



Interoffice Memo

DATE: December 11, 2019

FROM: Curtis Scott, Transportation Services Procurement Manager

TO: Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator

SUBJECT RFQ-484-052819; Batch #1 – 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract #1 -
PI# 0014914, Glynn 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
- Selection of Finalists Notification and Notice to Selected Finalists
- Consultants' Submission Prescreening Checklist – Phase II
- Area Class Checklist
- Selection Committee Overall Ratings for Phase I and Phase II
- Selection Committee Comments for Finalists – Phase II
- Past Performance Reference Checks and any available additional documentation
- Verification of Non-Debarment from SAM Website for Intended Awardee and Team
- Prequalification Certificate for Intended Awardee

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

1. **Michael Baker International, Inc.**
2. **Lowe Engineers, LLC**
3. **Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.**
4. **TranSystems Corporation**
4. **Holt Consulting Company, LLC**
6. **Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.**

The Selection Committee recommends the selection of the top ranked firm, **Michael Baker International, Inc.**

Concurrence with Award from Responsible Division Director:

Certification Procurement Requirements Met:


Albert Shelby, Director of Program Delivery


Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator

CS:sc

Attachments



Georgia Department of Transportation

Request for Qualifications

To Provide

Batch #1 – 2019 Engineering Design Services

RFQ-484-052819

Qualifications Due: May 28, 2019

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

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

484-052819

Batch #1 – 2019 Engineering Design Services

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):

Contract	County	PI #	Project Description
1	Glynn	0014914	CR 583/SEA ISLAND ROAD @ DUNBAR CREEK ON ST SIMONS ISLAND
2	Butts	0016126	SR 36 @ BIG SANDY CREEK 3.8 MI SW OF JACKSON (Bridge Design in-house)
	Butts	0016127	SR 36 @ NORRIS CREEK 3.2 MI SW OF JACKSON
3	McDuffie & Wilkes	0016128	SR 80 @ LITTLE RIVER 12.9 MI NW OF THOMSON
4	Monroe	0016129	SR 18 @ NS #718484D 13 MI E OF FORSYTH
	Jones & Monroe	0016130	SR 18 @ OCMULGEE RIVER 13 MI E OF FORSYTH
5	Monroe	0013120	SR 74 @ SR 42
6	Chatham	0015151	SR 204 FROM SR 21 TO CS 1201/RIO ROAD @ 25 LOCS
7	Baldwin	0015667	SR 22 @ SR 24
8	Butts	0015688	SR 16 @ CR 291/ENGLAND CHAPEL ROAD
9	Muscogee	0015690	SR 22/US 80 @ SR 22 SPUR

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-9. Firms that respond to this RFQ, and are determined by GDOT to be sufficiently qualified, may be deemed eligible, and invited to offer a technical approach and/or possibly present and/or interview for these services. All respondents to this RFQ are subject to instructions communicated in this document, and are cautioned to completely review the entire RFQ and follow instructions carefully. GDOT reserves the right to reject any or all Statements of Qualifications or Technical Approach, and to waive technicalities and informalities at the discretion of GDOT.

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

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

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

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

For more information on the GDOT DBE Program please contact:

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

D. Scope of Services

Under the terms of the resulting Agreements, the selected consultants will provide full engineering design services as well as associated engineering related services, for the GDOT Project identified. The anticipated scope of work for the project/contract is included in **Exhibit I-1 thru Exhibit I-9**.

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 the project/contract identified. GDOT anticipates that the Contract Type will be paid via Firm Fixed Price and/or Cost Plus Fixed Fee methodology. As a Project Specific contract, it is the Department's intention that the 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

The 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-484-052819. All firms are responsible for checking the GPR on a regular basis for updates, clarifications, and announcements. GDOT reserves the right to communicate via electronic-mail with the primary contact listed in the Statements of Qualifications. Other specific communications will be made as indicated in the remainder of this RFQ.

B. Phase I - Selection of Finalists

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

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

C. Finalist Notification for Phase II

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

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

GDOT will request a **Technical Approach** of the three (3) to five (5) finalist firms for the project/contract. GDOT reserves the right to request a presentation/interview on any project/contract as determined in its best interests; however, this additional requirement shall typically be reserved for the most complex projects. Each finalist firm shall be notified in writing and informed of the Technical Approach due date. Any additional detailed Technical Approach instructions and requirements, beyond that provided in **Section V. Selection Criteria for Phase II**, for the finalists will be provided in the Finalist Notification. All members of the Selection Committee will review the Technical Approach (and will attend the presentation/interview if so chosen). **Firms shall not address any questions, prior to the award announcement, to anyone other than the designated contact.**

E. Final Selection

Final selection will be determined by carrying the scores from **Phase I** forward for each Finalist and by evaluating the **Technical Approach** and **Past Performance** criteria for **Phase II**. The Selection Committee will discuss the Finalist's Phase II Responses and the final rankings will be determined.

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

III. Schedule of Events

The following Schedule of Events represents GDOT's best estimate of the Schedule that will be followed. All times indicated are prevailing times in Atlanta, Georgia. GDOT reserves the right to adjust the Schedule as GDOT deems necessary.

PHASE I	DATE	TIME
a. GDOT issues public advertisement of RFQ-484-052819	4/26/2019	-----
b. Deadline for submission of written questions and requests for clarification	5/13/2019	2:00 PM
c. Deadline for submission of Statements of Qualifications	5/28/2019	2:00 PM
d. GDOT completes evaluation and issues notification and other information to finalist firms	TBD	
PHASE II		
e. Deadline for submission of written questions from finalists	TBD	2:00 PM
f. Phase II Response of Finalist firms due	TBD	TBA

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

A. Area Class Requirements and Certification

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

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

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%

The Selection Committee will evaluate all firms on their Experience and Qualifications, which shall account for a total of thirty (30%) 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 – 20%

The Selection Committee will evaluate all firms on their Resources availability and Workload Capacity which shall account for a total of twenty (20%) 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. 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. **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**.

B. **Experience and Qualifications**

1. **Project Manager** - Provide information pertaining to the project manager, including but not limited to:
 - a. **Education.**
 - b. **Registration** (if necessary and applicable.)
 - c. **Relevant engineering experience.**
 - d. **Relevant project management experience** for projects of similar complexity, size, scope, and function.
 - 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, specifically Section 7** for the list of Key Team Leaders for each Project). For each Key Team Leader identified provide:
- Education.**
 - Registration** (if necessary and applicable.)
 - Relevant experience** in the applicable resource area of the most relevant projects.
 - 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. 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:
- Client name, project location and dates** during which services were performed.
 - Description of overall project and services performed** by your firm.
 - Duration of project services provided** by your firm, and overall project budget.
 - Experience utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance** (PDP, Design Policy, Environmental Procedures Manual, etc.)
 - Client(s) current contact information** including contact names and telephone numbers.
 - 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 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.

C. Resources/Workload Capacity

1. **Overall Resources** - Provide information regarding the overall resources dedicated to delivering the specific project, including:
 - a. **Organizational chart** which identifies the project manager, prime, Key Team Leaders, support personnel, and reporting structure. 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 allowed combined 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** (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 C1.b. and C1.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**, 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. 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%20484-052819%20Contract%201%20
- Contract 2: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%202%20
- Contract 3: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%203%20
- Contract 4: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%204%20
- Contract 5: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%205%20
- Contract 6: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%206%20
- Contract 7: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%207%20
- Contract 8: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%208%20
- Contract 9: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%209%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 hour of your submittal, please contact Folayan Battle at fbattle@dot.ga.gov.**

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

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

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

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

C. Questions and Requests for Clarification

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

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

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

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

- A. There is one (1) electronic version submittal required. The Submittal must follow the format and meet the content requirements identified in **Section VII**, entitled **Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response - Phase II Response**. See **Attachment 1** for a summary of how the submittals should be prepared.
- B. Submittals must be typed on standard (8½" x 11") paper. The pages should be numbered, however, submittal pages will be counted by section to determine compliance with page limits. Responses are limited to the page counts indicated in each section using a minimum of size 11 font. Page counts will be determined by pages with print on them, not by the physical piece of paper. Each Statement of Qualifications shall be prepared simply and economically as indicated above. Colored displays, and promotional materials are not desired. Emphasis must be on completeness, relevance, and clarity of content.

NOTE: Additional pages other than what has been specified above in each section **should not be included and will be grounds for disqualification**. Submittals are limited to the information requested in Section VII. Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response-Phase II Response only. Hyperlinks or embedded video are not allowed.

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

Contract 1: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%201%20
Contract 2: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%202%20
Contract 3: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%203%20
Contract 4: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%204%20
Contract 5: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%205%20
Contract 6: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%206%20
Contract 7: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%207%20
Contract 8: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%208%20
Contract 9: mailto:tsp_soq_tech_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%209%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 hour of your submittal, please contact Folyan Battle at fbattle@dot.ga.gov.**

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

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

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

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

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

Responses submitted via facsimile or e-mail will be rejected. All expenses for preparing and submitting responses are the sole cost of the party submitting the response. GDOT is not obligated to any party to reimburse such expenses. All submittals upon receipt become the property of GDOT. Labeling information provided in submittals "proprietary" or "confidential", or any other designation of restricted use will not protect the information from public view. Subject to the provisions of the Open Records Act, the details of the proposal documents will remain confidential until final award.

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

D. Questions and Requests for Clarification

Questions about any aspect of the Phase II Response for Finalists, shall be submitted in writing via e-mail to: **Folayan Battle, e-mail: fbattle@dot.ga.gov or as directed in the Notice to Selected Finalists, if different.** The deadlines for submission of questions relating to the Phase II Response will be identified in the Notice to Selected Finalists. From the issue date of this solicitation until a successful proposer is selected and the award is made official and announced, respondents are subject to the Restriction of Communication in **Section I.B.**

X. GDOT Terms and Conditions

A. Statement of Agreement

With the submission of a SOQ, the respondent agrees that he/she has carefully examined the Request for Qualifications, and agrees that it is the respondent's responsibility to request clarification on any issues in any section of the Request for Qualifications with which the respondent disagrees or needs clarified. The respondent also understands that failure to mention these items during the question period or in the SOQ will be interpreted to mean that the respondent is in full agreement with the terms, conditions, specifications and requirements in the therein. With submission of a SOQ, the respondent hereby certifies: (a) that this SOQ is genuine and is not made in the interest or on behalf of any undisclosed person, firm, or corporation; (b) that respondent has not directly or indirectly included or solicited any other respondent to put in a false or insincere SOQ; (c) that respondent has not solicited or induced any person, firm, or corporation to refrain from sending a SOQ.

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

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

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

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

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

C. Non-Discrimination and DBE Requirements

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

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

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

For more information on the GDOT DBE Program please contact:

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

D. Audit and Accounting System Requirements

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

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

E. Submittal Costs and Confidentiality

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

F. Award Conditions

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

G. Debriefings

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

H. Right to Cancel or Change RFQ

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

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

I. Substitutions, Alternates, Exceptions, and Extensions

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

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

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

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

EXHIBIT I-1

Contract 1

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Number: 0014914
3. County: Glynn
4. Description: CR 583/SEA ISLAND ROAD @ DUNBAR CREEK ON ST SIMONS ISLAND
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
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01a	Minor Bridge Design
	(OR)
4.01b	Minor Bridge Design
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Survey
5.02	Engineering Surveying
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
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

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, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way (ROW) plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging 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 Inroads 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 Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
4. Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities.
5. Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
6. Approved Concept Report.
7. Concept Design Data Book.
8. Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's approval).

C. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies surveys reports and assessment of effects (i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
2. NEPA documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impact (EA/FONSI).
 - c. Section 4f coordination.
 - d. One NEPA document reevaluation for Construction.
3. Preparation of a Section 404 Permit application.
4. Section 408 Coordination.
5. Aquatic Survey.
6. Stream Buffer Variance.
7. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
8. Public Involvement (1 possible detour/PIOH).
9. Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR) and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).

D. Preliminary Design:

1. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary ESPCP.
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.

2. Bridge Hydraulic Study.
 3. BFI Report.
 4. Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
 5. Constructability Meeting participation.
 6. Cost Estimation with annual updates.
 7. Location and Design Report.
 8. FFPR 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. Right of Way revisions during acquisition, as needed.
- F. Utilities:
Subsurface Utility Engineering.
- 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.
 2. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
 3. Corrected FFPR Plans.
 4. CES Final cost estimate.
 5. Final PS&E Package.
 6. Amendments & 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. Key Team Leaders:
- A. Roadway Design.
 - B. Bridge Design.
 - C. NEPA Lead.
8. The following milestone dates are proposed:
- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q4 FY 2020.
 - B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q1 FY 2021 (about 4 months duration).
 - C. FFPR – Q2 FY 2022.
 - D. FFPR – Q3 FY 2023.
 - E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 2024.

EXHIBIT I- 2

Contract 2

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Numbers: 0016126 and 0016127
3. County: Butts
4. Description: SR 36 @ BIG SANDY CREEK 3.8 MI SW OF JACKSON and
SR 36 @ NORRIS CREEK 3.2 MI SW OF JACKSON
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
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01a	Minor Bridge Design
	(OR)
4.01b	Minor Bridge Design
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Survey
5.02	Engineering Surveying
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)
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

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, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way (ROW) plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging 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.

Bridge design and H&H activities will be performed by GDOT's Bridge Design Office for PI# 0016126 only. The Consultant will be responsible for the bridge design and H&H on PI# 0016127; the BFI for both bridges, and all non-bridge hydraulics for both projects.

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

1. Provide Survey Control Package.
2. Provide Inroads 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 Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
4. Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
5. Approved Concept Report.
6. Concept Design Data Book.
7. Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's approval).

C. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies surveys reports and assessment of effects (i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
2. NEPA documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. Section 4f coordination.
 - d. One NEPA document reevaluation for Construction.
3. Preparation of a Section 404 Permit application.
4. Section 408 Coordination.
5. Aquatic Survey.
6. Stream Buffer Variance.
7. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
8. Public Involvement (1 possible detour/PIOH).
9. Prepare for and attend the PFPR and FFPR.

D. Preliminary Design:

1. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary ESPCP.
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.

- f. Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.
 2. Bridge Hydraulic Study (for PI# 0016127 only).
 3. BFI Report (both bridges).
 4. Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
 5. Constructability Meeting participation.
 6. Cost Estimation with annual updates.
 7. Location and Design Report.
 8. FFPR 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. Right of Way revisions during acquisition, as needed.
 - F. Utilities:

Subsurface Utility Engineering.
 - 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.
 2. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
 3. Corrected FFPR Plans.
 4. CES Final cost estimate.
 5. Final PS&E Package.
 6. Amendments & 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. Key Team Leaders:
- A. Roadway Design.
 - B. Bridge Design.
 - C. NEPA Lead.
8. The following milestone dates are proposed:
- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 2020.
 - B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q3 FY 2020 (about 4 months duration).
 - C. FFPR – Q2 FY 2021.
 - D. FFPR – Q1 FY 2023.
 - E. Let Contract – Q2 FY 2023.

EXHIBIT I- 3

Contract 3

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Numbers: 0016128
3. Counties: McDuffie and Wilkes
4. Description: SR 80 @ LITTLE RIVER 12.9 MI NW OF THOMSON
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
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01a	Minor Bridge Design
	(OR)
4.01b	Minor Bridge Design
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Survey
5.02	Engineering Surveying
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)
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

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, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging 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 Inroads 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 Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
4. Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
5. Approved Concept Report.
6. Concept Design Data Book.
7. Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's approval).

C. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies surveys reports and assessment of effects (i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
2. NEPA documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. Section 4f coordination.
 - d. One NEPA document reevaluation for Construction.
3. Preparation of a Section 404 Permit application.
4. Section 408 Coordination.
5. Aquatic Survey.
6. Stream Buffer Variance.
7. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
8. Public Involvement (1 possible detour/PIOH).
9. Prepare for and attend the PFPR and FFPR.

D. Preliminary Design:

1. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary ESPCP.
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.
2. Bridge Hydraulic Study.
3. BFI Report.

4. Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
 5. Constructability Meeting participation.
 6. Cost Estimation with annual updates.
 7. Location and Design Report.
 8. 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. Right of Way revisions during acquisition, as needed.
- F. Utilities:
Subsurface Utility Engineering.
- 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.
 2. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
 3. Corrected FFPR Plans.
 4. CES Final cost estimate.
 5. Final PS&E Package.
 6. Amendments & 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. Key Team Leaders:
- A. Roadway Design.
 - B. Bridge Design.
 - C. NEPA Lead.
8. The following milestone dates are proposed:
- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 2020.
 - B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q3 FY 2020 (about 4 months duration).
 - C. PFPR – Q2 FY 2021.
 - D. FFPR – Q1 FY 2023.
 - E. Let Contract – Q2 FY 2023.

EXHIBIT I-4

Contract 4

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Numbers: 0016129 and 0016130
3. Counties: Monroe & Jones
4. Description: SR 18 @ NS #718484D 13 MI E OF FORSYTH and
SR 18 @ OCMULGEE RIVER 13 MI E OF FORSYTH
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
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01a	Minor Bridge Design (OR)
	(OR)
4.01b	Minor Bridge Design
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Survey
5.02	Engineering Surveying
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
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

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, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging 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 Inroads 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 Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
4. PAR Activities.
5. Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
6. Approved Concept Report.
7. Concept Design Data Book.
8. Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's approval).

C. Environmental Document:

1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies surveys reports and assessment of effects (i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
2. NEPA documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. Section 4f coordination.
 - d. One NEPA document reevaluation for Construction.
3. Preparation of a Section 404 Permit application.
4. Section 408 Coordination.
5. Aquatic Survey.
6. Stream Buffer Variance.
7. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
8. Public Involvement (1 possible detour/PIOH).
9. Prepare for and attend the PFPR and FFPR.

D. Preliminary Design:

1. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary ESPCP.
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.
2. Bridge Hydraulic Study.

