and reconstruction projects. Experience includes Subject Matter Experts (SME's) coordination, public involvement, Categorical Exclusion (CE) and Environmental Assessment (EA) level documents. Prime listed intersection improvement projects of similar scale, widening projects where at least one of the Key Team Leads (KTL) participated. Experience includes traffic operations and widening projects, public involvement, local coordination. Most project descriptions show experience with unique and innovative designs.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Gresham Smith provided a huge organization chart, has multi-discipline QC/QA team. Firm is very well staffed for this project. PM and Key Team Leads (KTL) have capacity. The resources show recent experience with similar project type. Right-of-Way (ROW) lead to reduce impacts to businesses. Dedicated staff to review design, environmental, and constructability at every milestone to keep project on schedule and within budget. Overall, organizational chart has good depth to it and the additional resources section provided clarity on how the team will work together and have worked together in the past.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	TranSystems Corporation		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>TranSystems' PM has 26 years of experience. Listed several interchanges, widening projects where he acted as PM and lead Roadway. PM experience mentioned traffic operations, interchanges, railroad crossing, and relocation. Experience includes, coordination with environmental and bridge team members, and public involvement. Provided adequate examples of various projects for relevant experience. Roadway Lead has 27 years of experience. Has been lead on several rural widening projects, new location, bridge project and one local widening that involved roundabouts. Have adequate experience. NEPA Lead has 18 years of experience. Experience includes bypass, one way pair and interchange acting as NEPA lead. Experience mentioned intersection improvements, reconstruction, coordination of Subject Matter Experts (SME's), Categorical Exclusion (CE) level documents, Environmental Assessment (EA) level, stakeholder outreach, and public involvement. Environmental Lead has adequate experience. Prime did provide similar scope projects however none of the Key Team Leads (KTL) worked together. Prime experience cites widening, interchange, and connector, Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE), public involvement, traffic analysis, and continuous flow intersection (CFI). Overall, Prime's experience is satisfactory for this type of project.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>TranSystems organizational chart is staffed appropriately, provided QC/QA for Roadway, NEPA and intersection design. Firm demonstrated ability to deliver this type of project in other states. PM and Key Team Leads (KTL) appear to have capacity. The Resources show extensive innovative intersection design experience. Prime's ability to develop an organization chart that encompasses the needs of the project was good. They also provided a very detailed discussion of how the project will be delivered with the additional resources and methods developed. A screenshot of the conceptual layout for the project was also provided.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Barge Design Solutions, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Barge's PM has 22 years of experience. Has been PM on several intersection improvement projects, as well as widening and bridge projects. Cites eleven projects as PM, including widenings, intersection improvements. Experience also includes public involvement, environmental coordination, local coordination, and traffic study. Provided an extensive number of examples of unique traffic projects and he also possesses his Professional Traffic Operations Engineer (PTOE) which will aid in his understanding of the project and his ability to keep the project moving forward. Roadway Lead has 22 years of experience. Has transportation design experience and has been Roadway Engineer, PM, Principal Design engineer on roundabout, Diverging Diamond Interchange, and other intersection improvements. Cites traffic operations, widening projects experience. NEPA Lead has 22 years of experience. Has been environmental lead on two roundabouts, on-call contract and a widening project. He has also lead the GEC for Region 2. Project experience includes env lead on on-call contract. Experience includes, public involvement, full 4(f) impact to archaeological and historic resources experience, completing Categorical Exclusion (CE) level documents. Project experience lack details. Will be developing the concept report for the project under a separate contract. PRIME has mostly out of state experience with intersection improvements, widenings where at least one of the PM and Key Team Leads (KTL) were involved. Prime cites five traffic operations projects None are in Georgia. Overall, Prime's experience given provided an extensive innovative and alternative design.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Barge's organizational chart is well staffed. Has a QC/QA team. However, it's not discipline specific. The resources state that the subject matter leader is a national expert in alternative intersection design. Barge and Kittelson (KAI) has developed various intersection guidebooks for Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). PM and Key Team Leads (KTL) have experience working on this intersection. Firm recognizes stakeholder engagement may be needed. The organizational chart and additional resources provided good depth and information.