3. BFI Report.
 4. Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
 5. Constructability Meeting participation.
 6. Cost Estimation with annual updates.
 7. Location and Design Report.
 8. FFPR 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. Right of Way revisions during acquisition, as needed.
- F. Utilities:
- Subsurface Utility Engineering.
- 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.
 2. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
 3. Corrected FFPR Plans.
 4. CES Final cost estimate.
 5. Final PS&E Package.
 6. Amendments & 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. Key Team Leaders:
- A. Roadway Design.
 - B. Bridge Design.
 - C. NEPA Lead.
8. The following milestone dates are proposed:
- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q4 FY 2020.
 - B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q1 FY 21 (about 4 months duration).
 - C. FFPR – Q2 FY 2022.
 - D. FFPR – Q3 FY 2023.
 - E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 2024.

EXHIBIT I- 5**Contract 5**

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Numbers: 0013120
3. County: Monroe
4. Description: SR 74 @ SR 42
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	Two-Lane or Multi-lane 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
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.08	Landscape Architecture Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.15	Highway Lighting
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
5.04	Aerial Photography
5.05	Photogrammetry
5.06	Topographic Remote Sensing
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.03	Hydraulic and Hydrologic Studies (Soils & Foundation)
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The project will construct a Single Lane Roundabout at the intersection of SR 74 and SR 42. GDOT performed an Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) in 2017. The Single Lane Roundabout was preferred over the Conventional All-Way Stop (AWSC), however, it recommended the AWSC could be constructed as an interim measure, if needed.

The Consultant shall provide development of the following scope of service 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, GDOT Bridge and Structures Design Manual, Plan Presentation Guide, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 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.
 - 9. Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's approval).
- B. Environment Document:
 - 1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies survey reports and assessment of effects for Ecology, History, Archaeology, Air, and Noise.
 - 2. Agency coordination including multiple meetings to ensure consistency of expectations, design, and clearance limits.
 - 3. NEPA documents:
 - a. Environmental Approval.
 - b. NEPA Reevaluations, as required.
 - 4. Preparation of Section 404 Permit Application.
 - 5. Section 7 Coordination.
 - 6. Protected Species Surveys including Aquatic & Terrestrial Surveys, as required.
 - 7. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
 - 8. Public Involvement (Public Information Open House (PIOH)) and associated coordination with GDOT.
 - 9. Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), Constructability Reviews, and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
 - 10. Certification for Right-of-Way.
 - 11. Certification for Let.
 - 12. TPro and P6 Updates.
 - 13. Preparation of Environmental Commitments Table "Green Sheet" and Environmental Resource Impact Table (ERIT).
- C. Preliminary Design, include but not limited to:
 - 1. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
 - a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signal Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Staging & Erosion Control Plans.
 - 2. Cost Estimation System (CES) Preliminary cost estimate with annual updates.
 - 3. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
 - 4. Location and Design Report.
 - 5. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans 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).
- D. Survey:
1. Aerial Photogrammetry/Mapping.
 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.
- E. Right-of-Way 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. Including but not limited to:
 - 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 and NEPA reevaluation:
 - 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.
- G. Construction:
1. Use on Construction Revisions.
 2. Site Condition Revisions.
- 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. Key Team Leaders:
- A. Roadway Lead.
 - B. NEPA Lead.
8. An expected schedule includes the following milestone dates:
- A. Notice to Proceed: Q2 FY 2020.
 - B. Concept Report Q4 FY 2021.
 - C. Right of Way Authorization: Q3 FY 2021.
 - D. Construction Authorization: Q4 FY 2022.

EXHIBIT I-6

Contract 6

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Numbers: 0015151
3. County: Chatham
4. Description: SR 204 FROM SR 21 TO CS 1201/RIO ROAD @ 25 LOCS
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	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane 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
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
3.15	Highway Lighting
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
5.04	Aerial Photography
5.05	Photogrammetry
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.03	Hydraulic and Hydrologic Studies (Soils & Foundation)
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The purpose of this project is to address several issues identified in the Road Safety Audit of SR 204 due to concerns with pedestrian safety. The project is proposed to be pedestrian and signal upgrades in and around Savannah and will be funded with Federal safety dollars. The following reflect recommendations made in the report.

Install ADA-compliant pedestrian facilities. Install obstacles in medians to deter mid-block pedestrian crossings and encourage use of permitted pedestrian facilities. Add crosswalks and make push buttons more accessible. Implement ADA improvements in all quadrants at Abercorn Street @ E. Jackson Boulevard. Close driveways closest to intersections. Replace the painted islands with concrete islands to break up deceleration lanes, or extend right-turn storage onto Eisenhower Dr. at Abercorn Street @ Eisenhower Drive. Replace painted median with concrete along right-turn lane on southbound Abercorn Street at Abercorn Street @ West Montgomery Cross Road/SR 204 Spur. Pedestrian lighting as mentioned in the RSA. Evaluate and install RCUT's as mentioned in the RSA. Consider alternatives for frontage road access.

As programmed, the project does not have a ROW phase.

The Consultant shall provide development of the following scope of service 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, GDOT Bridge and Structures Design Manual, Plan Presentation Guide, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 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.
 - 9. Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's approval).
- B. Environment Document:
 - 1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies survey reports and assessment of effects for Ecology, History, Archaeology, Air, and Noise.
 - 2. Agency coordination including multiple meetings to ensure consistency of expectations, design, and clearance limits.
 - 3. NEPA documents:
 - a. Environmental Approval.
 - b. NEPA Reevaluations, as required.
 - 4. Preparation of Section 404 Permit Application.
 - 5. Section 7 Coordination.
 - 6. Protected Species Surveys including Aquatic & Terrestrial Surveys, as required.
 - 7. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
 - 8. Public Involvement (Public Information Open House (PIOH)) and associated coordination with GDOT.
 - 9. Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), Constructability Review, and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
 - 10. Certification for Right-of-Way.
 - 11. Certification for Let.
 - 12. TPro and P6 Updates.
 - 13. Preparation of Environmental Commitments Table "Green Sheet" and Environmental Resource Impact Table (ERIT).

- C. Preliminary Design, include but not limited to:
 - 1. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
 - a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signal Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Staging & Erosion Control Plans.
 - 2. Cost Estimation System (CES) Preliminary cost estimate with annual updates.
 - 3. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
 - 4. Location and Design Report.
 - 5. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans 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).

- D. Survey:
 - 1. Aerial Photogrammetry/Mapping.
 - 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.

- E. Right-of-Way 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. Including but not limited to:
 - 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 and NEPA reevaluation:
 - 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.

- G. Construction:
 - 1. Use on Construction Revisions.
 - 2. Site Condition Revisions.
 - 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. Key Team Leaders:
- A. Roadway Lead.
 - B. NEPA Lead.
8. An expected schedule includes the following milestone dates:
- A. Notice to Proceed: Q2 FY 2020.
 - B. PFPR Request: Q1 FY 2022.
 - C. Construction Authorization: Q4 FY 2023.

EXHIBIT I-7**Contract 7**

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Numbers: 0015667
3. County: Baldwin
4. Description: SR 22 @ SR 24
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	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane 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
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.08	Landscape Architecture Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.15	Highway Lighting
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
5.04	Aerial Photography
5.05	Photogrammetry
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The purpose of this project is to construct a roundabout at the intersection of SR 22 (Sparta Highway) and SR 24, approximately 4 miles east of Milledgeville. Federal funds will be utilized.

The Consultant shall provide development of the following scope of service 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, GDOT Bridge and Structures Design Manual, Plan Presentation Guide, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 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.
 9. Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's approval).
- B. Environment Document:
 1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies survey reports and assessment of effects for Ecology, History, Archaeology, Air, and Noise.
 2. Agency coordination including multiple meetings to ensure consistency of expectations, design, and clearance limits.
 3. NEPA documents:
 - a. Environmental Approval.
 - b. NEPA Reevaluations, as required.
 4. Preparation of Section 404 Permit Application.
 5. Section 7 Coordination.
 6. Protected Species Surveys including Aquatic & Terrestrial Surveys, as required.
 7. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
 8. Public Involvement (Public Information Open House (PIOH)) and associated coordination with GDOT.
 9. Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), Constructability Review, and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
 10. Certification for Right-of-Way.
 11. Certification for Let.
 12. TPro and P6 Updates.
 13. Preparation of Environmental Commitments Table "Green Sheet" and Environmental Resource Impact Table (ERIT).
- C. Preliminary Design, include but not limited to:
 1. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
 - a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signal Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Staging & Erosion Control Plans.
 2. Cost Estimation System (CES) Preliminary cost estimate with annual updates.
 3. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
 4. Location and Design Report.
 5. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans 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).
- D. Survey:
1. Aerial Photogrammetry/Mapping.
 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.
- E. Right-of-Way 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. Including but not limited to:
 - 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 and NEPA reevaluation:
 - 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.
- G. Construction:
1. Use on Construction Revisions.
 2. Site Condition Revisions.
- 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. Key Team Leaders:
 - A. Roadway Lead.
 - B. NEPA Lead.
- 8. An expected schedule includes the following milestone dates:
 - A. Notice to Proceed: Q2 FY 2020.
 - B. ROW Authorization: Q2 FY 2022.
 - C. Construction Authorization: Q2 FY 2023.

EXHIBIT I-8**Contract 8**

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Numbers: 0015688
3. County: Butts
4. Description: SR 16 @ CR 291/ENGLAND CHAPEL 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
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane 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
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.08	Landscape Architecture Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.15	Highway Lighting
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
5.04	Aerial Photography
5.05	Photogrammetry
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The purpose of this project is to construct a single lane roundabout at the intersection of SR 16 and CR 291/England Chapel Road. The intersection is currently stop-controlled and construction would include pedestrian crossings and sidewalks. Federal funds will be utilized.

The Consultant shall provide development of the following scope of service 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, GDOT Bridge and Structures Design Manual, Plan Presentation Guide, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 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.
 - 1. Conceptual construction cost estimate.
 - 2. Prepare concept layouts and alignments alternatives.
 - 3. Initial Concept meeting Preparation and Attendance.
 - 3. Approved Concept Report.
 - 4. Concept Design Data Book.
 - 5. Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
 - 6. Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's approval).
- B. Environment Document:
 - 1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies survey reports and assessment of effects for Ecology, History, Archaeology, Air, and Noise.
 - 2. Agency coordination including multiple meetings to ensure consistency of expectations, design, and clearance limits.
 - 3. NEPA documents:
 - a. Environmental Approval.
 - b. NEPA Reevaluations, as required.
 - 4. Preparation of Section 404 Permit Application.
 - 5. Section 7 Coordination.
 - 6. Protected Species Surveys including Aquatic & Terrestrial Surveys, as required.
 - 7. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
 - 8. Public Involvement (Public Information Open House (PIOH)) and associated coordination with GDOT.
 - 9. Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), Constructability Review, and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
 - 10. Certification for Right-of-Way.
 - 11. Certification for Let.
 - 12. TPro and P6 Updates.
 - 13. Preparation of Environmental Commitments Table "Green Sheet" and Environmental Resource Impact Table (ERIT).
- C. Preliminary Design, include but not limited to:
 - 1. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
 - a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signal Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Staging & Erosion Control Plans.
 - 2. Cost Estimation System (CES) Preliminary cost estimate with annual updates.
 - 3. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
 - 4. Location and Design Report.
 - 5. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans 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).
- D. Survey:
1. Aerial Photogrammetry/Mapping.
 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.
- E. Right-of-Way 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. Including but not limited to:
 - 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 and NEPA reevaluation:
 - 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.
- G. Construction:
1. Use on Construction Revisions.
 2. Site Condition Revisions.
- 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. Key Team Leaders:
 - A. Roadway Lead.
 - B. NEPA Lead.
- 8. An expected schedule includes the following milestone dates:
 - A. Notice to Proceed: Q2 FY 2020.
 - B. ROW Authorization: Q2 FY 2022.
 - C. Construction Authorization: Q1 FY 2023.

EXHIBIT I-9

Contract 9

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Numbers: 0015690
3. County: Muscogee
4. Description: SR 22/US 80 @ SR 22 SPUR
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	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design
3.02	Two-Lane or Multi-lane 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
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.08	Landscape Architecture Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.15	Highway Lighting
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
5.04	Aerial Photography
5.05	Photogrammetry
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

6. Scope:

The purpose of the project is to construct two multi-lane roundabouts with Federal Safety Dollars. The first roundabout would be constructed at the intersection of SR 22 @ SR 22 SPUR. The second roundabout would be constructed at SR 22 @ Technology Parkway. Railroad coordination is anticipated.

The Consultant shall provide development of the following scope of service 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, GDOT Bridge and Structures Design Manual, Plan Presentation Guide, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 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.
 - 9. Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's approval).
- B. Environment Document:
 - 1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies survey reports and assessment of effects for Ecology, History, Archaeology, Air, and Noise.
 - 2. Agency coordination including multiple meetings to ensure consistency of expectations, design, and clearance limits.
 - 3. NEPA documents:
 - a. Environmental Approval.
 - b. NEPA Reevaluations, as required.
 - 4. Preparation of Section 404 Permit Application.
 - 5. Section 7 Coordination.
 - 6. Protected Species Surveys including Aquatic & Terrestrial Surveys, as required.
 - 7. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
 - 8. Public Involvement (Public Information Open House (PIOH)) and associated coordination with GDOT.
 - 9. Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), Constructability Review, and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
 - 10. Certification for Right-of-Way.
 - 11. Certification for Let.
 - 12. TPro and P6 Updates.
 - 13. Preparation of Environmental Commitments Table "Green Sheet" and Environmental Resource Impact Table (ERIT).
- C. Preliminary Design, include but not limited to:
 - 1. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
 - a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signal Plans.
 - c. Preliminary Staging & Erosion Control Plans.
 - 2. Cost Estimation System (CES) Preliminary cost estimate with annual updates.
 - 3. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
 - 4. Location and Design Report.
 - 5. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans 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).
- D. Survey:
1. Aerial Photogrammetry/Mapping.
 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.
- E. Right-of-Way 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. Including but not limited to:
 - 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 and NEPA reevaluation:
 - 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.
- G. Construction:
1. Use on Construction Revisions.
 2. Site Condition Revisions.
- 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. Key Team Leaders:
 - A. Roadway Lead.
 - B. NEPA Lead.
- 8. An expected schedule includes the following milestone dates:
 - A. Notice to Proceed: Q2 FY 2020.
 - B. ROW Authorization: Q2 FY 2022.
 - C. Construction Authorization: Q2 FY 2023.

**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.:	<u>RFQ-484-052819</u>
Solicitation/Contract Name:	<u>Batch 1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services</u>

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 _____, 201__

 Notary Public

[NOTARY SEAL]

My Commission Expires: _____

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

ATTACHMENT 1

Submittal Formats for GDOT Batch 1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services

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

ADDENDUM NO. 1

ISSUE DATE: 5/1/2019

This Addendum shall become and form a part of the RFQ for:
RFQ 484- 052819 – Batch #1 – 2019 Engineering Design Services

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

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

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

Firm Name _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Typed Name and Title _____

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

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

The purpose of this Addendum is to modify the original RFQ.

I. Section I. A. Overview - Project Table is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

Contract	County	PI #	Project Description
1	Glynn	0014914	CR 583/SEA ISLAND ROAD @ DUNBAR CREEK ON ST SIMONS ISLAND
2	Butts	0016126	SR 36 @ BIG SANDY CREEK 3.8 MI SW OF JACKSON
	Butts	0016127	SR 36 @ NORRIS CREEK 3.2 MI SW OF JACKSON
3	McDuffie & Wilkes	0016128	SR 80 @ LITTLE RIVER 12.9 MI NW OF THOMSON (Bridge Design in-house)
4	Monroe	0016129	SR 18 @ NS #718484D 13 MI E OF FORSYTH
	Jones & Monroe	0016130	SR 18 @ OCMULGEE RIVER 13 MI E OF FORSYTH
5	Monroe	0013120	SR 74 @ SR 42
6	Chatham	0015151	SR 204 FROM SR 21 TO CS 1201/RIO ROAD @ 25 LOCS
7	Baldwin	0015667	SR 22 @ SR 24
8	Butts	0015688	SR 16 @ CR 291/ENGLAND CHAPEL ROAD
9	Muscogee	0015690	SR 22/US 80 @ SR 22 SPUR

II. Exhibit I-2, Contract 2 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

EXHIBIT I- 2

Contract 2

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Numbers: 0016126 and 0016127
3. County: Butts
4. Description: SR 36 @ BIG SANDY CREEK 3.8 MI SW OF JACKSON and
 SR 36 @ NORRIS CREEK 3.2 MI SW OF JACKSON
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
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01a	Minor Bridge Design
	(OR)
4.01b	Minor Bridge Design
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Survey
5.02	Engineering Surveying
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)
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

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, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way (ROW) plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging 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 Inroads 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 Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
 - 4. Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
 - 5. Approved Concept Report.
 - 6. Concept Design Data Book.
 - 7. Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's approval).

- C. Environmental Document:
 - 1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies surveys reports and assessment of effects (i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
 - 2. NEPA documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. Section 4f coordination.
 - d. One NEPA document reevaluation for Construction.
 - 3. Preparation of a Section 404 Permit application.
 - 4. Section 408 Coordination.
 - 5. Aquatic Survey.
 - 6. Stream Buffer Variance.
 - 7. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
 - 8. Public Involvement (1 possible detour/PIOH).
 - 9. Prepare for and attend the PFPR and FFPR.

- D. Preliminary Design:
 - 1. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
 - a. Preliminary Bridge Plans.
 - b. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - c. Preliminary ESPCP.
 - d. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - e. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - f. Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.
 - 2. Bridge Hydraulic Study.