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	CHA Consulting, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>CHA's PM has 14 years of experience. Has been PM on multiple roundabout and intersection improvement projects, as well as a new location roadway project. Cites multiple traffic operation projects and a widening. PM experience includes, complex staging, Subsurface utility engineering (SUE), mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) walls. Roadway Lead has 9 years of experience. Was roadway lead and engineer on roundabout, operational improvement and two widening projects. Has experience with Diverging Diamond Interchange, and intersection improvements. Example of various types of intersection improvement projects are not all unique or innovative. NEPA Lead has 27 years of experience. Has been NEPA Lead on widening, new alignment projects. Experience cites four traffic operation projects, Categorical Exclusion level documentation, virtual public involvement, Avoidance &amp; Minimization Measures Meetings (A3Ms).. Experience lacked details. Provided examples of various types of intersection improvement projects but not all unique or innovative. PRIME listed similar scope projects where at least two of three PM and Key Team Leads (KTL) collaborated together. Prime cited one intersection improvement, two interchanges, a corridor study and a connector. Experience also included traffic study, complex staging, environmental site assessments, virtual public involvement. Prime's experience references their involvement in the study completed to develop this project's conceptual plan.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>CHA's organizational chart is not adequately staffed with no environmental QA/QC. Does not show individual resources for environmental, lighting, Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE), and soils. Firm did not demonstrate the ability to deliver project with resources. Firm has completed traffic studies. The organizational chart was adequate, but need to be more robust in certain areas (i.e. QA/QC and Traffic). Overall, adequate information provided for the additional resources and the Key Team Leads (KTL) availability is acceptable.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP (RK&K)		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Rummel, Klepper &amp; Kahl's PM years of experience is questionable. Has been PM on multiple widening, bridge replacement, and turn lane projects. PM experience also mentioned intersection improvements, QA/QC roadway plans, project coordination, traffic studies, maintenance of traffic (MOT). PM provided examples of large scale projects but didn't focus on alternative intersection improvement projects specifically as his PM experience. Roadway Lead has 28 years of experience. Listed design build bridge experience from South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT), county turn lane, and a widening project from North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) and a bridge project where he acted as design manager or transportation manager. Roadway lead also did not provide specific experience with alternative intersection projects. NEPA Lead has 22 years of experience. Has been NEPA Lead on several intersection improvement projects. Project experience includes traffic operation projects, Environmental Justice, public involvement, full 4(f) impact to archaeological and historic resources experience, completing Categorical Exclusion (CE) level documents. Project experience lack details. The Environmental Lead provided adequate examples of experience working on intersection improvement projects. Prime lists several similar scope projects where at least one out of the three participated. Prime mentions three traffic operations and one widening project. Experience also includes traffic forecasting, traffic and safety analysis, signal design, Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and signal design.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Rummel, Klepper &amp; Kahl's organizational chart is staffed appropriately. Only listed one QA/QC individual for roadway only. PM and Key Team Leads (KTL) appear to have capacity. Resources show team members experience working to address traffic and signal. NEPA Lead will support GDOT's public involvement efforts. The overall organizational chart was lacking in depth for some disciplines (i.e. QA/QC). The additional resources provided depth to the overall staff and focused on how they will work together with the Key Team Leads (KTL) to deliver this project.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	American Engineers, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>American Engineers' PM has 23 years of experience. Has managed sixty standalone intersection improvement projects. Three have won awards. Lists a variety of SR, CR intersection improvement projects that he has managed. The write up references the wrong project (SR6/SR101 @ Coots Lake). Roadway Lead has 23 years of experience. The write up references the wrong project (SR6/SR101 @ Coots Lake). She served as Roadway Design Engineer not as lead on several cited intersection improvement jobs with varying complexity of similar scope and scale. NEPA Lead has 36 years of experience. Has managed environmental documentation (including Environmental Assessment (EA) level documents and analysis on two widening projects and has managed on-call contract for environmental services. Has completed over 250 projects for GDOT. He mentions experience with two widenings and contract management. Experience also includes avoidance and minimization, community outreach, and agency coordination. Details lacking because he did not provide urban design projects for his experience. Prime lists several similar scope projects where PM and Roadway lead collaborated. Mentions intersection improvement projects. Experience includes public involvement, new signals, culvert exertions, turn lanes, Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE), 404 ecology impacts. Innovative intersection design was not addressed in the prime experience. Firm referenced wrong project in Key Team Leads (KTL) write ups; QA/QC was not satisfactory. Lacking adequate innovative and alternative intersection design examples across the Key Team Leads (KTL) experience. Overall, Prime's experience did not include various intersection projects that show unique designs or presented challenges.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>American Engineers' organizational chart presented an adequate staff and PM and Key Team Leads (KTL) availability was acceptable, but they listed a deceased individual in their organization chart. The QA/QC team is not specified by discipline and Environmental Subject Matter Experts (SME) not listed by area class. The resources show conducted over 119 intersection improvement projects mostly re-hash of Key Team Leads (KTL) experience.</p>			



RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	EXP U.S. Services, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>EXP U.S.'s PM has 25 years of experience. Has been PM on interchange, widening, safety improvement projects in Georgia, Tennessee and Alabama. Provided adequate examples of projects and he also possesses his PTOE which will aid in his understanding of the project and his ability to keep the project moving forward. But experience mentioned is mostly a project description, not his role as PM. Roadway Lead has 30 years of experience. Though he has vast experience the three widening projects listed are as PM and not Roadway Design Lead or Key Team Leader. NEPA Lead has 18 years of experience. Was NEPA planner for several bridge over water but not really relevant project experience. Focused on bridge replacement projects which are questionable. Only experience listed is with Categorical Exclusion (CE). Prime listed interchange, new location, maintenance and an intersection improvement project. The firm included traffic study, new location roadway, urban widening, paving/resurfacing, and minimization for eco resources as experience. Overall, Prime's experience provided studies for alternative design examples, but no project design completed for those.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>EXP U.S.'s organizational chart is well staffed and satisfactory. Has a huge QC/QA team with multidiscipline, but there is no QA/QC for environmental. Additional narrative discusses commitment to schedules, GDOT Plan Development Process (PDP), constructability, practical design. PM and Key Team Leads (KTL) have capacity. Resources show very general information. Focused mainly on how they will meet the schedule with their overall staff/team.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Holt Consulting Company, LLC		
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Holt's PM has 22 years of experience. Lists intersection improvement, traffic operations, widening, and three bridge replacement projects where he acted as PM or lead Roadway Engineer. PM showed relevant engineering experience with intersection type projects but only provided bridge replacement projects for his PM experience. Experience also includes, local coordination, public involvement, and railroad coordination. Roadway Lead has 24 years of experience. Has been lead roadway engineer on safety improvement, corridor improvement and a widening project. Experience mentioned is two traffic operation projects, and one widening. Did not provide intersection improvement projects for his experience. NEPA Lead has 16 years of experience. Has been Environmental PM on one-way pair, reconstruction, bypass, and interchange projects. Experience also includes Subject Matter Experts (SME) coordination, public involvement, Categorical Exclusion (CE) and Environmental Assessment (EA) level documents. Did not provide intersection improvement projects for their experience. Prime only lists four bridge replacement projects for their experience which has no relevance. Experience also includes public involvement, railroad coordination, Avoidance &amp; Minimization Measures Meetings (A3Ms). Overall, Prime's experience did not provide experience with innovative traffic projects (i.e. roundabouts, or congested intersection improvements).</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Holt's organizational chart demonstrates appropriate resources for this project. Firm only has one roadway QC/QA. PM and Key Team Leads (KTL) appear to have capacity and NEPA does have a lot of projects. Resources experience mostly bridges. The organizational chart needs to be more robust in certain areas (i.e. QA/QC and Traffic). Overall, satisfactory information provided for the additional resources and team availability is acceptable.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Croy Engineering, LLC		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Croy's PM years of experience is questionable. PM showed good examples of innovative projects that he has worked on. Has been PM on three roundabout, extension and intersection improvement projects, as well as a new location roadway project. Experience includes 2020 Georgia Partnership for Transportation Quality (GPTQ) Award for traffic safety and intersection design, Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE), traffic forecasting, and experience with changing from NEPA to GEPA process. Roadway Lead has 9 years of experience. Was lead roadway and engineer on roundabout, operational improvement and widening projects. Have years of experience working on various types of projects that will benefit the project. NEPA Lead has 25 years of experience. Has been NEPA lead on two widening, extension and new alignment projects. Experience also includes NEPA, GEPA, Environmental Assessment (EA), public involvement, Environmental Justice (EJ), and mitigation plan. Have years of experience working on various types of projects that will benefit the project. Prime lists similar scope projects where at least two of the team members the PM and Roadway lead have collaborated together. Experience mentioned is one intersection improvement, and 2 roundabout projects. The Prime Experience shows an extensive amount of experience.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Marginal	
<p>Croy's organizational chart seems light on staff. Does not show individual resources for environmental, lighting, Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE), or soils. Does not show environmental QA/QC. Firm did not demonstrate the ability to deliver project with resources. The additional resources information was not detailed. Many Subject Matter Experts (SME's) listed by company, not give a specific list of personnel. The resources are an in-house traffic engineering group.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	R. K. Shah & Associates, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>R.K. Shah's PM has 14 years of experience. Was PM and Deputy PM for costing plans, bridge replacement, county on-call, four widenings and reconstruction projects. Details on experience are lacking. Provided some relevant experience with being a PM but did not include more than minimal examples of alternative intersection designs. Roadway Lead has 26 years of experience. Has been lead on a bridge replacement, interchange and a rural widening project. Provided minimal examples of various project experience. NEPA Lead has 15 years of experience. Provided environmental oversight on sidewalk, roundabout, widening, and passing lane projects as coordinator of NEPA activities. Details lacking. Prime listed two widenings, new interchange, and intersection improvement projects where a couple of the team members collaborated together. Experience also includes avoidance and minimization, storm water management, mechanically stabilized Earth (MSE) walls to avoid properties. Overall, Prime's experience shows minimal examples of various intersection and interchange projects.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Marginal	
<p>R.K. Shah's organizational chart is staffed at appropriate levels. Does not have environmental QC/QA only for Roadway and does not list disciplines. PM and Key Team Leads (KTL) appear to have capacity. Environmental Lead is over six area classes which is questionable but lacking environmental resources. Resources could use more description. Overall, the organizational chart provided minimal staffing. Could be more detailed with traffic and QA/QC. The additional resources section focused on details of how the staff will meet the schedule and how they have managed projects in the past.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Precision Planning, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Precision's PM has 47 years of experience. Has been PM on widenings, bypass, interchange, and safety improvement projects. Experience also includes railroad coordination, Utility coordination, signal design, Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) and alternative intersection projects. Roadway Lead has 35 years of experience, most of experience is listed as PM; also was a Engineer of Record (EOR) on safety improvements. Experience includes roadway extension on new location and three widening projects. Provided examples of projects to represent his depth of experience. NEPA Lead years of experience is questionable. Projects listed are pedestrian. bridge, sidewalks, and on-call services contract with all roles acting as environmental PM or Deputy PM. Not much relevance to this scope of work. Experience also includes Subject Matter Expert (SME) management, public involvement, environmental permitting, and avoidance and minimization for resources. Provided examples of projects to represent her depth of experience. Prime's experience showed experience with various types of projects such as bypass, interchange study, traffic operations, extension and widening projects. Experience also includes Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE), signal design, public involvement, and utility coordination.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Marginal	
<p>Precision's organizational chart only shows one individual resource for roadway, geotechnical, and traffic for example. Need more personnel for this project. The availability is minimal. Also, there is no QC/QA listed for Roadway and NEPA. Resources does not really show a lot of substance. The overall organizational chart was lacking in depth and information. The additional resources was not completely thought out or developed.</p>			

### SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST

Solicitation #: RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12

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)	1.10	3.02	3.03	3.06	3.07	3.09	3.12	3.13	3.15	5.08	6.01(e)	6.03	6.05	9.01	Certificate Expires		
<b>3</b>	<b>Barge Design Solutions, Inc.</b>	X				X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	9/30/2024	
	Practical Design Partners, LLC								X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	8/13/2023	
	Kittelson & Associates, Inc.								X			X	X			X								1/12/2023	
	WSP USA, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	11/9/2023
	Edwards-Ptiman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																3/12/2023
	United Consulting, LLC																	X	X	X	X			7/13/2023	
	Gresham Smith	X		X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	6/7/2023	
<b>10</b>	<b>KCI Technologies, Inc.</b>	X			X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	5/10/2023	
	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X	3/11/2024	
	New South Associates, Inc.		X				X																	6/11/2023	
	Ecological Solutions, Inc.	X				X		X																2/28/2022	
	Key Engineering Group, Inc.																X							8/9/2023	
	MC Squared, Inc.																		X	X	X	X		11/9/2023	
<b>11</b>	<b>Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.</b>	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	8/31/2024	
	Aulick Engineering, LLC															X							X	11/9/2023	
	CHA Consulting, Inc.	X				X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	2/9/2023
	Edwards-Ptiman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																	3/12/2023
	MC Squared, Inc.																		X	X	X	X		11/9/2023	
	TerraXplorations, Inc.		X				X																	5/31/2024	
<b>17</b>	<b>Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	12/14/2023	
	Accura Engineering and Consulting Services, Inc.																	X	X	X	X	X		1/31/2022	
	Ecological Solutions, Inc.	X				X		X																2/28/2022	
	MC Squared, Inc.																		X	X	X	X		11/9/2023	
	New South Associates, Inc.		X				X																	6/11/2023	
	Practical Design Partners, LLC								X	X					X	X							X	8/13/2023	



# 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: Barge Design Solutions, Inc.; KCI Technologies, Inc.; Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.; and Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.**

**Please send an e-mail confirming receipt of this notice to Melissa Hannah (mehannah@dot.ga.gov).**

**Re: RFQ-484-051121 – Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services, Contract 12 - PI #0017845, Fulton 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 Melissa Hannah, and congratulations again to each of you!

Melissa Hannah  
[mehannah@dot.ga.gov](mailto:mehannah@dot.ga.gov)  
404-631-1495



## SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

<b>SOLICITATION #:</b>	<b>RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12</b>	
<b>SOLICITATION TITLE:</b>	<b>Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services</b>	
<b>SOLICITATION DUE DATE:</b>	<b>September 1, 2021</b>	
<b>SOLICITATION TIME DUE:</b>	<b>2:00pm</b>	

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Meets Required Area Classes	Compliant with Page # Limitations
1	KCI Technologies, Inc.	9/1/2021	1:03 PM	X	X
2	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	9/1/2021	1:46 PM	X	X
3	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	9/1/2021	11:25 AM	X	X
4	Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	9/1/2021	12:54 PM	X	X

**GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF SUBMITTALS**

Solicitation Title:	Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services	1	Barge Design Solutions, Inc.
Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	2	KCI Technologies, Inc.
PHASE I AND PHASE II - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria		2	Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.
		2	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

**(This Page For GDOT Use)**

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING)	
	Sum of	
	Total	Group
	Score	Ranking
KCI Technologies, Inc.	625	2
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	625	2
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	625	2
Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	750	1

Evaluation Criteria	PHASE I		PHASE II		Group Scores and Ranking	
	200	300	400	100	Total Score	Ranking
<i>Experience and Qualifications</i>	Good	Good	Adequate	Adequate	625	2
<i>Resources and Workload Capacity</i>	Good	Good	Adequate	Adequate	625	2
<i>Technical Approach</i>	Good	Good	Adequate	Adequate	625	2
<i>Past Performance</i>	Good	Good	Good	Good	750	1
<b>Maximum Points allowed =</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>%</b>

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	KCI Technologies, Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>KCI extensively provided some knowledge and details pertaining to the project and project location. They did not mention picking project up after concept, did list some challenges and provided a good understanding of project and main hurdles that includes constrained Right-of-Way, Construction Staging, Utilities, Traffic Operations and public involvement. KCI's procurement plan is a major part of the project execution plan to avoid procurement delays for the different task orders. The PM will hold monthly team meetings and more frequent small group meetings and provide minutes documenting the discussion including upcoming milestones, task orders, and project risks will be sent out to the team. The minutes will also include action items and who is the responsible party. Firm has a decent understanding of environmental concerns. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) discussion is light. PM worked with City on on-call contract. The firm's schedule discussion is not strong. KCI has shown that they had previous experience with projects of a similar design. They understand the potential project issues and risks to look out for during the design process. They did not provide detailed information about the overall technical approach.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>KCI - Evaluators do not have any direct work relationship with the firm and provided CMIS scores ranging from 60s to 80s and comments states the firm project work has been adequate and the firm's activities are managed in a timely manner with quality submittals and deliverables. The past performance shows a rating of 4.20 and comments provided are that the firm effectively managed resources and expedited schedule as they worked through an expedited project process for this widening project to meet the fiscal year funding authorizations for ROW (FY 19) and CST (FY 21), and they were able to meet these goals. The firm was very responsive to GDOT staff and worked cooperatively with the project team to ensure deliverables were provided in a timely manner. KCI met the expectations of previous projects.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	<b>PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS</b>	
Firm	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.		
<b>Technical Approach</b>		<b>Assigned Rating</b>	Adequate
<p>Kimley-Horn's technical approach font is hard to read. Firm provided good depth of knowledge about intersection and project location. The firm understood the concept was being completed by others and mentioned that environmental survey boundary would need to be developed, which is questionable to the evaluators. The firm stated this was done as part of concept. KCI recommended a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) for this project, and identified existing utilities that will be a challenge. The firm also identified unique challenges such as construction staging, right-of-way, wayfinding, signal timing, pedestrian accommodations, and signal maintenance. There was no mention of public involvement, which the evaluators questioned. The firm provided a thorough QA/QC plan. The team has extensive experience with alternative intersection design. KHA provided a detailed technical approach to completing the design services for the project. They outlined the various challenges that can be encountered during the process.</p>			
<b>Past Performance</b>		<b>Assigned Rating</b>	Adequate
<p>Kimley-Horn - Evaluators do not have any direct work relationship with the firm and provided CMIS scores ranging from 60s to 90s and comments state the firm provided completed deliverables, except the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) request by the baseline dates. Revisions are minimal on studies, reports, and submittals. Invoices are always thorough and complete. The firm completed deliverables per the agreed upon date and within budget. The past performance shows a rating of 3.80 and comments provided are that the firm identified a floodplain issue early in a project and mitigated that risk by completing a hydraulic study and negotiating with the local water authority. Their knowledge of the Project Delivery Process was such that they could find solutions to move the project forward and deliver their scope in accordance with the baseline schedule and under budget.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Stantec provided design alternatives that may add value to project; however, the firm really did not speak on the unique challenges this project provides. The firm did list as risks stakeholders, utilities and hazardous sites. Firm committed to shortening the schedule by three months by using innovative data collection for survey and traffic. The firm has a unique risk management approach. The firm also has a good understanding of the lack of environmental concerns. The Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) was vague. Stantec provided detailed information on a technical approach based on the proposed concept layout. The firm discussed a list of challenges related to the design approach to minimize impacts and they also provided information related to public involvement.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Stantec - Evaluators do not have any direct working relationship with the firm and provided CMIS scores ranging from 50s to 70s and felt the comments did not support the scoring. The past performance shows a rating of 4.30 and comments provided state that overall the team members and PM with Stantec have all done a great job. They have shown that they have the knowledge and technical expertise to handle the jobs assigned to them. They helped to stay on scope, schedule and budget.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-051121, Contract 12	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Barge Design Solutions, Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Barge provided a great depth of knowledge and details pertaining to the project and project location. The firm understood the challenges of picking the project up after concept, identified challenges such as Local Support, Bicyclists &amp; Pedestrians, and uniqueness of Conceptual Design. The firm also discussed Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), Constructability, NEPA and Utility Conflicts factors in delivering the project. Prior project knowledge to promote continuity of the design development, NEPA studies, and public/stakeholder outreach efforts led by the firm's strategic partner WSP. The firm's strong communication plan consists of monthly team meetings, bi-weekly consultant meeting, and PM communication. The firm discussed a continuous evaluation of risks. The firm has a good understanding of project needs and proposed solution. The firm sees issues with existing layout. Has a good understanding of environmental outlook and the need to focus on public involvement based on high traffic, staging, and utilities. Firm stated concern that the budget is low. Barge has established a working relationships with John's Creek. They noted "nuances" of proposed design. The Quality Assurance/Quality Control QA/QC could be more detailed and addressed design only. Barge has exhibited not only that they are qualified and have the available resources, but has also provided details for the technical approach on how they plan to handle challenges. They have given a standard process for handling public involvement which can be a critical part of the project.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Barge - Evaluators do not have any direct working relationship with the firm and provided CMIS scores ranging from 80s and comments state the firm was focused on meeting the needs of the project and scope in an efficient manner. The past performance shows a rating of 4.10 and comments provided for Barge has exceeded performance expectations, performs admirably and provided sound project management. Also, the firm has been assigned various workorders and have provided sound project management and technical resources to complete each task.</p>			