3. BFI Report.
 4. Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
 5. Constructability Meeting participation.
 6. Cost Estimation with annual updates.
 7. Location and Design Report.
 8. 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. Right of Way revisions during acquisition, as needed.
- F. Utilities:
- Subsurface Utility Engineering.
- 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.
 2. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
 3. Corrected FFPR Plans.
 4. CES Final cost estimate.
 5. Final PS&E Package.
 6. Amendments & 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. Key Team Leaders:
- A. Roadway Design.
 - B. Bridge Design.
 - C. NEPA Lead.
8. The following milestone dates are proposed:
- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 2020.
 - B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q3 FY 2020 (about 4 months duration).
 - C. PFPR – Q2 FY 2021.
 - D. FFPR – Q1 FY 2023.
 - E. Let Contract – Q2 FY 2023.

III. Exhibit I-3, Contract 3 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

EXHIBIT I- 3

Contract 3

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Numbers: 0016128
3. Counties: McDuffie and Wilkes
4. Description: SR 80 @ LITTLE RIVER 12.9 MI NW OF THOMSON
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
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
5.01	Land Survey
5.02	Engineering Surveying
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)
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

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, hydraulic and hydrological studies, preliminary bridge plans, signing and marking plans, final right-of-way plans (including revisions), erosion control plans, staging 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 Inroads Survey Database.
 - 3. Staking for ROW acquisition.

- B. Concept Report:
 - 1. Traffic Studies.
 - 2. Cost Estimates.
 - 3. Initial Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
 - 4. Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
 - 5. Approved Concept Report.
 - 6. Concept Design Data Book.
 - 7. Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's approval).

- C. Environmental Document:
 - 1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies surveys reports and assessment of effects (i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
 - 2. NEPA documents:
 - a. Categorical Exclusion.
 - b. EA/FONSI.
 - c. Section 4f coordination.
 - d. One NEPA document reevaluation for Construction.
 - 3. Preparation of a Section 404 Permit application.
 - 4. Section 408 Coordination.
 - 5. Aquatic Survey.
 - 6. Stream Buffer Variance.
 - 7. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
 - 8. Public Involvement (1 possible detour/PIOH).
 - 9. Prepare for and attend the PFPR and FFPR.

- D. Preliminary Design:
 - 1. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
 - a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Preliminary ESPCP.
 - c. Preliminary Utility Plans.
 - d. Preliminary Staging Plans.
 - e. Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.
 - 2. Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
 - 3. Constructability Meeting participation.
 - 4. Cost Estimation with annual updates.
 - 5. Location and Design Report.

6. FFPR 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. Right of Way revisions during acquisition, as needed.
- F. Utilities:
 - Subsurface Utility Engineering.
- G. Final Design:
 1. Complete Final Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
 - a. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
 - b. Final ESPCP.
 - c. Final Utility Plans.
 - d. Final Staging Plans.
 - e. Final Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.
 2. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
 3. Corrected FFPR Plans.
 4. CES Final cost estimate.
 5. Final PS&E Package.
 6. Amendments & 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. Key Team Leaders:
 - A. Roadway Design.
 - B. NEPA Lead.
8. The following milestone dates are proposed:
 - A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q2 FY 2020.
 - B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q3 FY 2020 (about 4 months duration).
 - C. FFPR – Q2 FY 2021.
 - D. FFPR – Q1 FY 2023.
 - E. Let Contract – Q2 FY 2023.

ADDENDUM NO. 2

ISSUE DATE: 5/16/2019

This Addendum shall become and form a part of the RFQ for:
RFQ 484-052819 – Batch #1 – 2019 Engineering Design Services

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

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

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

Firm Name _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Typed Name and Title _____

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

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

The purpose of this Addendum is to modify the original RFQ to include the Project Consideration Checklist.

Project Consideration Checklist – RFQ-484-052819 Batch 1 - 2019

This form must be completed and included in the Statement of Qualifications as the last page with 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	County	PI #	Project Description
1	Glynn	0014914	CR 583/SEA ISLAND ROAD @ DUNBAR CREEK ON ST SIMONS ISLAND
2	Butts	0016126	SR 36 @ BIG SANDY CREEK 3.8 MI SW OF JACKSON
3	Butts	0016127	SR 36 @ NORRIS CREEK 3.2 MI SW OF JACKSON
3	McDuffie & Wilkes	0016128	SR 80 @ LITTLE RIVER 12.9 MI NW OF THOMSON (Bridge Design in-house)
4	Monroe	0016129	SR 18 @ NS #718484D 13 MI E OF FORSYTH
4	Jones & Monroe	0016130	SR 18 @ OCMULGEE RIVER 13 MI E OF FORSYTH
5	Monroe	0013120	SR 74 @ SR 42
6	Chatham	0015151	SR 204 FROM SR 21 TO CS 1201/RIO ROAD @ 25 LOCS
7	Baldwin	0015667	SR 22 @ SR 24
8	Butts	0015688	SR 16 @ CR 291/ENGLAND CHAPEL ROAD
9	Muscogee	0015690	SR 22/US 80 @ SR 22 SPUR

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ-484-052819
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 1
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	May 28, 2019
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
1	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	5/28/2019	1:20 PM	X	X	X	X	X
2	Barge Design Solutions	5/28/2019	10:21 AM	X	X	X	X	X
3	CALYX Enginers and Consultants	5/28/2019	11:41 AM	X	X	X	X	X
4	CDM Smith Inc	5/28/2019	12:18 PM	X	X	X	X	X
5	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	5/28/2019	1:58 PM	X	X	X	X	X
6	Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.	5/28/2019	11:56 AM	X	X	X	X	X
7	CROY Engineering, LLC	5/28/2019	8:32 AM	X	X	X	X	X
8	EXP US Services Inc.	5/28/2019	7:35 AM	X	X	X	X	X
9	Freese And Nichols	5/23/2019	6:17 PM	X	X	X	X	X
10	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	5/28/2019	12:58 PM	X	X	X	X	X
11	Holt Consulting Company, LLC	5/28/2019	1:49 PM	X	X	X	X	X
12	Hussey, Gay, Bell & Deyoung, Inc.	5/28/2019	12:37 PM	X	X	X	X	X
13	IDS-Global	5/28/2019	1:40 PM	X	X	X	X	X
14	KCI Technologies, Inc.	5/28/2019	1:48 PM	X	X	X	X	X
15	Lowe Engineers, LLC	5/28/2019	11:47 AM	X	X	X	X	X
16	Mead and Hunt, Inc.	5/28/2019	9:53 AM	X	X	X	X	X
17	Michael Baker International, Inc.	5/28/2019	12:45 PM	X	X	X	X	X
18	Moffatt & Nichol	5/28/2019	12:59 PM	X	X	X	X	X
19	Moreland Altobelli Associates, LLC	5/28/2019	1:12 PM	X	X	X	X	X
20	Mott MacDonald, LLC	5/28/2019	12:16 PM	X	X	X	X	X
21	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	5/28/2019	9:55 AM	X	X	X	X	X
22	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	5/28/2019	1:03 PM	X	X	X	X	X
23	QK4, Inc.	5/28/2019	1:03 PM	X	X	X	X	X
24	RK Shah Associates, Inc.	5/28/2019	11:43 AM	X	X	X	X	X
25	RS&H, Inc.	5/28/2019	8:04 AM	X	X	X	X	X
26	STV Incorporated	5/28/2019	11:28 AM	X	X	X	X	X
27	T.Y. Lin International	5/28/2019	1:55 PM	X	X	X	X	X
28	Thompson Engineering, Inc.	5/28/2019	9:50 AM	X	X	X	X	X
29	TranSystems Corporation	5/28/2019	1:35 PM	X	X	X	X	X

GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

RFQ 484-052819

Batch #1 – 2019 Engineering Design Services

Contract #1, PI #0014914

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

Coordination and Communication

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

Evaluation Process

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

Phase I

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

Phase II

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

Phase I Evaluation of Statements of Qualifications

Evaluation of Eligible Submittals

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

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

Directions for use of the Evaluation Preliminary Scoring Forms:

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

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

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

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATING AVAILABILITY

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

Evaluation Meeting:

All completed Scoring Forms with the preliminary scores and comments for each criteria of each firm, must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for **Wednesday, July 03, 2019. The completed forms must be turned in at the conclusion of the meeting.**

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

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

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

GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Phase II Evaluation - Revised
RFQ 484-052819
Batch #1 – 2019 Engineering Design Services
Contract #1, PI #0014914

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

Coordination and Communication

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

Evaluation Process

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

Phase I

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

Phase II

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

Phase I
Evaluation of Statements of Qualifications

Evaluation of Eligible Submittals

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

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

Directions for use of the Evaluation Preliminary Scoring Forms:

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

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

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

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATING AVAILABILITY

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

Evaluation Meeting:

All completed Scoring Forms with the **preliminary scores** and **comments** for each criteria of each firm, must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Wednesday, July 03, 2019. 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 - Revised

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 it's team that may hinder or improve their overall rating for past performance.**
- **Selection committee members that do not have any personal prior work experience with any of the shortlisted firms, must seek additional documented material through discussion with their Office Management, CMIS (Vendor evaluation), inter-office documentation (emails, written correspondence, cure letters, etc.) to help aid in the discussion during the Phase II meeting.**

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

Evaluation Meeting:

All notes must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Tuesday, October 22, 2019. The Selection Committee will discuss and determine a final committee rating for each criteria and will provide summary comments as to why the Committee feels the rating is warranted. The Committee will assign the following ratings:

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

FINAL SCORING AND SELECTION

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

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE PRELIMINARY SCORING AND RANKING OF SUBMITTALS

Solicitation Title.	Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 1	1	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	
Solicitation #.	RFQ-484-052819	2	Lowe Engineers, LLC	
PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Preliminary Scoring based on Published Criteria			3	
(This Page For GDOT Use)			4	
			5	
			(RANKING)	
			Sum of	
			Individual	Group
SUBMITTING FIRMS			Rankings	Ranking
			6	TranSystems Corporation
			7	Holt Consulting Company, LLC
			8	KCI Technologies, Inc.
			9	RS&H, Inc.
			10	STV Incorporated
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	43	15	11	Thompson Engineering, Inc.
Barge Design Solutions	50	19	12	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.
CALYX Engineers and Consultants	39	12	13	CALYX Engineers and Consultants
CDM Smith Inc	58	21	14	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	39	13	15	QK4, Inc.
Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.	75	27	16	American Consulting Professionals, LLC
CROY Engineering, LLC	65	25	17	Moffatt & Nichol
EXP US Services Inc.	57	20	18	Moreland Altobelli Associates, LLC
Freese And Nichols	61	22	19	Mott MacDonald, LLC
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	17	3	20	Barge Design Solutions
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	21	6	21	EXP US Services Inc
Hussey, Gay, Bell & Deyoung, Inc.	62	24	22	CDM Smith Inc
IDS-Global	84	29	23	Freese And Nichols
KCI Technologies, Inc.	25	7	24	T.Y. Lin International
Lowe Engineers, LLC	14	2	25	Hussey, Gay, Bell & Deyoung, Inc.
Mead and Hunt, Inc.	67	26	26	CROY Engineering, LLC
Michael Baker International, Inc.	16	4	27	Mead and Hunt, Inc.
Moffatt & Nichol	48	16	28	Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.
Moreland Altobelli Associates, LLC	49	17	29	RK Shah Associates, Inc.
Mott MacDonald, LLC	49	18		IDS-Global
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	39	11		
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	6	1		
QK4, Inc.	40	14		
RK Shah Associates, Inc.	83	28		
RS&H, Inc.	26	8		
STV Incorporated	31	9		
T.Y. Lin International	61	23		
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	32	10		
TranSystems Corporation	32	5		

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications

Resources and Workload Capacity

Evaluator 1

Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	Phase One Evaluator 1 Individual	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Barge Design Solutions	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
CALYX Engineers and Consultants	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
CDM Smith Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P C	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Cranston Engineering Group, P C	Marginal	Adequate	175	29
CROY Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
EXP US Services Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Freese And Nichols	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc	Adequate	Good	300	3
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Good	300	3
Hussey, Gay, Bell & Deyoung, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
IDS-Global	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
KCI Technologies, Inc	Excellent	Good	450	1
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Adequate	Good	300	3
Mead and Hunt, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Michael Baker International, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Moffatt & Nichol	Adequate	Good	300	3
Moreland Altobelli Associates, LLC	Adequate	Good	300	3
Mott MacDonald, LLC	Adequate	Good	300	3
Neel-Schaffer, Inc	Adequate	Good	300	3
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc	Adequate	Excellent	350	2
QK4, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
RK Shah Associates, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
RS&H, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
STV Incorporated	Adequate	Good	300	3
T Y Lin international	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Thompson Engineering, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
TranSystems Corporation	Good	Good	250	11
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	500	%



GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-052819, Contract #1	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 1	Evaluation Committee should assign ratings (options and explanation for ratings belong to each Section). Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.		
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name: <i>Arventis Consulting Professionals, LLC</i>			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
PM - No coastal experience Road - 1 FDOT project used GDOT processes? Did mention < impacts Bridge - 1 project with environmental Env - bridge CE's, cut & paste relevance statement Prime experience - doesn't include environmental KTLs			
	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
PM - 63% available Road - 61% available Bridge - 62 % available Env - 87% available Just 1 prequalified archaeo firm (other 2-3) Org chart <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • doesn't distinguish between environmental disciplines • no env QC 			
Firm Name: <i>Design Design Solutions</i>			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
PM - coastal experience, mentions environmental document and agencies Road - 1 project with agencies, 1 project with major environmental issues Bridge - no mention of environmental Env - bridge CE's Prime experience - doesn't include KTL's			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
PM - 75% available Road - 75% available Bridge - 80 % available Env - 87% available Just 1 prequalified env firm Org chart <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 per environmental discipline • no env QC 			
Firm Name: <i>CA, TX Engineers and Consultants</i>			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM - No coastal experience, project description - not duties, env not part of design, a few projects with env issues • Road - 1 project with env, otherwise no mention • Bridge - 1 mention 404 • Env - bridge CE's • Prime experience - includes all KTLs 			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
PM - 40% available Road - 55% available Bridge - 64 % available Env - 71% available Just 1 prequalified archaeo firm (others 2-3) Org chart <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-3 per environmental discipline • no env QC 			
Firm Name: <i>DOB Smith Inc</i>			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM - No coastal experience, several project with env • Road - no mention env • Bridge - 1 project with env • Env - bridge CE's • Prime experience - doesn't include env KTL 			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate

PM - 43% available
 Road - 29% available
 Bridge - 79 % available
 Env - 87% available
 Just 1 prequalified history & archaeo firm
 Org chart
 • 1 per environmental discipline
 • no env QC

Firm Name: Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyors and Architects, P.C.	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating 

Adequate

- PM – No coastal experience, 1 project with “full NEPA”?? (v. partial?) 1 project with env issues
- Road – 1 project with BV
- Bridge – no mention env
- Env – 1 bridge CE
- Prime experience – doesn't include KTL's

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

Adequate

PM - 60% available
 Road - 48% available
 Bridge - 75 % available
 Env - 57% available
 Multiple prequalified env firms
 Org chart
 • 1 per history & archaeo
 • no env QC

Firm Name: Cranshaw Engineering Group, P.C.	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating 

Marginal

- PM – No coastal experience, 1 stand-alone bridge, 1 project with env issues
- Road – 1 TIA with env (appears that road KTL responsible for env)
- Bridge – no mention env
- Env – bridge CE's
- Prime experience – doesn't include env KTL

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

Adequate

PM – nearly 100% available
 Road - 46% available
 Bridge - 64 % available
 Env - 87% available
 One prequalified history, eco & archaeo firm
 Org chart
 • 2 per discipline
 • no env QC
 • quality control & PI in same block?

Firm Name: CROF Engineering, LLC	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating 

Adequate

- PM – No coastal experience, assist with env process, 1 project with permit
- Road – no mention env
- Bridge – 1 project with permit
- Env – no bridge CE's
- Prime experience – doesn't include env KTL (or substituted road KTL?)

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

Adequate

PM – 70% available
 Road - 75% available
 Bridge - 64 % available
 Env - 75% available
 One prequalified history & archaeo firm
 Org chart
 • Lists firms not individuals
 • no env QC

Firm Name: EXP US Services, Inc.	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating 

Adequate

- PM – No coastal experience, 2 projects < wetland impacts
- Road – no mention env
- Bridge – no mention env
- Env –bridge CE's
- Prime experience – doesn't include KTL's

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

Adequate

1

PM - nearly 100% available
Road - nearly 100% available
Bridge - 75 % available
Env - 87% available
One prequalified archaeo firm

Org chart

- Disciplines not specified, 1 person no longer with firm
- no env QC

Firm Name: Freese And Nichols	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating Adequate

- PM - No coastal experience, 1 project considers env, 1 project fit env
- Road - no mention env
- Bridge - 1 project reduced impacts during construction
- Env -bridge CE's, several on coast
- Prime experience - doesn't include KTL's

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

PM - nearly 100% available
Road - 85% available
Bridge - 85 % available
Env - 89% available
One prequalified history & archaeo firm
Org chart

- 1 per discipline
- no env QC

Firm Name: Hearn & Lindback Engineers, Inc.	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating Adequate

- PM - No coastal experience, 1 bridge project, env but no AMM
- Road - 1 project with env, no AMM
- Bridge - no mention env
- Env -bridge CE's, one on coast
- Prime experience - doesn't include env KTL; does discuss AMM

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

PM - 54% available
Road - 74% available
Bridge - 71% available
Env - 87% available
Narrative notes coastal env challenges
One prequalified firm for all environmental disciplines
Org chart

- 2 per discipline
- no env QC

Firm Name: Hill Consulting Company, LLC	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating Adequate

- PM - 1 coastal bridge, 1 mention 404, BV & A3M
- Road - relevance statement mention A3M & FWS but project narratives do not
- Bridge - no mention env
- Env -bridge CE's
- Prime experience - includes KTL's

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

PM - 55% available
Road - 67% available
Bridge - 56% available
Env - 89% available
Narrative notes importance of checking plans at environment tech studies, frequent coordination including env surveys & reports
One prequalified firm for all environmental disciplines
Org chart

- 1 per discipline (2 per ecology)
- no env QC

Firm Name: Hensley, Gay, Bell & Dwyer, Inc.	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating Adequate

Comments

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%

Assigned Rating

Adequate

Comments

Firm Name: IDS-QUIDA

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%

Assigned Rating

Adequate

- PM - 1 project mentions env "resolved with conflict"?
- Road - assists with communicating with env?
- Bridge - no mention env
- Env - 1 coastal bridge CE
- Prime experience - does not include KTL's

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%

Assigned Rating

Adequate

- PM - 82% available
- Road - 85% available
- Bridge - 88% available
- Env - 70% available [hours per commitment different than those shown in TYLin]
- One prequalified firm for all environmental disciplines
- Org chart
- 1 per discipline
- no env QC

Firm Name: KDI Technologies, Inc.

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%

Assigned Rating

Excellent

- PM - no coastal; integrates env into design
- Road - env critical
- Bridge - no mention env
- Env - bridge CE's
- Prime experience - does not include KTL's
- Environmental discussion throughout

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%

Assigned Rating

Good

- PM - 75% available
- Road - 79% available
- Bridge - 71% available
- Env - 36% available
- 2-3 prequalified firms for all environmental disciplines
- Org chart
- 1 per discipline
- no env QC

Firm Name: Lowe Engineers, LLC

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%

Assigned Rating

Adequate

- PM - no coastal; 1 project - balance env
- Road - CE's mentioned, no AMM
- Bridge - 1 project mentions env
- Env - 1 bridge CE
- Prime experience - does not include bridge & env KTL's

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%

Assigned Rating

Good

- PM - 69% available
- Road - 56% available
- Bridge - 75% available
- Env - 58% available
- 1 prequalified firm for all environmental disciplines
- Org chart
- 2 per discipline
- Env QC

Firm Name: Mead and Hunt, Inc.

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%

Assigned Rating

Adequate

- **PM - no GA experience; bridges with env considerations**
- **Road - CE, 404, no AMM**
- **Bridge - no mention env**
- **Env -bridge CE's**
- **Prime experience - does not include env KTL**

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

- PM - 38% available**
- Road - 48% available**
- Bridge - 20% available (> in 2020)**
- Env - 87% available**
- 1 prequalified firm for archaeo**
- Org chart**
- **discipline not specified**
- **No env QC**

Firm Name: Michael Baker Corporation, Inc.

A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
---	-----------------	-----------------

- **PM - coastal experience & env; 1 project stalled due to env**
- **Road - include env but no AMM**
- **Bridge - include env but no AMM**
- **Env -bridge CE's**
- **Prime experience - includes KTL's**

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

- PM - 50% available**
- Road - 75% available**
- Bridge - 62% available**
- Env - 74% available**
- 2 prequalified firm per discipline**
- Org chart**
- **1 per env discipline**
- **No env QC**

Firm Name: Moffatt & Nichol

A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
---	-----------------	-----------------

- **PM - coastal experience and 1 project with AMM (TIA)**
- **Road - include env but no AMM**
- **Bridge - include env**
- **Env -bridge CE's**
- **Prime experience - does not include env KTL**

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

- PM - 55% available**
- Road - 76% available**
- Bridge - 45% available**
- Env - 87% available**
- 1 prequalified firm history & eco**
- Org chart**
- **2 per env discipline**
- **Env QC**

Firm Name: Miravanti Alliance Associates, LLC

A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
---	-----------------	-----------------

- **PM - no coastal, env but no AMM**
- **Road - 1 project with env screening**
- **Bridge - 1 project worked proactively to avoid delays from env reevaluations (NWC)**
- **Env -2 NEPA (rest ecology lead), no bridge CE's**
- **Prime experience - KTL's not together in prime experience**

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

- PM - 71% available**
- Road - 71% available**
- Bridge - 40% available**
- Env - 66% available**
- 1 prequalified firm NEPA & eco**
- Org chart**
- **2 per env discipline**
- **No env QC though is in narrative**

Firm Name: Mike MacDonnell, LLC

A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
---	-----------------	-----------------

- **PM – SC coast?, 1 project AMM**
- **Road – projects with env doc, no AMM**
- **Bridge – no mention env**
- **Env –Bridge CE's**
- **Prime experience does not include env KTL**

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
---	-----------------	---	------

- PM – 71% available**
- Road – 46% available**
- Bridge - 75% available**
- Env - 87% available**
- 1 prequalified firm for env disciplines (2 for NEPA)**
- Discussion on constructability**
- Org chart**
- **2 per env discipline**
- **Env QC**

Firm Name: Hillier-Smith, Inc.			
---------------------------------------	--	--	--

A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
---	-----------------	---	----------

- **PM – most projects without env, 1 AMM for history**
- **Road – 2 projects mention with env, no AMM**
- **Bridge – bridge in env sensitive conditions**
- **Env –Bridge CE's**
- **Prime experience only includes PM**

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
---	-----------------	---	------

- PM – 43% available**
- Road – 64% available**
- Bridge - 90% available**
- Env - 89% available**
- 1 prequalified firm for history & archaeo**
- Org chart**
- **1 per env discipline**
- **Env QC**

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

A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
---	-----------------	---	----------

- **PM – no mention env**
- **Road – AMM all 3 projects**
- **Bridge – 1 project selected method to < impacts**
- **Env –Bridge CE's**
- **Prime experience does not include bridge KTL**

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Excellent
---	-----------------	---	-----------

- PM – 62% available**
- Road – 75% available**
- Bridge - 64% available**
- Env - 89% available**
- Multiple prequalified firms for environmental disciplines**
- Narrative notes ESB & A3M as well as need to focus on avoidance**
- Org chart**
- **Multiple per env discipline**
- **Env QC**

Firm Name: CH2M, Inc.			
------------------------------	--	--	--

A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
---	-----------------	---	----------

- **PM – coastal experience, env docs, env "coordination"**
- **Road – no mention env**
- **Bridge – NEPA, aesthetics**
- **Env –Bridge CE's**
- **Prime experience does not include env KTL**

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
---	-----------------	---	----------

- PM – 52% available**
- Road – 56% available**
- Bridge - 63% available**
- Env - 48% available**
- 1 prequalified firms for history, eco & archaeo**
- Org chart**
- **1 per env discipline**
- **No env QC**

Firm Name: RMC SHRI Associates, Inc.			
A	Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM – no coastal experience, 2 projects with env study or doc, no AMM • Road – no mention env • Bridge – no mention env • Env –Bridge CE's • Prime experience does not include bridge & env KTL's 			
B	Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM – 82% available • Road – 81% available • Bridge - 71% available • Env - 87% available • 1 prequalified firms for all env disciplines • Org chart • 1 per env discipline • No env QC - QC by PM & road lead 			
Firm Name: NASH, Inc.			
A	Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM – no coastal experience, no AMM • Road – oversaw env, no clear AMM • Bridge – project with env doc, no AMM • Env –Bridge CE's • Prime experience does not include env KTL • Prime experience does include project with AMM 			
B	Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM – 75% available • Road – 64% available • Bridge – largely available • Env - 48% available • 1 prequalified firms for history, eco & archaeo • Org chart • 1 per env discipline • No env QC 			
Firm Name: STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whittemore Associates			
A	Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM –coastal experience unclear, 2 projects with AMM • Road – no mention env • Bridge – 1 project emphasized < impacts • Env –Bridge CE's • Prime experience does not include env KTL 			
B	Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Good
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM – 75% available • Road – 46% available • Bridge – 55% available • Env - 62% available • Multiple prequalified firms for env disciplines • Org chart • 1 per env discipline • No env QC (narrative notes that subs will do reviews) • Narrative – reduce impacts 			
Firm Name: T. M. LINDENHARDT			
A	Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM –c oastal experience, 1 project with env doc, no AMM • Road – "knowledgeable of NEPA," no explanation • Bridge – 2 projects with env • Env –Bridge CE's • Prime experience does not include env or road KTL's 			
B	Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate

PM - 80% available

Road - 64% available

Bridge - 71% available

Env - 46% available [hours per commitment different than those shown in IDS]

1 prequalified firms per env discipline

Org chart

• Not all env disciplines shown

• No env QC

Firm Name: Thompson Engineering, Inc.

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating Adequate

- PM - coastal experience, tasks include env, no AMM
- Road - tasks include env, no AMM
- Bridge - 1 env permit
- Env - 1 bridge CE
- Prime experience does not include env or bridge KTL's

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20% Assigned Rating Adequate

- PM - largely available
- Road - 75% available
- Bridge - 68% available
- Env - 87% available
- 1 prequalified firms for history, archaeo & eco
- Org chart
- 2 per env disciplines
- No env QC

Firm Name: TriSystems Corporation

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating Good

- PM - no coastal experience, close coordination with env, A3M on schedule, 1 project < Impacts
- Road - 2 projects < Impacts
- Bridge - no mention env
- Env - bridge CE's
- Prime experience does not include PM or env KTL (but env KTL includes one of the projects in her experience)

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20% Assigned Rating Good

- PM - largely available
- Road - 70% available
- Bridge - 55% available
- Env - 87% available
- 1 prequalified firms for many env disciplines (2 for NEPA & eco)
- Org chart
- 1 per env disciplines
- Env QC
- Narrative - importance of environmental

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications

Resources and Workload Capacity

Evaluator 2

Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	Phase One	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Barge Design Solutions	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
CALYX Engineers and Consultants	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
CDM Smith Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P C	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Cranston Engineering Group, P C	Marginal	Adequate	175	21
CROY Engineering, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	175	21
EXP US Services Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	21
Freese And Nichols	Adequate	Marginal	200	17
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Hussey, Gay, Bell & Deyoung, inc	Adequate	Marginal	200	17
IDS-Globa!	Marginal	Marginal	125	29
KCI Technologies, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Mead and Hunt, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	21
Michael Baker International, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	2
Moffatt & Nichol	Marginal	Good	225	16
Moreland Altobelli Associates, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	175	21
Mott MacDonald, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	175	21
Neel-Schaffer, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	21
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc	Good	Good	375	1
QK4, Inc	Adequate	Marginal	200	17
RK Shah Associates, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	21
RS&H, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
STV incorporated	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
T.Y. Lin International	Adequate	Marginal	200	17
Thompson Engineering, inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	300 %	



GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-052819, Contract #1	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 2			
Evaluation Committee should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) in each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25% of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects = 75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name: American Consulting Professionals, LLC			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	adequate
Comments: PM - 26 years, has both Roadway and BR exp. on Bridge replacement over water Roadway - 23 years, has roadway senior exp. on BR over water - Bridge - has inter-coastal exp. NEPA - has worked on BR over water NEPA lead. Prime has BR over water exp.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	adequate
Comments: Org chart is staffed at appropriate level, Need AC/QA for Env. NEPA is over worked.			
Firm Name: Darge Design Solutions			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	adequate
Comments: PM - Has 19 years exp, been on Roadway team on BR over water Roadway - 11 years exp, has BR over water Bridge - 25 years exp. priority of BR over water projects and NEPA - 20 years, has worked on BR over water Prime -			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	adequate
Comments: Org chart has multi-discipline AC/QA team, does not have NEPA. NEPA has a lot of project commitments			
Firm Name: CARY ENGINEERS AND CONSULTANTS			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	adequate
Comments: PM - 29 years exp, PM on two Bridge bundles Roadway - 13 years, list on BR no stand alone BR projects. Bridge - Bridge on the exp. NEPA - 29 years - Bridge bundle exp as well as T.O. Prime - HAS 4 Bridge bundles under contract			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	adequate
Comments: no NEPA AC/QA. Resource availability is good			
Firm Name: RDM STUDIOS			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	adequate
Comments: PM - 15 years exp. is PM currently on BR bundle and EOL. Roadway - 20 years, not registered in GA, task manager on BR and Technical Lead Bridge - 25 years, has been bridge lead on BR, NEPA 20 years and has Prime worked on BR projects			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	adequate

2
 Comments only 1 QC/QA, not discipline specific
 minimal staffed org chart
 NEPA has a lot of project comments

Firm Name: Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyors and Architects, P.C.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	adequate
PM - 25 years exp, has design exp w/ bridge crossings over water, not much BR exp w/ BR. Roadway - 20 years exp, 1 w/ one BR over water Comments Bridge - 20 years, has bridge design exp, no exp listed over water NEPA - has been NEPA lead on two BR over water Prime - has exp w/ BR over water		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		
Comments - no NEPA QC/QA Org chart is staffed at appropriate level. KTL's appear to have capacity		

Firm Name: Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	marginal
PM - Although he lists wading projects where he was PM, only 1 BR over water listed Roadway - 15 years, lists no design lead exp on BR over water Comments Bridge - HAS bridge bundle exp. NEPA - 20 years exp, has BR as NEPA lead. Prime - list several local BR projects,		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		
Comments list multidiscipline QC/QA team. org chart is well staffed KTL's have capacity		

Firm Name: CROY Engineering, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	marginal
PM - 29 years exp, list two BR over water Roadway - Roadway lead no longer works for Croy. Comments Bridge - 13 years, Bridge bundle exp. NEPA - 25 years, no BR exp. listed. Prime - exp listed as sub. to prime on first two, does have bridge bundle exp.		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		
Comments Lists only 1 QC/QA. KTL's have capacity		

Firm Name: EAP Inc		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	marginal
PM - 25 years list two BR over water where he played dual role Roadway - no roadway lead exp. listed? 24 years exp, only PM Comments Bridge - 14 years exp, BR over water exp in IL. NEPA - 14 years exp. Has been NEPA lead Prime - has some exp		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		
Comments Org chart is well staffed only one QC/QA NEPA only has one comment?? Doesn't seem right when compared to her projects w/ other firms		

Firm Name: <u>Freese And Nichols</u>		Assigned Rating	<u>adequate</u>
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	<u>adequate</u>
Comments: PM - has 37 years exp. has been PM on Bridge bundle projects. Roadway - 25 years exp, Has exp. in other's roles, not true. Has turn in / GOOT Bridge - 34 years exp, Has plenty of BR over water exp NEPA - 20 years, it's been nepe lead on several BR over water Prime - exp. listed only included Roadway etc, all out of state.			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	<u>adequate</u>
Comments: - only 1 - ac/qa member - not many resources listed, have have team.			

Firm Name: <u>Health & Linnback Engineers, Inc</u>		Assigned Rating	<u>adequate</u>
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	<u>adequate</u>
Comments: PM - 23 years, has been PM or APM on a number of projects including bridges/BR's Roadway - Bridge Batch exp, and standalone BR Bridge - 18 years exp, Has Lead exp w/ bridges over water NEPA - 20 years, Has prepared documents for BR projects Prime - has demonstrated exp w/ BR over water			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	<u>adequate</u>
Comments: Did not specify discipline for quality management team. org chart is stuffed appropriately PM/NEPA have a lot of project commitments			

Firm Name: <u>Hill Consulting Company, LLC</u>		Assigned Rating	<u>adequate</u>
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	<u>adequate</u>
Comments: PM - 20 years exp, Has been PM on several BR over water Roadway - 22 years, has been lead roadway on two SR BR over water Bridge - 14 years, Has bridge batch exp. Prime - 3 SR BR over water as prime exp, all ongoing. NEPA - Has 24 years, been NEPA lead on BR over water			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	<u>adequate</u>
Comments: org chart has same person providing multiple roles ie. Buddy Courston on NEPA NO NEPA ac/qa			

Firm Name: <u>Hobby, Gay, Bell & Dunning, Inc</u>		Assigned Rating	<u>adequate</u>
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	<u>adequate</u>
Disqualified: PM - 23 years exp. has listed several BR over water where he was PM Roadway - 25 years, has been lead on several SR BR projects Bridge - 33 years, worked on larger projects as well as Bundle projects. NEPA - 20 years, list 1 standalone BR project Prime -			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	<u>adequate</u>
Disqualified: org chart is stuffed only 1 ac/qa			

Firm Name: <u>HBS Group</u>		Assigned Rating	<u>adequate</u>
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	<u>adequate</u>

PM - exp is dated and not relevant
 Roadway - 20 years, none relevant project exp listed
 Comments Bridge - has bridge design exp but not over water
 NEPA - 28 years, most of BR/water project that relevant
 Prime - need more standalone BR overwater projects

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

org chart - instead of saying staff... use the resources
 Comments no QC/QA at all

Firm Name: ACH Technologies, Inc.
 A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating → Adequate

PM - 20 years exp. She has a lot of PM exp on water, only lists 1 BR project
 Roadway - 13 years exp, Has been lead/PM on several BR over water
 Comments Bridge - 22 years, has been bridge engineer on multiple bridges
 NEPA - 25 years, has been on 4 Bridge Bundles
 Prime - HAS CR GROUP

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20% Assigned Rating → Adequate

only 1 QC/QA
 Comments Bridge/NEPA have a lot of project comments

Firm Name: Lewis Engineering, LLC
 A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating → Adequate

PM - 31 years, all his exp says he was PM from transition to ec. How long was he PM?
 Roadway - 20 years, Has been lead on at least 4 BR over water.
 Comments Bridge - 20 years, lots of CR bridges, would like to see
 NEPA - Boomer - blunder on BR over water
 Prime - has listed numerous BR over water

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20% Assigned Rating → Adequate

org chart, needs to list QC/QA disciplines
 well staffed org chart
 Comments KTR appear to have capacity

Firm Name: Michael Baker Corporation, Inc.
 A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating → Marginal

PM - 16 years exp, cites several SEOT projects where he was PM or lead decision
 Bridge - 33 years, has been DM/Bridgeland on at least 1 BR
 Comments Roadway - only lists 1 relevant project
 NEPA - 20 years, has prepared documents on embankment projects

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20% Assigned Rating → Adequate

only 1 QC/QA
 Comments NEPA ~~is not~~ disciplines are not specified

Firm Name: Michael Baker Corporation, Inc.
 A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating → Good

PM - 19 years exp, has previous PM on project, has exp in District/Area,
 Roadway - 14 years exp, has BR exp as DM/lead engineer
 Comments Bridge - 19 years exp, has BR exp over water
 NEPA - 40 years, has been Env. lead on 4 BR over water
 Prime - has coastal BR exp.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating	adequate
<p>Comments: No NEPA Q/A, not much depth on org chart, #11 etc's have capacity</p>		