Reference Check Summary for  
RFQ 484-051121 Contract 12  
Batch #1 - 2021 Engineering Design Services

	Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	KCI Technologies, Inc.	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.
<b>Questions answered on a 1, 3, 5 scale.</b>				
<b>1 = Below Expectations, 3 = Met Expectations, 5 = Exceeded Expectations</b>				
1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project.				
Reference 1	5	3	3	5
Reference 2	3			5
Reference 3	5			5
Reference 4	3			3
Reference 5				
Reference 6				
Reference 7				
<b>Section Average</b>	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.50
2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.				
Reference 1	5	5	3	5
Reference 2	3			5
Reference 3	3			5
Reference 4	3			3
Reference 5				
Reference 6				
Reference 7				
<b>Section Average</b>	3.50	5.00	3.00	4.50
3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.				
Reference 1	5	5	5	5
Reference 2	5			3
Reference 3	5			3
Reference 4	3			3
Reference 5				
Reference 6				
Reference 7				
<b>Section Average</b>	4.50	5.00	5.00	3.50
4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management.				
Reference 1	5	3	5	5
Reference 2	3			5
Reference 3	5			5
Reference 4	5			3
Reference 5				
Reference 6				
Reference 7				
<b>Section Average</b>	4.50	3.00	5.00	4.50
5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.				
Reference 1	5	5	3	5
Reference 2	5			5
Reference 3	3			5
Reference 4	3			3
Reference 5				
Reference 6				
Reference 7				
<b>Section Average</b>	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.50
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>4.30</b>

Respondent



1

Anonymous



02:42  
Time to complete



1. Name \*

David J. Welch, P.E.

2. Organization \*

ALDOT (AL Dept of Transportation)

3. Address \*

1409 Coliseum Blvd

4. City, State Zip Code \*

Montgomery, AL 36110

5. Email Address \*

welchd@dot.state.al.us

6. Phone number

334-242-6842



## 7. Date Completed \*

9/7/2021



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 referenced project has not yet let to contract, but this is ALDOT, not the Consultant. The Consultant has performed admirably, has been responsive to ALDOT requests, and has provided (thus far) a technically complete and accurate set of plans.

Respondent

<   >

**01:48**  
Time to complete

1. Name \*

2. Organization \*

3. Address \*

4. City, State Zip Code \*

5. Email Address \*

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed \*

9/7/2021 

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.

Respondent



**06:26**  
Time to complete



1. Name \*

2. Organization \*

3. Address \*

4. City, State Zip Code \*

5. Email Address \*

6. Phone number

## 7. Date Completed \*

9/8/2021



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.

Barge has an on-call design contract with my Region. They have been assigned various work orders and have provided sound project management and technical resources to complete each task. Barge has delivered many projects for TDOT in years past and we have a good relationship with them.



Respondent



**02:24**  
Time to complete



1. Name \*

2. Organization \*

3. Address \*

4. City, State Zip Code \*

5. Email Address \*

6. Phone number

## 7. Date Completed \*

9/8/2021



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 Barge team thoroughly vetted several alternatives to address safety and congestion issues at a high priority suburban intersection. Their insights helped ODOT to move forward with a practical and performance based solution.

Respondent

<   >

**23:03**  
Time to complete

1. Name \*

2. Organization \*

3. Address \*

4. City, State Zip Code \*

5. Email Address \*

6. Phone number

## 7. Date Completed \*

9/7/2021



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 firm effectively managed resources and an expedited schedule as they worked through an expedited project process for this widening project to meet the fiscal year funding authorizations for ROW (FY 19) and CST (FY 21), and they were able to meet these goals. The firm was very responsive to GDOT staff and worked cooperatively with the project team to ensure deliverables were provided in a timely manner.

Respondent

<   >

14:26  
Time to complete

1. Name \*

Ivie Goorsky

2. Organization \*

Gresham Smith for the Office of Program Delivery

3. Address \*

600 West Peachtree Street NW, Suite 1550

4. City, State Zip Code \*

Atlanta, GA 30308

5. Email Address \*

igoorsky@dot.ga.gov

6. Phone number

770-833-1029

7. Date Completed \*

9/8/2021 

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.

Kimley-Horn identified a floodplain issue early in a project and mitigated that risk by completing a hydraulic study and negotiating with the local water authority. Their knowledge of the Project Delivery Process was such that they could find solutions to move the project forward and deliver their scope in accordance with the baseline schedule and under budget.

Respondent

<   >

**04:00**  
Time to complete

1. Name \*

2. Organization \*

3. Address \*

4. City, State Zip Code \*

5. Email Address \*

6. Phone number

## 7. Date Completed \*

9/8/2021



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.

Several years ago, but the Stantec team (ABMB at the time) helped lead us through delivery and completion of our first continuous flow intersection project. Capable and attentive staff.

Respondent

<   >

**02:22**  
Time to complete

1. Name \*

Sean Epperson

2. Organization \*

NCDOT

3. Address \*

716 W Main St

4. City, State Zip Code \*

Albemarle, NC 28001

5. Email Address \*

smepperson@ncdot.gov

6. Phone number

704-983-4400

7. Date Completed \*

9/9/2021	
----------	---

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 the team members with Stantec that I have worked with have all done a great job. They have shown that they have the knowledge and technical expertise to handle the jobs we have assigned to them. They are helping us stay on scope, schedule and budget.

Respondent



**04:00**  
Time to complete



1. Name \*

2. Organization \*

3. Address \*

4. City, State Zip Code \*

5. Email Address \*

6. Phone number



7. Date Completed \*

9/7/2021 

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.

Stantec did a good job on the survey and was responsive to comments.

Respondent



**02:37**  
Time to complete



1. Name \*

2. Organization \*

3. Address \*

4. City, State Zip Code \*

5. Email Address \*

6. Phone number

7. Date Completed \*

9/8/2021 

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.

Experienced firm with excellent project management.

An official website of the United States government [Here's how you know](#)



[Requests](#) | [Notifications](#) | [Workspace](#) | [Sign Out](#)

[Download](#)  
[Home](#) | [Search](#) | [Data Bank](#) | [Data Services](#) | [Help](#)

Search

e.g. 1606N020Q02

[Search Results](#)

[Saved Searches](#)

[Actions](#)

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

- 
- BARGE DESIGN SOLUTIONS, INC. (079454163) ×
- Practical Design Partners, LLC ×
- Kittelson & Associates, Inc. (194835088) ×
- WSP USA Inc. (021411210) ×
- Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc. (926622598) ×
- United Consulting< LLC ×
- Gresham Smith (059153676) ×

**DUNS** Unique Entity ID

**SAM** Unique Entity ID

CAGE / NCAGE



## 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](#)

**Actions** ✕

Exclusion Type ▼

**Save** Exclusion Program ▼

**Download** Location ▼

Dates ▼

**Reset** ↻



Feedback

**Our Website**

- [About This Site](#)
- [Our Community](#)
- [Release Notes](#)
- [System Alerts](#)