Firm Name: MURPHY & WILSON		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<p>Comments: PM - has BR as well as w. design exp. Bridge Bundle Roadway - does not list relevant BR projects (standalone) Bridge - Not much full exp. has down hydro/wk/preliming but not much full NEPA - 21 years - has been Env. Lead on BR projects Prime - would like to see more standalone BR HAS BR exp. on larger projects</p>		

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating	good
<p>Comments: org chart - has 3 QC/QA (Bridge, Roadway, NEPA) well staffed</p>		

Firm Name: Moore and Anderson Associates, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<p>Comments: PM - 27 years, Although he has exp. on larger projects, looking for stand alone BR exp. Roadway - 5 years exp., has no standalone BR exp. Bridge - 32 years, has plenty of BR exp., although he only lists one overwater NEPA - refs taken on by both ecology/lead on all but two projects listed Prime - has BR exp for waterway for 29 yrs</p>		

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating	adequate
<p>Comments: org chart - list two QC/QA but doesn't list discipline well staffed org chart.</p>		

Firm Name: Matt MacDonald, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<p>Comments: PM - 23 years, Has BR exp. in SC DOT, w. design exp. in GA, Roadway - 21 years exp. has on call in GA doing 63 BR for NCDOT Bridge - has been lead eng. on w. design projects in GA. NEPA - 20 years, Prime - mainly w. design exp. listed, although have NE one call contract</p>		

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating	adequate
<p>Comments: QC/QA team has 3 disciplines (Road, Bridge, NEPA) Org chart - is well staffed NEPA has a ton of project commitments</p>		

Firm Name: W&A SOLUTIONS, INC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<p>Comments: PM - 22 years, All w. design except for DB Batch 4 Bridge replacement Roadway - 16 years, no relevant project exp listed, want to see standalone BR Bridge - 29 years, has BR exp over water in SC NEPA - 20 years, has extensive BR exp. as env. lead Prime - mostly DB bridge project exp</p>		

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating	adequate
--	-----------------	----------

multi-discipline QC/QA team. thin on env. resources. OK staffed everywhere else

see above

Comments

Firm Name: Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating: good

Comments: PM - 33 years exp, was Precast Eng, to a lot of BR projects, has significant exp.
Roading - 21 years exp, has been lead on several BR over water
Bridge - 29 years, has exp w/ layer, LPR as well as BR over water
NEPA - 24 years, drafted documents for several BR over water
Prime - Has extensive BR exp. over water

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

Comments: org chart is very well staffed
across team w/ multiple disciplines (Roading, NEPA, Bridge)
KTL's appear to have capacity

Firm Name: CH2M

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating: adequate

Comments: PM - concerned that he has no recent/relevant exp listed. why did he list
Bridge bundle last?
Roading - Bridge and, 4 BR. not sure if there over water.
Bridge - 30 years, has exp w BR over water
NEPA - 16 years, has been NEPA lead on BR
Prime - dated exp... nothing but bridge bundle is recent

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

Comments: org chart - no multidiscipline ac/AR
thing stalled
All KTLs have several comments

Firm Name: Hillier Associates, Inc.

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating: marginal

Comments: PM - 26 years, main exp has been w/ ordinary projects, only 1 BR over water
Roading - 24 years, only 1 BR over water
Bridge - 26 years, need description of roles/duties instead of history, project
NEPA - Has 20 years, and has worked on BR over water
Prime - history 1 BR over water

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

Comments: org chart has no NEPA ac/AR, nor bridge
has no bridge resources

Firm Name: HNTB

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating: adequate

Comments: PM - 35 years, Bridge bundle exp as PM
Roading - 15 years exp, Bridge bundle and structure lead design exp
Bridge - 27 years, has been structural EOH on several BR over water
NEPA - 16 years, has ext. exp w/ BR over water
Prime - has relevant project exp.

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

Comments: org chart - No NEPA ac/AR
org chart is staffed appropriately
All KTL except NEPA have capacity
NEPA has 12 project comments

Firm Name: <u>City Inspector/DCS BY PAID/Wholesale/Asst Manager</u>		Assigned Rating	adequate
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	adequate
Comments	PM - 26 years, 17 on bridge/bridge w/ 6 bridges, he also worked on water with exp. - has bridge/bridge exp., has been lead on several other projects as well Bridge - Has been PM / senior engineer on BE BR and has intercoastal exp. in SC NEPA - 17 years exp, has ext. BR over water exp. Prime - only list 1 BR over water.		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	adequate
Comments	org chart - only 1 ac/oa resources appear to be appropriate KTL's appear to have capacity		

Firm Name: <u>TECH ENGINEERING, INC.</u>		Assigned Rating	adequate
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	adequate
Comments	PM - 38 years. 1 on current two intercoastal BE. all other exp. is not relevant Roadway - 17 years, unsure of his abilities as lead roadway Bridge - 17 years, has the current project but just getting started. NEPA - only list the intercoastal BE that hasn't gotten started yet. Prime - Has bridge bridge		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	marginal
Comments	only 1 ac/oa thin by staffed, only 2 resources for Env? Bridge only has 2 resources.		

Firm Name: <u>Thompson Engineering, Inc.</u>		Assigned Rating	adequate
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	adequate
Comments	PM - 29 years, PM exp on tidal/intercoastal BR project & Roadway - 19 years exp, Bridge - 30 years, been Bridge/BR/Manager on BR over water NEPA - 20 years, Has prepared CE's for BR over water Prime - Has past exp working on tidal		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	adequate
Comments	only list 1 ac/oa (no NEPA, bridge) org chart is well staffed KTL' Bridge/NEPA KTL's have a lot of project commitments		

Firm Name: <u>TECH ENGINEERING, INC.</u>		Assigned Rating	adequate
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	adequate
Comments	PM - 24 years exp, most BR projects are still ongoing Roadway - 25 years, list 3 BR over water Bridge - 25 years, describes BR over water but not NEPA - 20 years -		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	adequate
Comments	- multi discipline ac/oa - no depth in env. resources		

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications

Resources and Workload Capacity

Evaluator 3

SUBMITTING FIRMS	Maximum Points allowed =		Phase One Evaluator 3 Individual	
	300	200	Total Score	Ranking
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
Barge Design Solutions	Marginal	Adequate	175	16
CALYX Enginers and Consultants	Marginal	Adequate	175	16
CDM Smith Inc	Marginal	Marginal	125	24
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P C	Marginal	Adequate	175	16
Cranston Engineering Group, P C	Marginal	Adequate	175	16
CROY Engineering, LLC	Marginal	Marginal	125	24
EXP US Services Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	16
Freese And Nichols	Marginal	Marginal	125	24
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc	Adequate	Good	300	2
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
Hussey, Gay, Bell & Deyoung, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
IDS Global	Marginal	Marginal	125	24
KCI Technologies, Inc	Adequate	Marginal	200	15
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
Mead and Hunt, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
Michael Baker International, Inc	Good	Good	375	1
Moffatt & Nichol	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
Moreland Altobelli Associates, LLC	Adequate	Good	300	2
Mott MacDonald, LLC	Adequate	Good	300	2
Neel-Schaffer, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Adequate	Good	300	2
QK4, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
RK Shah Associates, Inc	Marginal	Marginal	125	24
RS&H, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
STV Incorporated	Marginal	Adequate	175	16
T.Y. Lin International	Marginal	Marginal	125	24
Thompson Engineering, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	16
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Adequate	175	16
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	500 %	



GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-052819, Contract #1	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #:	3		
<p><i>Evaluation Comments should assign Rating options and explanation for ratings below to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.</i></p>			
<p>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 qualifications/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</p>			
Firm Name: Americal Consulting Professionals, LLC			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
<p><i>PM has relevant experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways on two lane roads and demonstrated experience with various techniques (staging, on-site detour, ABC closure) of maintaining traffic and GDOT PDP. Roadway KTL has relevant experience with two lane bridge replacement projects over waterways, including tidally influenced locations and experience with some traffic maintenance techniques, such as on-site detours and shifted alignments. Bridge KTL demonstrates experience with similar type projects, including ABC techniques with roadway closures. NEPA KTL provides some experience with bridge replacement projects but none in coastal GA region. Prime shows experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways with several KTLs having worked together on previous projects.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
<p><i>Org chart shows plenty of depth for this single bridge replacement project with separate QC/QA for Roadway and Bridge components. PM and KTL appear to have sufficient time to devote to project. The project team appears to provide experienced personnel in support roles such as hydraulics, survey, public involvement and geotechnical.</i></p>			
Firm Name: Barge Design Solutions			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Marginal
<p><i>PM demonstrates experience with similar scoped projects, including off-site detours and offset alignments, though some of them (PI 0013738/0013739/0007037) have not been completed through the entire PDP process or were switched to DB projects. Roadway KTL shows some experience with bridge replacement projects although several have not completed the PDP yet and write-up is unclear to the role provided by the Roadway KTL. Bridge KTL provides some relevant experience in bridge replacement projects though more description on how they relate to the subject replacement would be good. NEPA KTL provides some experience with bridge replacement projects but none in coastal GA region. The Prime's section shows barely sufficient experience on similar projects, with many projects still under development</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
<p><i>Org chart shows enough resources to deliver this project on schedule but appears to lack additional depth for redundancy and recovery if necessary. Org Chart does show deep QC/QA team, divided by subject matter. Team members project with suitable capacity to deliver the project.</i></p>			
Firm Name: CALYX Engineers and Consultants			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Marginal
<p><i>PM shows several examples of similar scoped projects with varied traffic management approaches. Roadway KTL shows limited experience with projects that include bridge replacements that have completed the PDP process. Bridge KTL demonstrates sufficient experience to deliver this bridge replacement project. NEPA KTL shows relevant experience with bridge replacement, including an on-call contract for District 5 - however, no specifics of the projects provided in District 5 were provided. Most of the Prime's experience shows similar scoped projects but that haven't completed the PDP process yet. Several KTL and the PM show work experience together on previous projects.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
<p><i>Org chart shows ample depth for delivery of this single bridge project. PM and KTL show sufficient capacity to take on the subject project.</i></p>			
Firm Name: COM Smart Inc			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Marginal
<p><i>PM experience is sufficient for the subject bridge project but many examples provided are parts of on-going projects and don't fully show PDP experience as a project manager. Roadway KTL demonstrates an incomplete experience with bridge replacement projects with similar scope. roadway KTL is not currently a GA PE. While the Bridge KTL is sufficient for this project, most examples provided are on-going projects are not very related to the subject project. NEPA KTL provides some experience with bridge replacement projects but none in coastal GA region. Prime demonstrates suitable experience with 2D tidal study project but current projects are incomplete examples of application of PDP.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Marginal

Org chart shows enough resources to deliver single bridge project but lacks redundancy in environmental side. Hydraulic team has experience with tidal hydraulic analysis. PM and most KTL appear to have sufficient time to devote to project but concern with 100 hours of work already committed for Roadway KTL.

Firm Name: Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	Assigned Rating	—————→	Marginal
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

PM demonstrates some design experience with bridge replacement projects but no project management experience with such projects. Bridge KTL shows experience with bridge replacement projects though highlighted projects don't appear relevant to subject project. Roadway KTL shows sufficient experience with bridge replacement projects over streams. NEPA KTL shows experience in bridge replacement projects over water but doesn't demonstrate any familiarity with coastal environments. Prime provides experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways though nothing with tidal analysis required.

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

Org chart provides suitable depth for a project of this size. QC/QA to be provided by different SME. Discusses use of ABC methods for delivery of bridges with possible use of off-site detour but didn't provide any examples by the Prime or KTLs of use of ABC methods on previous projects. PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient capacity to deliver project on time.

Firm Name: Crankton Engineering Group, P.C.	Assigned Rating	—————→	Marginal
--	-----------------	--------	-----------------

PM and Roadway KTL demonstrate little relevant experience for bridge replacement projects. Bridge KTL shows sufficient experience with similar scoped bridge replacement projects over waterways. NEPA KTL provides some experience with bridge replacement projects but none in coastal GA region. Prime demonstrates some experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways though unclear as to the environmental documentation required for the projects. PM and Roadway KTL have worked together on several past projects.

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

Org chart shows plenty of depth for scope of project. Concern that QC/QA is being performed by PM and Roadway Support personnel. PM and KTL appear to have sufficient capacity to take on work for subject project.

Firm Name: CROY Engineering, LLC	Assigned Rating	—————→	Marginal
---	-----------------	--------	-----------------

PM and Roadway KTL appear to have limited experience with completed projects similar to the subject bridge replacement. Bridge KTL provides experience that is acceptable for the subject project. NEPA KTL has sufficient experience for bridge replacement projects over water but doesn't provide any experience in coastal areas. Prime's experience represents projects that are still in progress or projects where the main work was provided by another design firm.

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

Org shows very minimum information about personnel to provide environmental services and has an awkward format that doesn't show a clear chain of command from area classes to the KTLs. Croy has access to in-house resources for utility coordination and survey. PM and KTL appear to have suitable availability for the project.

Firm Name: CROPS Services Inc.	Assigned Rating	—————→	Marginal
---------------------------------------	-----------------	--------	-----------------

PM shows some experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways for local governments. Roadway KTL shows experience only as a Project Manager in bridge projects provided. Bridge KTL shows some experience with bridge replacements over waterways but lacks details applicable to the subject location. EPA KTL provides some experience with bridge replacement projects but none in coastal GA region. Prime shows sufficient experience on bridge replacement projects over water, though none are in a coastal environment.

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

Org chart shows ample resources in roadway and bridge design personnel but lacks explanation of which personnel will be responsible for specific area classes. Current workload for NEPA KTL appears to be incomplete - remainder of team appears to have adequate work capacity to take on project.

Firm Name: [Redacted]		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<i>PM demonstrates experience with similar scoped bridge replacement projects. Bridge KTL shows relevant experience with bridge replacement projects. Roadway KTL provides no prior experience with bridge replacement projects. NEPA KTL shows good experience with bridge replacement projects in District 5. Prime provides limited experience with bridge replacement projects, with most projects show focused on rehabilitation work.</i>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<i>Org chart doesn't show good relationship between support personnel and KTLs and doesn't provide much redundancy in resources for area classes. PM and KTL show suitable capacity to take on the work.</i>		

Firm Name: [Redacted]		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<i>PM has relevant experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways on two lane roads. Roadway KTL displays ample experience with similar scoped projects. Bridge KTL provides sufficient experience for subject project but most listed experience is for on-going projects. NEPA lead shows good examples of bridge replacement projects, including currently working on a replacement project in a coastal environment. Prime provides several bridge replacement experiences including some preliminary work on projects in a coastal environment. PM and several KTLs have experience working on previous projects together.</i>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Good
<i>Org Chart shows ample depth for delivery of this single bridge project. Additional resources include separate group with tidal hydraulics experience as well as coastal experience in the geotechnical and environmental parts of the team. Would prefer if PM is not part of QC/QA oversight. Acknowledges different types of traffic maintenance possible for the location. All team members show sufficient time to devote to the project.</i>		

Firm Name: [Redacted]		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<i>PM has good experience with bridge replacement projects of similar scope. Roadway KTL demonstrates relevant experience with bridge replacement projects including various methods (off-site detour, stage constr) for maintaining traffic but several are still active projects. Bridge KTL has good experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways. NEPA KTL demonstrates relevant experience on bridge replacement projects but doesn't show experience in coastal regions. Prime shows applicable experience to the subject project but most of it appears to be on-going work.</i>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<i>org chart shows sufficient depth for scale of project. Org chart includes separate QA/QC leads for roadway and structures. PM and KTL show ample capacity to take on subject project.</i>		

Firm Name: [Redacted]		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
Comments		

Firm Name: [Redacted]		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Marginal

PM shows some experience with bridge replacement projects but none that involve waterways. None of the projects presented for the Roadway KTL appear to involve bridge work of any kind. Bridge KTL demonstrates experience with bridge replacement projects but none of waterways. NEPA KTL shows experience with bridge replacement projects in coastal areas although the projects are not complete. Prime displays very limited experience with bridge replacement projects.

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

Org chart provides little depth on available support staff, doesn't identify KTLs nor show the relationship between support staff, KTL and PM very well. Org chart also lacks any QC/QA section. Team appears to have sufficient time for project.

Firm Name: WCI Technologies, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate

PM has adequate experience with bridge replacement projects of similar scope. Most of Roadway KTL experience is skewed towards project management or structural design - main roadway experience (SR 26) is still in early phases. NEPA KTL has relevant experience for similar scoped projects. Bridge KTL has ample experience presented to work on the subject project. Prime lists relevant examples of similar bridge replacement projects.

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

Team provides a Section 20 plan development lead. Org chart lacks any redundancy in area classes. Narrative discusses 4 separate project teams but that is not represented on the org chart. PM and KTLs display sufficient time to devote to the project.

Firm Name: Lowe Engineers, LLC		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate

PM demonstrates experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways but concern that none were presented with PM responsibilities for the entire project. Roadway KTL provided experience with bridge replacement projects that utilize varied methods of traffic management (off-site detour, shifted alignment). Bridge KTL shows sufficient experience for subject project. NEPA KTL shows sufficient experience for the subject project. Prime displays suitable experience on similar scoped projects.

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
---	-----------------	----------

Org chart shows ample depth for the single bridge replacement project. Offers additional in-house survey capabilities with 3d laser scanning and drones. Named constructability engineer for team. All KTLs and PM appear to have sufficient capacity to take on project.

Firm Name: Stead and Ham, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate

PM has ample experience on similar scoped projects. Bridge KTL has suitable experience for the subject project. Roadway KTL shows applicable examples of bridges over waterways. NEPA KTL provides some experience with bridge replacement projects but none in coastal GA region. Prime demonstrates sufficient experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways.

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
---	-----------------	----------

Org chart shows ample depth for single bridge replacement project. Section presents possible traffic maintenance approaches for the bridge replacement. PM and KTL appear to have sufficient workload capacity to take on project.

Firm Name: Michael Baker International, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Good

PM has good relevant experience with similar projects in District 5 and tidally influenced bridge crossings, including unique experience with the subject project. Roadway and Bridge KTLs have sufficient experience with bridge replacement projects crossing waterways. NEPA KTL has ample experience with bridge replacement projects including coastal environments. Prime demonstrates good experience with bridges over waterways including coastal environments. Several KTL have worked on multiple past projects together

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
---	-----------------	--	------

Org chart shows depth in engineering side for subject project but no redundancy for environmental and geotechnical area classes. Multi-discipline approach for QC/QA (Road, Bridge) presented. Narrative identifies possible issues with traffic management, ROW and environmental associated with the project. PM and KTLs all have reasonable time to add this project to their workload.

Firm Name: Moffatt & Nichol			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate

PM has suitable experience in Dist 5 and bridge replacement projects. Roadway KTL has sufficient experience for subject project but several experiences are more focused on PM duties rather than roadway activities. Bridge KTL displays good experience with tidally influenced hydraulic studies in Coastal GA but doesn't demonstrate much experience with final bridge design. NEPA KTL provides some experience with bridge replacement projects but none in coastal GA region. The Prime demonstrates relevant experience with similar scoped projects although some are still in the design phase.

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
---	-----------------	--	----------

Org Chart shows reasonable depth for scope of project. Multi-disciplined QA/QC presented but Bridge and Roadway personnel are involved in design activities as well according to the org chart. All KTLs and PM appear to have sufficient capacity in their workload for this project.

Firm Name: Mizelland Allsbell Associates, LLC			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate

PM shows sufficient experience for bridge replacement projects over waterways. Roadway KTL demonstrates limited experience with stream crossing. Bridge KTL has experience with similar scoped projects as well as some experience with bridge widenings in Glynn County. NEPA KTL has some experience in Dist 5 but not much shown for bridges over waterways. Prime displays ample experience with similar scoped projects.

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
---	-----------------	--	------

Org chart shows sufficient depth for scale of project. Not certain why org Chart shows resources for "Freshwater Aquatic Survey" given project location. Named, dedicated source for schedule and budget that is separate from the PM. Named personnel for constructability reviews. Use of Inter-Disciplinary Review to engage all facets of team prior to submittals. All team members appear to have sufficient time to work on project.

Firm Name: New MacDonnell, LLC			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate

PM shows sufficient experience for bridge replacement projects over waterways. Roadway and Bridge KTL shows experience with bridge replacement projects. NEPA KTL provides some experience with bridge replacement projects but none in coastal GA region. Prime demonstrates sufficient experience for bridge replacement projects over waterways. Team members have experience working together on past projects.

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
---	-----------------	--	------

Org chart shows sufficient depth for single bridge replacement project. QC/QA split by discipline for roadway, structures and environmental. Named resources for constructability reviews. PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient capacity for subject project.

Firm Name: New Scheller, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate

PM has sufficient experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways. Roadway KTL provided limited bridge replacement projects over water. Bridge KTL shows experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways including coastal regions. NEPA KTL displays suitable experience with hydraulic bridge replacements and environmental work performed in Dist 5. Prime demonstrates experience with rural hydraulic bridges replacement projects.

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
---	-----------------	--	----------

Org chart shows plenty of design depth for project scope but concern that NEPA KTL is listed as the resource for 3 of the environmental area classes. Multi-disciplined approach to QC/QA with roadway, bridge, environmental and hydraulics all having a named resource. All team members present with sufficient capacity to support working on this project.

Firm Name: Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating Adequate

PM and Roadway KTL show ample experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways with multiple traffic management approaches (off-site detour, on-site detour, staging). Bridge KTL demonstrates sufficient experience with bridge replacements over waterways. NEPA KTL has sufficient experience with bridge replacement projects. Prime provides sufficient experience for subject project.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating Good
--	-----------------------

Org chart shows deep team for delivery of project. Multi-disciplined QC/QA shown on Org Chart. Named resources for VE, constructability and cost estimated presented in org chart. Additional resource with extensive ABC experience provided. PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient capacity to take on subject project.

Firm Name: QKA, Inc.	
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating Adequate

PM demonstrates ample experience with bridges over waterways including work in Dist 5. Roadway KTL shows limited experience with hydraulic bridge replacements because the projects are still in design phase. Bridge KTL shows sufficient experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways. NEPA KTL demonstrates relevant work experience with bridge replacement projects over water but no coastal experience shown. Prime shows suitable work experience for subject project including work in Dist 5.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating Adequate
--	---------------------------

Org chart shows sufficient resources for project but lacks redundancy in many areas if potentially needed. Separate QC identified for bridge work. All team members appear to have sufficient time to devote to the subject project.

Firm Name: SP Shah Associates, Inc.	
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating Marginal

PM and Roadway KTL present limited experience with full bridge replacement projects over streams. Bridge KTL appears to have sufficient experience for project scope but listed projects don't provide much detail to scope of project or type of work performed. NEPA KTL demonstrates relevant work experience with bridge replacement projects over water but no coastal experience shown. Prime shows limited experience with similar type (stream) bridge replacement projects.

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

Org chart shows sufficient resources for project but lacks redundancy in environmental area classes if potentially needed. QA/QC to be performed by PM and Roadway KTL isn't ideal. PM and KTLs appears to have sufficient capacity for project.

Firm Name: PMA, Inc.	
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating Adequate

PM demonstrates ample experience with bridges over waterways including work in Dist 5. Roadway and Bridge KTL shows sufficient experience with bridges over waterways including work in dist 5. NEPA KTL demonstrates plenty of relevant experience but doesn't highlight any work in coastal environments. Prime shows sufficient experience with stream crossing bridge replacements. PM and several KTLs have worked on previous projects together.

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating Adequate
--	---------------------------

Org chart shows sufficient depth for scope of project but would like to see redundancy in environmental areas if needed. Multi-disciplined QC/QA (Roadway/Bridge) provided. All team members appear to have sufficient capacity available when NTP for the project is issued.

Firm Name: RTV Incorporated and RTV Ralph Whithead Associates		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<i>PM and Roadway KTL display limited experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways with the primary projects (Bridge Bundle 3 - 2016) still in design. Bridge KTL shows sufficient experience with stream crossing replacement projects. NEPA KTL shows ample experience with bridge projects over water but doesn't show experience with coastal regions. Prime shows little experience with similar project types because highlighted examples are still under design. Team members show experience working together on prior projects.</i>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<i>Org chart shows sufficient depth for design services. Would prefer to see redundancy in environmental areas. Concern with NEPA lead also being listed as only resource for several environmental area classes. Additional resources section describes independent reviews to be performed. Named utility coordinator on the team to mitigate concern over existing water line on bridge. PM and KTLs present sufficient capacity for anticipated project work.</i>		
Firm Name: T.Y. Lin International		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<i>PM, Roadway, Bridge and NEPA KTL display limited experience with bridge replacement projects over waterways with the primary project (SR 26) still in design phase. Prime lists few hydraulic bridge replacement projects that are not currently under design.</i>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<i>Org chart shows sufficient resources for most areas but concern about lack of environmental staff listed. All team members appear to have sufficient time for the subject project.</i>		
Firm Name: Thompson Engineering, Inc		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<i>PM, Roadway KTL and Prime list experience with bridge projects in coastal areas including subject location but don't acknowledge this experience with the site and the advantage that would present. Bridge KTL demonstrates sufficient experience with similar scoped projects. NEPA KTL demonstrates plenty of relevant experience but doesn't highlight any work in coastal environments.</i>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<i>Org chart shows sufficient personnel to provide services for subject project. Concern that PM and Roadway KTL are also listed as part of the Roadway Design team. PM and KTL show sufficient time to provide services for the project.</i>		
Firm Name: Tri-Systems Corporation		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<i>PMs experience is limited due to all hydraulic bridge replacement projects listed still be in the design phase. Roadway KTL shows sufficient experience with similar type projects. Bridge KTL provides some relevant experience in bridge replacement projects though more description on how they relate to the subject replacement would be good. NEPA KTL demonstrates plenty of relevant experience including work in coastal region. Prime shows plenty of relevant project experience to the subject project.</i>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<i>Org chart shows sufficient depth for scope of project but would like to see redundancy in environmental areas if needed. Multi-disciplined QC/QA (Roadway/Bridge/Environmental) provided. Bridge KTL has prior experience with subject project hydraulics. All team members present sufficient capacity for project demands.</i>		

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications

Resources and Workload Capacity

Evaluator 4

SUBMITTING FIRMS	Maximum Points allowed =		Phase One Evaluator 4 Individual	
	300	200	Total Score	Ranking
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Adequate	Good	300	23
Barge Design Solutions	Good	Adequate	325	20
CALYX Engineers and Consultants	Good	Good	375	9
CDM Smith Inc	Good	Adequate	325	20
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P C	Good	Good	375	9
Cranston Engineering Group, P C	Good	Good	375	9
CROY Engineering, LLC	Good	Good	375	9
EXP US Services Inc	Good	Good	375	9
Freese And Nichols	Good	Good	375	9
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc	Good	Good	375	9
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Good	Good	375	9
Hussey, Gay, Bell & Deyoung, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	28
IDS-Global	Good	Adequate	325	20
KCI Technologies, Inc	Excellent	Adequate	400	6
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Excellent	Good	450	2
Mead and Hunt, Inc	Adequate	Marginal	200	29
Michael Baker International, Inc	Excellent	Good	450	2
Moffatt & Nichol	Adequate	Good	300	23
Moreland Altobelli Associates, LLC	Adequate	Good	300	23
Mott MacDonald, LLC	Adequate	Good	300	23
Neel-Schaffer, Inc	Good	Good	375	9
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc	Excellent	Excellent	500	1
QKA, Inc	Excellent	Adequate	400	6
RK Shah Associates, Inc	Good	Marginal	275	27
RS&H, Inc	Excellent	Adequate	400	6
STV Incorporated	Good	Good	375	9
T Y Lin International	Good	Good	375	9
Thompson Engineering, Inc	Excellent	Good	450	2
TranSystems Corporation	Good	Good	450	2
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	500 %	



GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-052819, Contract #1	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #4			
Evaluation Committees should assign Ratings (define and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points			
Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points			
Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points			
Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points			
Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name: American Consulting Professionals, LLC			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>Team has some experience with Georgia Bridges</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>Overall the team has capacity to take on work. NEPA is lead or PM on 32 GDOT projects, but shows only 23 committed hours per month. - Edwards</i></p>			
Firm Name: Range Design Solutions			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>Team looks strong and experienced for Georgia Bridges</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>There is QA/QC for Roadway, Structures, Hydrology, & Survey. NEPA is lead or PM on 32 GDOT projects, but shows only 23 committed hours per month. - Edwards</i></p>			
Firm Name: CALYA Engineers and Consultants			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>Team looks strong and experienced for Georgia Bridges</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>All Key team leads seem to have available capacity; 2 QA/QC available; atleast two resources in all resource areas. - Wade</i></p>			
Firm Name: COM Smith Inc			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>Team looks strong and experienced for Georgia Bridges</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate

4

Availability of Workload capacity looks to be low; One QA/QC reviewer. NEPA is lead or PM on 32 GDOT projects, but shows only 23 committed hours per month. - Edwards

Firm Name: Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyors and Architects, P.C.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	Good

Team looks strong and experienced for Georgia Bridges

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

Team looks to have workload capacity; team has 2 QA/QC groups with ample manpower.

Firm Name: Creston Engineering Group, P.C.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	Good

Team looks strong and experienced for Georgia Bridges

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

Team looks to have workload capacity; team has 2 QA/QC individuals. Edwards

Firm Name: CROY Engineering, LLC		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	Good

Team looks strong and experienced for Georgia Bridges

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

Team looks to have workload capacity; team has 1 QA/QC individual. McIntosh

Firm Name: EXPSS Services Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	Good

Bridge designer does not seem to have much experience with Georgia Bridge projects. PM and Roadway Lead have ample experience on Georgia Bridges.

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

Team looks to have workload capacity; team has 1 QA/QC individual. NEPA work capacity seems to be stated lower than actual. - Edwards

Firm Name: [Redacted]			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Team looks strong and experienced, although Roadway lead does not have experience in georgia.</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Good

Firm Name: [Redacted]			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Team looks strong and experienced for Georgia Bridges</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Good

Firm Name: [Redacted]			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Team looks to have workload capacity; team has 2 QA/QC individuals, not including the PM, Edwards</i>			

Firm Name: [Redacted]			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>Team looks strong and experienced for Georgia Bridges</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Good

Firm Name: [Redacted]			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>Comments</i>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>Comments</i>			

Firm Name: [Redacted]			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good

4

Team looks strong and experienced for Georgia Bridges

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
---	-----------------	----------

Team looks to have workload capacity; team has 0 QA/QC individuals and two PM's according to Org Chart. Barker

Firm Name: PCI Technologies, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Excellent

Team looks strong and experienced for Georgia Bridges, has done similar projects; NEPA - mislabeled at Bridge design lead - Team & prime has completed several bridge projects within Georgia.

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
---	-----------------	----------

1 QA/QC individual for the team. Abundant Survey and Geotech support; PM and Lead design has capacity; Bridge Design lead currently working on 14+ projects, NEPA has 19 listed GDOT projects and atleast 5 not listed (Hwy 9, PI#'s 0007838,0007843,0007844,0008357,121690) - Smith

Firm Name: Loebe Engineers, LLC		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Excellent

Team looks strong and experienced for Georgia Bridges; Team & prime has completed several bridge projects within Georgia

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Good
---	-----------------	------

2 QA/QC individual for the team. Abundant Survey and Geotech support; Team looks to have available workload capacity; Pugh

Firm Name: Mead and Hunt, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate

PM and Bridge head have little to know experience with bridges in Georgia.

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

1 QA/QC individual for the team. Bridge design lead does not seem to have capacity for more work. Edwards

Firm Name: Mitchell Eganly International, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Excellent

Firm and all leads have ample experience with GDOT bridges.

4

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Good
---	-----------------	--------	------

2 QA/QC individuals for the team, and a Deputy PM, All resources have workload capacity. Best

Firm Name: Muffart & Nichol

A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
---	-----------------	--------	----------

Team has adequate experience with GDOT bridges

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Good
---	-----------------	--------	------

Team has 3 QA/QC members, team has workload capacity. Edwards

Firm Name: Cleveland Atabell Associates, LLC

A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
---	-----------------	--------	----------

Team did not show a lot of experience with Bridges.

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Good
---	-----------------	--------	------

Team has Deputy PM and 2 QA/QC. Team has workload capacity. Niraula

Firm Name: Matt MacDonald, LLC

A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
---	-----------------	--------	----------

PM and Roadway design lead seem to have limited GDOT bridge experience.

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Good
---	-----------------	--------	------

Team has 3 QA/QC members, team has workload capacity, Edwards

Firm Name: Jean Schaefer, Inc

A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Good
---	-----------------	--------	------

Bridge team lead may have limited experience with Georgia Bridges, but overall team looks qualified

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Good
---	-----------------	--------	------

4
Team has 4 QA/QC individuals, team has workload capacity. Covington

Firm Name: Parsons Transmission Group, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Excellent

Team looks highly experienced and qualified in Georgia Bridges

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Excellent
---	-----------------	---	-----------

Team has 4 QA/QC individuals, and ample resources. Team has workload capacity. Covington

Firm Name: GMA, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Excellent

Team looks highly experienced and qualified in Georgia Bridges

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
---	-----------------	---	----------

Team has 1 QA/QC, and has workload capacity. Brown

Firm Name: ESI S&AS Associates, LLC			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good

Team has good experience with Georgia Bridges.

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

QA/QC is the same as PM and Roadway Lead. Team has workload capacity. No project Consideration checklist. Edwards



Firm Name: REACH, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Excellent



Team has excellent experience and qualifications for Georgia Bridges.