**Our Partners**

- [Acquisition.gov](#)
- [USASpending.gov](#)
- [Grants.gov](#)
- [More Partners](#)

**Policies**

- [Privacy Policy](#)
- [Disclaimers](#)
- [Freedom of Information Act](#)
- [Accessibility](#)

**Customer Service**


- [Help](#)
- [Check Registration](#)
- [Federal Service Desk](#)
- [External Resources](#)
- [Contact](#)



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
BARGE DESIGN SOLUTIONS, INC. 6525 The Corners Pkwy, Suite 450 Peachtree Corners, GA 30092	August 30, 2021	September 30, 2024
<b>SIGNATURE</b>		
		
<b>1. Transportation Planning</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.01 State Wide Systems Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.02 Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning <input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/> 1.06 Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06a NEPA Documentation <input type="checkbox"/> 1.06b History <input type="checkbox"/> 1.06c Air Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 1.06d Noise Studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06e Ecology <input type="checkbox"/> 1.06f Archaeology <input type="checkbox"/> 1.06g Freshwater Aquatic Surveys  <input type="checkbox"/> 1.06h Bat Surveys <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.07 Attitude, Opinion and Community Value Studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.08 Airport Master Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.09 Location Studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.10 Traffic Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 1.11 Traffic and Toll Revenue Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 1.12 Major Investment Studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.13 Non-Motorized Transportation Planning	<b>3. Highway Design Roadway (continued)</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.09 Traffic Control System Analysis, Design and Implementation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.10 Utility Coordination <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/> 3.14 Historic Rehabilitation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.15 Highway Lighting <input type="checkbox"/> 3.16 Value Engineering <input type="checkbox"/> 3.17 Design of Toll Facilities Infrastructure	
<b>2 Mass Transit Operations</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 2.01 Mass Transit Program (Systems) Management <input type="checkbox"/> 2.02 Mass Transit Feasibility and Technical Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 2.03 Mass Transit Vehicle and Propulsion System <input type="checkbox"/> 2.04 Mass Transit Controls, Communications and Information Systems <input type="checkbox"/> 2.05 Mass Transit Architectural Engineering <input type="checkbox"/> 2.06 Mass Transit Unique Structures <input type="checkbox"/> 2.07 Mass Transit Electrical and Mechanical Systems <input type="checkbox"/> 2.08 Mass Transit Operations Management and Support Services <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.09 Aviation <input type="checkbox"/> 2.10 Mass Transit Program (Systems) Marketing	<b>4. Highway Structures</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.01a Minor Bridges Design <input type="checkbox"/> 4.01b Minor Bridges Design CONDITIONAL <input type="checkbox"/> 4.02 Major Bridges Design <input 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	
<b>3 Highway Design Roadway</b> <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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.06 Traffic Operations Studies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.07 Traffic Operations Design <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.08 Landscape Architecture	<b>5. Topography</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.01 Land Surveying <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.02 Engineering Surveying <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.03 Geodetic Surveying <input type="checkbox"/> 5.04a Aerial Photography/Conventional Aircraft <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.04b Aerial Photography Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Concept Grade <input type="checkbox"/> 5.04c Aerial Photography Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Design Grade <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.05 Aerial Photogrammetry <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.06a Topographic Remote Sensing (LIDAR) (Conventional Aircraft, Terrestrial Sensors and Mobile Vehicle, Boat, or Rail Units) (Design Grade) <input type="checkbox"/> 5.06b Topographic Remote Sensing (Unmanned Aircraft Systems LIDAR) (Design Grade) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.06c Topographic Remote Sensing (Unmanned Aircraft Systems LIDAR) (Concept Grade) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.06d Topographic Remote Sensing (SONAR) <input type="checkbox"/> 5.06e Topographic Remote Sensing Thermal and Infrared <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.07 Cartography <input type="checkbox"/> 5.08 Subsurface Utility Engineering	
	<b>6. Soils, Foundation &amp; Materials Testing</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 6.01a Soil Surveys <input type="checkbox"/> 6.01b Geological and Geophysical Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 6.02 Bridge Foundation Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 6.03 Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Soils and Foundation) <input type="checkbox"/> 6.04a Laboratory Materials Testing <input type="checkbox"/> 6.04b Field Testing of Roadway Construction Materials <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6.05 Hazard Waste Site Assessment Studies	
	<b>8. Construction</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 8.01 Construction Supervision	
	<b>9. Erosion and Sedimentation Control</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9.01 Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control and Comprehensive Monitoring Program <input type="checkbox"/> 9.02 Rainfall and Runoff Reporting <input type="checkbox"/> 9.03 Field Inspections for Compliance of Erosion and Sedimentation Control Devices Installations	