B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
---	-----------------	---	----------



Team has 2 QA/QC, Team does not have a lot of workload capacity to give, but they state workload shrinks after Jan 2020. Brown

4

Firm Name: STV Incorporated dba STV Rain Watered Associates	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Good
<i>Team has experience and qualifications for Georgia Bridges</i>	
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating  Good
<i>Team has 1 QA/QC, team has workload capacity. Mathis</i>	

Firm Name: T.V. LW International	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Good
<i>Team has experience and qualifications for Georiga Bridges</i>	
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating  Good
<i>Team has 1 QA/QC, team has workload capacity. No project Consideration checklist. Baker</i>	

Firm Name: Thompson Engineering, Inc	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Excellent
<i>Team looks very strong on experence and qualifications for Georgia Bridges</i>	
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating  Good
<i>Team has 1 QA/QC, team has workload capacity. Edwards</i>	

Firm Name: TrauSystems Corporation	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Good
<i>Team has good experence and qualifications for Georiga Bridges</i>	
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating  Good
<i>Team has 3 QA/QC members, team has workload capacity. Edwards</i>	

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

Solicitation Title	Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 1	1	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
Solicitation #	RFQ-484-052819	2	Michael Baker International, Inc.
PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria FOR TOP FIFTEEN SUBITTALS			3
(This Page For GDOT Use)			3
			3
SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING)	3	Lowe Engineers, LLC
		7	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.
		7	TranSystems Corporation
	Score	7	Holt Consulting Company, LLC
	Ranking	7	KCI Technologies, Inc.
		7	RS&H, Inc.
		7	STV Incorporated
		7	Thompson Engineering, Inc.
		7	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.
		7	CALYX Engineers and Consultants
		7	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.
		7	QK4, Inc.
		7	American Consulting Professionals, LLC
		7	
		7	

Evaluation Criteria	Experience and Qualifications		Resources and Workload Capacity	
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	Phase One Scores and Group Ranking	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Adequate	Excellent	350	1
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Adequate	Good	300	3
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Good	300	3
Michael Baker International, Inc.	Good	Adequate	325	2
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Good	300	3
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Good	300	3
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
RS&H, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
STV Incorporated	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
CALYX Engineers and Consultants	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
QK4, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
American Consulting Professionals, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	300 %	

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Parsons Transportation Group's project manager had 33 years of experience, which included one project with bridge over water. However this project was in a non-coastal district where he was pre-construction/design engineer. The projects that were listed for the project manager did not mention environmental services or concerns. The Key team leads all have over 20 years experience demonstrating sufficient experience with bridge replacements and reducing environmental impacts.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Excellent	
<p>Parsons Transportation's Organizational chart showed the team was very well staffed and had a multi-disciplinary QC/QA team. Their narrative noted the importance of team coordination to efficiently advance the project. The team had separately named resources for value engineering and constructibility review as well as cost estimating. They also provided narrative identifying additional resource with ABC experience.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Lowe Engineers, LLC	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Lowe Engineers' project manager demonstrated experience with bridge replacement projects over waterway, however there were some concern that none of the projects showed the project manager being responsible for the entire project. The Roadway, Bridge, and Environmental leads have all worked on bridge over water.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Lowe's organizational chart showed depth and capability to do the project. The firm identified a constructibility review engineer on the team.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Heath & Lineback's project manager has over 23 years experience, but only listed two projects as project manager. The Roadway and Bridge key team leads did not demonstrate coastal bridge experience. The Environmental key team lead showed appropriate bridge experience.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Heath and Lineback's organizational chart was appropriately staffed to do the work, and included the project manager as part of its team. The organizational chart showed an independent tidal hydraulics group. The narrative discussed geotechnical and environmental coastal experience.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Michael Baker International, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Michael Baker International's project manager has 18 years experience and was previously the project manager on this project. The project manager has experience in district 5 and with tidally influenced bridge crossings. The Firm and key team leads have ample experience with coastal bridges. Several key team leads have worked on multiple past projects together.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Michael Baker's organizational chart showed sufficient depth for design activities, but did not show depth in geotechnical and environmental and also lacks environmental QC. The key team leads appear to have capacity to take on additional work.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	TranSystems Corporation	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Tran Systems Corporation's environmental key team lead has relevant experience with bridge replacement, including coastal bridges. The project manager and Roadway key team lead did not demonstrate experience with coastal bridges. The bridge key team lead did not highlight his experience with coastal bridges.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Tran Systems organizational chart shows sufficient depth for the scope of the project. The organizational chart listed a multi-disciplinary QC/QA team. The narrative discussed the bridge key team lead's prior experience with subject project. The team appears to have workload capacity.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Holt Consulting Company, LLC	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Holt Consulting Company's project manager has experience with coastal bridges in a design capacity. The key team leads have experience with bridge replacement, but not coastal. The firm listed several bridge replacement projects, however they are still under development.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Holt Consulting showed sufficient depth for the project except for environmental area classes. Holt has multi-disciplinary QC/QA. All team members showed capacity to take on additional projects.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	KCI Technologies, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>KCI Technologies' project manager has 20 years of relevant experience, but showed only one bridge replacement project. The project manager recognized how integral environmental is to project delivery. The roadway key team lead did not show much experience with roadway design. The firm's experience showed experience with bridge replacement projects, but none with coastal bridges.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>KCI identified its resource to lead the development of the section 20 plans; however the organizational chart lacks depth in many areas. There are some concerns with the lack of QC/QA team, as well as the availability of the environmental key team lead. The narrative discussed four separate project teams, which does not support this contract, as there is only one project on this contract. Also this was not represented in the organizational chart.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	RS&H, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>RS&H's project manager has 35 years of experience and has been project manager on various bridge bundle projects. The roadway and bridge key team leads showed experience with bridge over waterways. The environmental key team lead has experience with bridge CEs, however none of the key team leads showed coastal experience. The project manager and several key team leads have worked on several projects together.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>RS&H's organizational chart showed sufficient depth in design, but lacked depth in environmental areas. It showed multi-disciplinary QCQA, but lacked environmental QC. The roadway and bridge design team leads have limited capacity until after January 2020. The environmental key team lead also has limited capacity.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	STV Incorporated	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>STV Incorporated's project manager has 26 years of experience, however showed limited experience with completed bridge projects. The bridge key team lead showed sufficient experience including a coastal project in South Carolina. STV however showed little experience with similar projects, the projects they highlighted are still under design.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>STV's organizational chart showed sufficient depth for the project scope, but lacked redundancy in environmental areas. The team appeared to have adequate capacity. The firm identified the utility coordinator on the team.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Thompson Engineering, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Thompson Engineering's project manager has 24 years of experience as project manager, including coastal bridge replacement. Both the firm and roadway lead listed experience with coastal projects, including this project, but did not acknowledge their prior experience with this location.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Thompson Engineering's organizational chart showed sufficient personnel to provide services for subject project, however roadway design is not well staffed. Thompson Engineering mentioned QC/QA management, but did not show a QC/QA team on the organizational chart or in the narrative.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Neel-Schaffer's bridge key team lead showed experience with hydraulic bridge projects including coastal regions. The environmental key team lead has ample experience with bridge replacement projects, however the roadway key team lead did not show experience with stand alone bridges over water.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Neel-Schaffer's organizational chart showed a multi-disciplinary QCQA team and its roadway team showed depth. The organizational chart also included a principal in charge as well as constructibility review engineer.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	CALYX Engineers and Consultants	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>CALYX Engineers and Consultants' project manager has 29 years of experience, however the projects that were listed did not outline his project management responsibilities. The Roadway key team lead has only 13 years of experience, however some of his experience did include stand alone bridge over water. The Bridge key team lead's experience did not include coastal bridges.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>CALYX Engineers' organizational chart was staffed at adequate levels for the project, however it lacked environmental QC/QA. The project manager has limited availability.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects' project manager has 25 years of experience, but not with similar projects. The roadway key team lead has 20 year of experience but listed only one bridge replacement project. The bridge key team lead highlighted his experience with bridges over railroad and streets, but only listed his projects over water.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Clark Patterson's organizational chart was well staffed. The team has available capacity but no environmental QCQA. The narrative discussed use of ABC methods, but did not provide any examples by prime or key team leads and they did not outline the use of these methods.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	QK4, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>QK4's project manager has 29 years of experience, however the projects listed were not relevant or recent. The roadway key team lead showed limited experience, this was indicated by the fact that the projects listed are still in design phase. The bridge design key team lead did not show experience with coastal bridges. The environmental key team lead had experience with bridge CEs.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>QK4's team has some work load capacity, but the organizational chart lacks depth in environmental and also lacks environmental QC.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	American Consulting Professionals, LLC	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>American Consulting Professionals' project manager has experience with 17 bridge replacement projects over water, however he did not lists his role in these projects. The roadway key team lead listed a project for bridge replacement tidally bridge influenced waterway. The bridge key team lead demonstrated experience with similar type projects.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>American Consulting's organizational chart is adequately staffed, however it did not clearly distinguish staffing for each environmental discipline and lacked environmetal QC.</p>			



SELECTION OF FINALISTS

RFQ-484-052819

Batch #1 – 2019 Engineering Design services

The Georgia Department of Transportation is pleased to announce the selection of the following firms as finalists regarding the above RFQ:

Contract #1: PI# 0014941, Glynn County

Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.
Holt Consulting Company, LLC
Lowe Engineers, LLC
Michael Baker International, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
TranSystems Corporation

Contract #2: PI# 0016126 and 0016127, Butts County

American Consulting Professionals, LLC
KCI Technologies, Inc.
Lowe Engineers, LLC
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

Contract #3: PI# 0016128, McDuffie and Wilkes Counties

Barge Design Solutions, Inc.
Lowe Engineers, LLC
Moffatt & Nichol
Mott MacDonald, LLC
R.K. Shah & Associates

Contract #4: PI#s 0016129 and 0016130, Jones and Monroe Counties

Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, PC
Lowe Engineers, LLC
Michael Baker International, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
STV Incorporated d/b/a STV Ralph Whitehead Associates

Contract #5: PI# 0013120, Monroe County

American Consulting Professionals, LLC

Mead and Hunt, Inc.

Michael Baker International, Inc.

Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

Pond & Company

Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.

Contract #6: PI# 0015151, Chatham County

American Engineers, Inc.

Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.

Michael Baker International Inc.

Moffatt & Nichol

Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.

STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates

Contract #7: PI# 0015667, Baldwin County

American Consulting Professionals, LLC

Development Planning & Engineering, Inc.

Mott MacDonald, LLC

Pond & Company

Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.

WSP USA, Inc.

Contract #8: PI# 0015688, Butts County

CHA Consulting, Inc.

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Mott MacDonald, LLC

Pond & Company

Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.

Contract #9: PI# 0015690, Muscogee County

Barge Design Solutions, Inc.

CHA Consulting, Inc.

Clark Paterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, PC

TranSystems Corporation

Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.



Russell R. McMurry, P.E., Commissioner
 One Georgia Center
 600 West Peachtree Street, NW
 Atlanta, GA 30308
 (404) 631-1000 Main Office

September 4, 2019

NOTICE TO SELECTED FINALISTS - REVISED

To: Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.; Holt Consulting Company, LLC ; Lowe Engineers, LLC ; Michael Baker International, Inc. ; Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.; and TranSystems Corporation

Please send an e-mail confirming receipt of this notice to R. Steve Farrar (rfarrar@dot.ga.gov).

Re: RFQ 484-052819, Batch #1 – 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 1 , PI# 0014914, Glynn 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-484-052819), page 9, VII. Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response – Phase II Response, A&B and pages 10-12, 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. 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	09/03/2019	-----
e. Deadline for submission of written questions from finalists	09/20/2019	2:00 PM
f. Phase II Response of Finalist firms due	10/01/2019	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 Sharon Cyrus, and congratulations, again, to each of you!

Sharon Cyrus
scyrus@dot.ga.gov
404-631-1585

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ-484-052819	
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 1	
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	October 1, 2019	
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm	

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Compliant with Page # Limitations	Meets Required Area Classes
1	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	10/1/2019	12:59 PM	X	X
2	Michael Baker International, Inc.	10/1/2019	10:34 AM	X	X
3	Lowe Engineers, LLC	10/1/2019	1:06 PM	X	X
4	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	10/1/2019	10:37 AM	X	X
5	TranSystems Corporation	10/1/2019	10:23 AM	X	X
6	Holt Consulting Company, LLC	10/1/2019	12:07 PM	X	X

SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST

Solicitation #: RFQ-484-052819

Solicitation Title: Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 1

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	3.01	3.12	4.01a	4.01b	4.04	5.01	5.02	5.08	5.01(a)	5.01(b)	5.02	5.06	5.01	Certificates Expires	
	10 Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X
Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.																						X	4/11/2020
Wolverton & Associates, Inc.																						X	2/9/2020
Terracon Consulting, Inc.																						X	5/31/2022
11 How Computing Company, LLC																						X	11/10/2022
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group, LLC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	7/17/2021
New South Associates, Inc.																						X	6/7/2020
Ecological Solutions, Inc.	X				X		X															X	2/28/2022
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	X																					X	11/10/2022
Patterson & Dewar Engineers, Inc.	X																					X	3/14/2022
Long Engineering, Inc.																						X	12/14/2020
Combour Engineering, LLC																						X	4/11/2020
15 Lowe Engineers, LLC																						X	8/9/2021
Jacobs Engineering Group	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	4/30/2022
Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	4/11/2020
Clark Patterson Lee																						X	4/11/2020
Sycamore Consulting, Inc.																						X	7/13/2020
United Consulting Group, LTD																						X	7/13/2020
Combour Engineering, LLC																						X	4/11/2020
Aulick Engineering, LLC																						X	9/6/2020
17 McInerney Baker International, Inc.																						X	11/9/2020
Aulick Engineering, LLC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	9/9/2020
Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	4/11/2020
Long Engineering, Inc.																						X	12/14/2020
Roberts Civil Engineering																						X	8/9/2021
Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	X				X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	12/31/2021
Veitmar Engineering, Inc.																						X	2/6/2020
22 Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.																						X	12/14/2020
Accura Engineering & Consulting Services	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	1/31/2022
Bowditch & Associates																						X	5/31/2021
Ecological Solutions, Inc.	X				X		X															X	2/28/2022
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group, LLC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	7/17/2021
New South Associates, Inc.																						X	6/7/2020
Terracon Consulting, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	5/31/2022
29 TransSystems Corporation																						X	8/9/2020
Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	4/11/2020
Pond & Company, Inc.	X				X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	3/8/2021
Accura Engineering & Consulting Services																						X	1/31/2022
NOVA Engineering and Environmental																						X	3/14/2022

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF SUBMITTALS

Solicitation Title.	Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 1	1	Michael Baker International, Inc.
Solicitation #	RFQ-484-052819	2	Lowe Engineers, LLC
PHASE I AND PHASE II - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria		3	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.

(This Page For GDOT Use)

SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING)	
	Sum of	Group
	Total Score	Ranking
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	625	3
Michael Baker International, Inc.	700	1
Lowe Engineers, LLC	675	2
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	550	6
TranSystems Corporation	600	4
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	600	4

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications
 Resources and Workload Capacity
 Technical Approach
 Past Performance

SUBMITTING FIRMS	PHASE I		PHASE II		Group Scores and Ranking	
	300	200	400	100	Total Score	Ranking
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc	Adequate	Excellent	Adequate	Good	625	3
Michael Baker International, Inc	Good	Adequate	Good	Good	700	1
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Adequate	Good	Good	Good	675	2
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc	Adequate	Good	Adequate	Adequate	550	6
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Good	Adequate	Excellent	600	4
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Good	Adequate	Excellent	600	4
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	400	100	1000 %	

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
Technical Approach	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Parsons Transportation identified the complexity of the project being a tidal stream and highlighted their experience performing similar studies for FDOT. They also offered a frame work of their risk registry. The firm provided a solid discussion on alternatives for maintaining traffic. Parsons transportation discussed developing a communications plan, which will take into consideration the stake holders, general public and emergency evacuation routes. The firm did not include any discussion on mitigating for marsh impacts, which is vital to this project. Also the information they provided for a regional permit being quicker and less expensive than a nationwide is incorrect.</p>			
Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Survey Monkey did not generate any past performance for Parsons Transportation Group for this contract, however the evaluators reviewed the GDOT project evaluations and based on the average ratings in CMIS for 2018 the evaluation team agreed to a past performance rating of good. There was a total of 15 projects that were listed.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Michael Baker International, Inc.		
Technical Approach	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Michael Baker appears to understand the unique conditions of the project and has done a good job of identifying challenges and providing initial solutions for each challenge. They recognized the lack of salt marsh mitigation and provided a potential solution. The firm's structure team has experience with designing ABC Tier 1 and Tier 2 bridge replacement. The firm emphasized the inportance of early coordination and identification of project risk. Michael Baker discussed quality control, however their QC discussion did not include environmental and was not multi-disciplined.</p>			
Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Michael Baker received one past performance from Survey Monkey for this contract. The evaluators used this past performance and the average GDOT project ratings in CMIS to determine a rating of good. There was a total of 6 projects listed.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Lowe Engineers, LLC		
Technical Approach	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Lowe Engineers developed a delivery plan for the project, which guards against scope creep. The firm anticipates early constuctibility discussion with the bridge group. Lowe's did a good job of reaching out to the locals on the previous detour for the route. They also mentioned roadway user cost in the evaluation of detour alternatives. The firm did not mention the lack of available salt marsh mitigation.</p>			
Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>There were no survey monkey responses for Lowe Engineers. The evaluators reviewed and discussed the six GDOT projects listed in CMIS past performance evaluation and agreed to a rating of good.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.		
Technical Approach	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Heath and Lineback identified the tidal conditions for the location and teamed with a consultant that specializes in modeling these conditions. They did a good job of highlighting four methods for maintaining traffic. They were aware of issues with marshes but did not discuss the difficulty in mitigating for marsh impacts. The firm mentioned using a web based dashboard to provide critical project metrics and information. They expressed a willingness to deviate from standards and guidelines without context for why.</p>			
Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>There were no survey monkey responses for Heath and Lineback. The reviewers reviewed and discussed the nine GDOT projects listed in CMIS past performance evaluation and agreed to a rating of adequate.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	TranSystems Corporation		
Technical Approach	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>TranSystems Corporation conducted a site inspection and identified that the water and sewer lines had been abandoned on the bridge and relocated with borings on either side. The firms public involvement took into consideration part time residents. They recognized the lack of salt marsh mitigation. The firm correctly identified the project as a tidal boundry model. The firm did not identify the challenges and risks of the project and they lacked detail on the range of options.</p>			
Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Excellent	
<p>There were no responses from survey monkey for Transystems Corporation. The evaluators reviewed and discussed the past performance of the three GDOT projects listed in CMIS to determine an average rating of 93.33, which resulted in a rating of excellence.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Holt Consulting		
Technical Approach	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Holt Consulting discussed reducing marsh impacts and staying on alignment, however did not mention the lack of salt marsh mitigation. They discussed the potential for ABC and avoiding construction during hurricane and tourist season. The firm identified the project as a tidal stream. The firm identified the potential challenges and discussed how they would mitigate these challenges as well as how they think it would benefit the project. They discussed avoidng direct drainage into the marsh. The firm's narrative had some good discussions, however They provided conflicting information for reducing superstructure depth being critical to the project while stating that increase depth would solve utility issues. As a result, the evaluators felt that a rating of adequate was appropriate.</p>			
Past Performance	Assigned Rating	Excellent	
<p>There were no past performance responses from Survey Monkey for Holt Consulting, however the evaluators reviewed and discussed the project that was listed in CMIS. The project had a score of 100 on the GDOT past performance and the evaluators agreed, which resulted in a rating of excellence.</p>			

Reference Check Summary for
RFQ 484-052819 Contract #1
Engineering Design Services

Questions answered on a 1, 3, 5 scale.

1 = Below Expectations, 3 = Met Expectations, 5 = Exceeded Expectations

	Michael Baker International	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	TranSystem Corporation	Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Lowe Engineers	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.
1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project.						
Reference 1	5					
Reference 2						
Reference 3						
Reference 4						
Reference 5						
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
Section Average	5.00					
2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.						
Reference 1	5					
Reference 2						
Reference 3						
Reference 4						
Reference 5						
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
Section Average	5.00					
3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.						
Reference 1	5					
Reference 2						
Reference 3						
Reference 4						
Reference 5						
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
Section Average	5.00					
4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management.						
Reference 1	5					
Reference 2						
Reference 3						
Reference 4						
Reference 5						
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
Section Average	5.00					
5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.						
Reference 1	5					
Reference 2						
Reference 3						
Reference 4						
Reference 5						
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
Section Average	5.00					
Overall Average	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

GDOT RFQ-484-052819-Contract 1 - Consultant Reference Check Survey for Michael Baker International, Inc.;
ISLANDS EXPRESSWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT ENGINEERING SERVICES

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Email Invitation 1 (Email)
Started: Friday, September 27, 2019 4:05:23 PM
Last Modified: Friday, September 27, 2019 4:06:16 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:53
Email: NPanther@chathamcounty.org
IP Address: 12.48.151.106

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Nathaniel Panther
Chatham County, GA
PM
NPanther@chathamcounty.org
912.652.7800

Nathaniel Panther
Chatham County
Project Manager
npanther@chathamcounty.org
(912) 652 7813

Q2 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?

No

Page 2: Consultant Reference Check Survey

Q3 Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project

5 - Exceeded expectations

Q4 Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project

5 - Exceeded expectations

Q5 Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals

5 - Exceeded expectations

GDOT RFQ-484-052819-Contract 1 - Consultant Reference Check Survey for Michael Baker International, Inc.;
ISLANDS EXPRESSWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT ENGINEERING SERVICES

Q6 Rate the firm's technical assistance in
program/project management

**5 - Exceeded
expectations**

Q7 Rate the overall success of the project thus far

**5 - Exceeded
expectations**

Q8 Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings

Exceptional job getting this project to Let and helping to address contractor concerns during construction.

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 827041075 +4:	CAGE Code: 540F6 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 06/06/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 1501 LYNDON B JOHNSON FWY STE 650 City: DALLAS State/Province: TEXAS ZIP Code: 75234-6800 Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 112128140 +4:	CAGE Code: 69UN4 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 05/23/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 1818 MARKET ST STE 3110 City: PHILADELPHIA State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA ZIP Code: 19103-3653 Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 079125975 +4:	CAGE Code: 6ZD87 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 02/27/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 500 Enterprise Dr Ste 2B City: Rocky Hill State/Province: CONNECTICUT ZIP Code: 06067-3913 Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 080236120 +4:	CAGE Code: 7W4T6 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 02/15/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 56 Exchange Ter Ste 400 City: Providence State/Province: RHODE ISLAND ZIP Code: 02903-1772 Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 933603482	+4:	CAGE Code: 1MAS0 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 02/18/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 272 Bendix Rd Ste 400		
City: Virginia Beach	State/Province: VIRGINIA	
ZIP Code: 23452-1367	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 614844970	+4:	CAGE Code: 48SM9 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 04/24/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 165 S UNION BLVD STE 1000		
City: LAKEWOOD	State/Province: COLORADO	
ZIP Code: 80228-2226	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 020841673	+4:	CAGE Code: 69GW8 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 04/24/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2030 FALLING WATERS RD STE 125		
City: KNOXVILLE	State/Province: TENNESSEE	
ZIP Code: 37922-8803	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 018634578	+4:	CAGE Code: 7MG30 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 04/24/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 801 S Grand Ave Ste 250		
City: LOS ANGELES	State/Province: CALIFORNIA	
ZIP Code: 90017-4725	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 942848714	+4:	CAGE Code: 79CB1 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 05/12/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 500 YGNACIO VALLEY RD STE 300		
City: WALNUT CREEK	State/Province: CALIFORNIA	
ZIP Code: 94596-3846	Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 182698449	+4:	CAGE Code: 028J5 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 04/18/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2929 N CENTRAL AVE STE 800	City: PHOENIX	State/Province: ARIZONA
ZIP Code: 85012-2794		Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 832426030	+4:	CAGE Code: 6AHV5 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 05/23/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2004 Jennie Lee Dr	City: Idaho Falls	State/Province: IDAHO
ZIP Code: 83404-7000		Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 082428244	+4:	CAGE Code: 1M8H1 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 05/27/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 4431 N FRONT ST FL 2	City: HARRISBURG	State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA
ZIP Code: 17110-1778		Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 070636210	+4:	CAGE Code: 7BS52 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 05/23/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 615 CRESCENT EXECUTIVE CT Ste 200	City: LAKE MARY	State/Province: FLORIDA
ZIP Code: 32746-2146		Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 195201660	+4:	CAGE Code: 688M9 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 05/07/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 11 N Water S Ste 14290	City: Mobile	State/Province: ALABAMA
ZIP Code: 36602-5014		Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY [REDACTED] Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 080268057 +4:	CAGE Code: 7NB37 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 05/23/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 3900 Kilroy Airport Way Ste 120 City: Long Beach ZIP Code: 90806-6811	State/Province: CALIFORNIA Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY [REDACTED] MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 786887703 +4:	CAGE Code: 79DK9 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 05/12/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 40810 COUNTY CENTER DR STE 100 City: TEMECULA ZIP Code: 92591-6049	State/Province: CALIFORNIA Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY [REDACTED] Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 361333243 +4:	CAGE Code: 3ZVT1 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 04/18/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1650 LYNDON FARM CT STE 101 City: LOUISVILLE ZIP Code: 40223-5008	State/Province: KENTUCKY Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY [REDACTED] Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 080268066 +4:	CAGE Code: 7N4R2 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 04/24/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1026 Chorro St Ste 225 City: SAN LUIS OBISPO ZIP Code: 93401-3299	State/Province: CALIFORNIA Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY [REDACTED] Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 079929486 +4:	CAGE Code: 7FG68 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 04/24/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2729 Prospect Park Dr Ste 220 City: Rancho Cordova ZIP Code: 95670-6291	State/Province: CALIFORNIA Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 016022303	+4:	CAGE Code: 1MSC1 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 04/24/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 400 WASHINGTON ST E STE 300		
City: CHARLESTON	State/Province: WEST VIRGINIA	
ZIP Code: 25301-1509	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 197739530	+4:	CAGE Code: 39AB6 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 05/27/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1228 Euclid Avenue Ste 1050		
City: Cleveland	State/Province: OHIO	
ZIP Code: 44115-1816	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 044679335	+4:	CAGE Code: 3BNH6 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 07/04/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 7090 S UNION PARK AVE		
City: MIDVALE	State/Province: UTAH	
ZIP Code: 84047-4156	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 081217428	+4:	CAGE Code: 83W06 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 04/11/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2025 1st Ave Ste 1150		
City: Seattle	State/Province: WASHINGTON	
ZIP Code: 98121-2150	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 078708613	+4:	CAGE Code: 75GA0 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 02/05/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 3815 RIVER CROSSING PKWY STE 20		
City: INDIANAPOLIS	State/Province: INDIANA	
ZIP Code: 46240-7756	Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 060507630	+4:	CAGE Code: 6AKG1 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 10/01/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 5470 KIETZKE LN STE 208		
City: RENO	State/Province: NEVADA	
ZIP Code: 89511-2097	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 798068235	+4:	CAGE Code: 78HM2 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 10/07/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 5051 Verdugoway Ste 300		
City: CAMARILLO	State/Province: CALIFORNIA	
ZIP Code: 93012-8683	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 361461721	+4:	CAGE Code: 3ZWD1 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 04/15/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 200 W ADAMS ST STE 2800		
City: CHICAGO	State/Province: ILLINOIS	
ZIP Code: 60606-5234	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 080048398	+4:	CAGE Code: 7HAZ5 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 09/09/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 120 S 6th St Ste 1710		
City: Minneapolis	State/Province: MINNESOTA	
ZIP Code: 55402-1819	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 017864339	+4:	CAGE Code: 698X1 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 09/09/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 310 NEW POINTE		
City: RIDGELAND	State/Province: MISSISSIPPI	
ZIP Code: 39157-3903	Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 048029719	+4:	CAGE Code: 1W3M8 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/25/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1904 W GRAND PKWY N # 110		
City: KATY	State/Province: TEXAS	
ZIP Code: 77449-1599	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 194075529	+4:	CAGE Code: 4ADF9 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/22/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 3200 ROCKBRIDGE ST STE 104		
City: RICHMOND	State/Province: VIRGINIA	
ZIP Code: 23230-4333	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 078708616	+4:	CAGE Code: 78EL7 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 09/05/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 57 Boston-Providence Hwy Ste 203		
City: Norwood	State/Province: MASSACHUSETTS	
ZIP Code: 02062-2645	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 002110661	+4:	CAGE Code: 1M7D8 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 09/05/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 500 OFFICE CENTER DR STE 210		
City: FORT WASHINGTON	State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA	
ZIP Code: 19034-3234	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 956772347	+4:	CAGE Code: 0KCH7 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 09/08/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 100 Airside Dr		
City: Moon Township	State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA	
ZIP Code: 15108-2783	Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 782320097	+4:	CAGE Code: 1UKL6 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 10/20/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 300 American Metro Blvd Ste 154		
City: Hamilton	State/Province: NEW JERSEY	
ZIP Code: 08619-2371	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 941324113	+4:	CAGE Code: 1LKF8 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/19/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 3900 C St Ste 900		
City: ANCHORAGE	State/Province: ALASKA	
ZIP Code: 99503-5963	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 073022944	+4:	CAGE Code: 0F6Z8 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/21/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 3601 Eisenhower Ave Ste 600		
City: Alexandria	State/Province: VIRGINIA	
ZIP Code: 22304-6426	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 804266539	+4:	CAGE Code: 68D99 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/25/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1400 W MARKHAM ST STE 204		
City: LITTLE ROCK	State/Province: ARKANSAS	
ZIP Code: 72201-1843	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 117121410	+4:	CAGE Code: 8CWY3 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 07/21/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 835 Mason St Ste A290		
City: Dearborn	State/Province: MICHIGAN	
ZIP Code: 48124-2231	Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 037868606	+4:	CAGE Code: 3X3S0 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 07/11/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1306 CONCOURSE DR STE 500		
City: LINTHICUM HEIGHTS	State/Province: MARYLAND	
ZIP Code: 21090-1026	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 117120108	+4:	CAGE Code: 8CQP7 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 07/15/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 225 W 34th St Ste 1304		
City: New York	State/Province: NEW YORK	
ZIP Code: 10122-2015	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 080707650	+4:	CAGE Code: 7W8G3 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 04/11/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 125 Cambridgepark Dr Ste 502		
City: Cambridge	State/Province: MASSACHUSETTS	
ZIP Code: 02140-2392	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 024222656	+4:	CAGE Code: 59KF3 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 02/27/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 645 HAMILTON ST STE 206		
City: ALLENTOWN	State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA	
ZIP Code: 18101-2109	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 102661175	+4:	CAGE Code: 54QN6 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 07/07/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 10150 Covington Cross Dr		
City: LAS VEGAS	State/Province: NEVADA	
ZIP Code: 89144-6567	Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 081820458 +4: CAGE Code: 0LRV8 DoDAAC:	
Expiration Date: 06/24/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 5 Hutton Centre Dr Ste 500 City: Santa Ana State/Province: CALIFORNIA ZIP Code: 92707-6736 Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 088202379 +4: CAGE Code: 1KTF3 DoDAAC:	
Expiration Date: 05/29/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 9755 Clairemont Mesa Blvd, City: San Diego State/Province: CALIFORNIA ZIP Code: 92124-1333 Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 080232628 +4: CAGE Code: 7TJ19 DoDAAC:	
Expiration Date: 11/18/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 700 Huger St City: Columbia State/Province: SOUTH CAROLINA ZIP Code: 29201-3663 Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 808585780 +4: CAGE Code: 4JC64 DoDAAC:	
Expiration Date: 11/14/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 420 TECHNOLOGY PKWY STE 150 City: NORCROSS State/Province: GEORGIA ZIP Code: 30092-3415 Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 175099530 +4: CAGE Code: 79DK5 DoDAAC:	
Expiration Date: 11/10/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 75410 GERALD FORD DR # 100 City: PALM DESERT State/Province: CALIFORNIA ZIP Code: 92211-2090 Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY [REDACTED] Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 079900161 +4:	CAGE Code: 7EZ77 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 12/01/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 500 Grant Street Ste 5400 City: Pittsburgh ZIP Code: 15219-2523	State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY [REDACTED] Michael Baker International, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 831496679 +4:	CAGE Code: 6W9X7 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 04/24/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 7633 GANSER WAY STE 206 City: MADISON ZIP Code: 53719-2092	State/Province: WISCONSIN Country: UNITED STATES

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : AULICK ENGINEERING LLC*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY AULICK ENGINEERING LLC	Status: Active
DUNS: 036755448 +4:	CAGE Code: 7JP53 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 01/08/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2000 AIRPORT RD STE 121	
City: ATLANTA	State/Province: GEORGIA
ZIP Code: 30341-4964	Country: UNITED STATES

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY	Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 926622598	+4:	CAGE Code: 1J4K1 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 03/31/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2700 Cumberland Pkwy Ste 300		
City: Atlanta	State/Province: GEORGIA	
ZIP Code: 30339-3321	Country: UNITED STATES	

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : LONG ENGINEERING, INC.*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY LONG ENGINEERING, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 015783298 +4:	CAGE Code: 57G16 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 09/29/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2550 Heritage Ct Se Ste 250	
City: ATLANTA	State/Province: GEORGIA
ZIP Code: 30339-3074	Country: UNITED STATES

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : Roberts Civil Engineering*
Record Status: Active

No Search Results

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : SOUTHEASTERN ENGINEERING, INC*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY	Southeastern Engineering Sales, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 091216945	+4:	CAGE Code: 6R297 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 05/08/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1001 Port Walthall Dr		
City: South Chesterfield	State/Province: VIRGINIA	
ZIP Code: 23834-5919	Country: UNITED STATES	

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : Willmer Engineering Inc*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY Willmer Engineering Inc Status: Active

DUNS: 805198892 +4: CAGE Code: 1CXM0 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 06/12/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 3772 PLEASANTDALE RD STE 165

City: ATLANTA

State/Province: GEORGIA

ZIP Code: 30340-4270

Country: UNITED STATES

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANT QUALIFICATIONS ISSUED BY GDOT
 MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC.

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
MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL INC 420 Technology Parkway, Suite 150 Norcross, GA 30082		May 11, 2018	November 9, 2020
SIGNATURE			
<i>Neal B. ...</i>			
1.	Transportation Planning	3.	Highway Design Roadway (continued)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.01 State Wide Systems Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.09 Traffic Control System Analysis, Design and Implementation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.02 Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning	-	3.10 Utility Coordination
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.03 Aviation Systems Planning	-	3.11 Architecture
-	1.04 Mass and Rapid Transportation Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.12 Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
-	1.05 Alternate System and Corridor Location Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.13 Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
-	1.06 Unknown	-	3.14 Historic Rehabilitation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.06a NEPA Documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.15 Highway Lighting
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.06b History	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.16 Valve Engineering
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.06c Air Studies	-	3.17 Design of Toll Facilities Infrastructure
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.06d Noise Studies		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.06e Ecology		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.06f Archaeology		
-	1.06g Freshwater Aquatic Surveys		
-	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.11 Traffic and Toll Revenue Studies		
-	1.12 Major Investment Studies		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1.13 Non-Motorized Transportation Planning		
2.	Mass Transit Operations	4.	Highway Structures
-	2.01 Mass Transit Program (Systems) Management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.01a Minor Bridges Design
-	2.02 Mass Transit Feasibility and Technical Studies	-	4.01b Minor Bridges Design CONDITIONAL
-	2.03 Mass Transit Vehicle and Propulsion System	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.02 Major Bridges Design
-	2.04 Mass Transit Controls, Communications and Information Systems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.03 Movable Span Bridges Design
-	2.05 Mass Transit Architectural Engineering	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.04 Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
-	2.06 Mass Transit Unique Structures	-	4.05 Bridge Inspection
-	2.07 Mass Transit Electrical and Mechanical Systems		
-	2.08 Mass Transit Operations Management and Support Services		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.09 Aviation		
-	2.10 Mass Transit Program (Systems) Marketing		
3.	Highway Design Roadway	5.	Topography
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.01 Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Rural Generally Free Access Highway Design	-	5.01 Land Surveying
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.02 Two-Lane or Multi-Lane with Curb and Gutter Generally Free Access Highways Design Including Storm Sewers	-	5.02 Engineering Surveying
<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	-	5.03 Geodetic Surveying
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.04 Multi-Lane, Limited Access Expressway Type Highway Design	-	5.04 Aerial Photography
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.05 Design of Urban Expressway and Interstate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.05 Aerial Photogrammetry
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.06 Traffic Operations Studies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.06 Topographic Remote Sensing
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3.07 Traffic Operations Design	-	5.07 Cartography
-	3.08 Landscape Architecture	-	5.08 Subsurface Utility Engineering
		6.	Soils, Foundation & Materials Testing
		-	6.01a Soil Surveys
		-	6.01b Geological and Geophysical Studies
		-	6.02 Bridge Foundation Studies
		-	6.03 Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Soils and Foundation)
		-	6.04a Laboratory Materials Testing
		-	6.04b Field Testing of Roadway Construction Materials
		-	6.05 Hazard Waste Site Assessment Studies
		7.	Construction
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7.01 Construction Supervision
		8.	Erosion and Sedimentation Control
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8.01 Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control and Comprehensive Monitoring Program
		-	8.02 Rainfall and Runoff Reporting
		-	8.03 Field Inspections for Compliance of Erosion and Sedimentation Control Devices Installations