



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 #4 - PI# 0016129, Monroe County and 0016130, Jones & Monroe Counties 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 five (5) highest firms in order of ranking are as follows:

1. **STV, Incorporated**
2. **Lowe Engineers, LLC**
3. **Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.**
4. **Michael Baker International, Inc.**
5. **Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.**

The Selection Committee recommends the selection of the top ranked firm, **STV, Incorporated**.

Concurrence with Award from Responsible Division Director:

Certification Procurement Requirements Met:


Albert Shelby, Director of Program Delivery


Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator

CS:ace

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:
 - a. **Education**.
 - b. **Registration** (if necessary and applicable.)
 - c. **Relevant experience** in the applicable resource area of the most relevant projects.
 - d. **Relevant experience utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance** (PDP, Design Policy, Environmental Procedures Manual, etc.) which are specific to the key team leader's area.

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

3. **Prime Experience** - Provide information on the prime's experience and ability in delivering effective services for projects of similar complexity, size, scope, and function, which demonstrate the firm's capabilities to provide services for GDOT. For each project, the following information should be provided:
 - a. **Client name, project location and dates** during which services were performed.
 - b. **Description of overall project and services performed** by your firm.
 - c. **Duration of project services provided** by your firm, and overall project budget.
 - d. **Experience utilizing GDOT specific processes, manuals, or guidance** (PDP, Design Policy, Environmental Procedures Manual, etc.)
 - e. **Client(s) current contact information** including contact names and telephone numbers.
 - f. **Involvement of Key Team Leaders** on the projects.

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

4. **Area Class Summary Form and Notice of Professional Consultant Qualifications** - Prime Consultants are defined as the firm submitting the Statement of Qualifications and the firm with whom GDOT will contract. The Team is defined as the Prime Consultant and their sub-consultants, who are considered team members. Prime Consultants and their sub-consultant team members must meet the Area Class requirements listed in Exhibit I 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. 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 – Q4 FY 2020.
 - B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q1 FY 2021 (about 4 months duration).
 - C. PFPR – 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. 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 – 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-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. 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 – Q4 FY 2020.
 - B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q1 FY 21 (about 4 months duration).
 - C. PFPR – 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: _____

EXHIBIT IV
Area Class Summary Example

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

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

3.09	Traffic Control Systems Analysis, Design and Implementation								
3.10	Utility Coordination								
3.11	Architecture								
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)								
3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians								
3.14	Historic Rehabilitation								
3.15	Highway and Outdoor Lighting								
3.16	Value Engineering (VE)								
3.17	Toll Facilities Infrastructure Design								
4.01	Minor Bridge Design								
4.02	Major Bridge Design								
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)								
4.05	Bridge Inspection								
5.01	Land Surveying								
5.02	Engineering Surveying								
5.03	Geodetic Surveying								
5.04	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.

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ-484-052819
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 4
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	Comments
1	Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	5/28/2019	10:25 a.m	X	X	X	X	X	
2	Calyx Engineers and Consultants	5/28/2019	11:42 a.m	X	X	X	X	X	
3	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	5/28/2019	1:56 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
4	Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.	5/28/2019	11:59 p.m	X	X	X	X	X	Exhibit II & III in wrong order and both Addendums attached at end of SOQ
5	CROY Engineering, LLC	6/28/2019	8:34 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
6	EXP US Services, Inc.	5/28/2019	7:37 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
7	Freese and Nichols	5/23/2019	6:21 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
8	HDR Engineering, Inc.	5/28/2019	1:11 p.m	X	X	X	X	X	
9	Heath Lineback Engineers, Inc.	5/28/2019	1:00 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
10	Holt Consulting Company, LLC	5/28/2019	1:50 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	Addendum #2 missing
11	IDS Global	5/28/2019	1:41 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	Administrative Requirements out of order and Project Consideration Checklist out of order
12	KCI Technologies, Inc.	5/28/2019	1:49 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
13	Keck & Wood, Inc.	5/28/2019	11:22 a.m	X	X	X	X	X	
14	Lowe Engineers, LLC	5/28/2019	11:54 a.m	X	X	X	X	X	
15	Mead and Hunt, Inc.	5/28/2019	9:55 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	Old DBE Letters attached to certifications
16	Michael Baker International, Inc.	5/28/2019	12:48 p.m	X	X	X	X	X	
17	Moffatt & Nichol	5/28/2019	1:02 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
18	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	5/28/2019	1:14 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
19	Mott MacDonald, LLC	5/28/2019	12:26 p.m	X	X	X	X	X	
20	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	5/28/2019	9:56 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
21	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	5/2/2019	1:04 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
22	QK4, Inc.	5/28/2019	1:11 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
23	RK Shah Associates, Inc.	5/28/2019	11:47 a.m	X	X	X	X	X	
24	RSH, Inc.	5/28/2019	8:13 a.m	X	X	X	X	X	
25	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	5/28/2019	12:35 p.m	X	X	X	X	X	
26	STV Incorporated	5/28/2019	11:28 a.m	X	X	X	X	X	
27	TY Lin International	5/28/2019	1:59 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
28	Thompson Engineering, Inc.	5/28/2019	9:51 a.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
29	TranSystems Corporation	5/28/2019	1:37 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
30	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	5/28/2019	11:52 a.m	X	X	X	X	X	
31	Wood EIS	5/28/2019	1:26 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	
32	WSP USA inc.	5/28/2019	1:43 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	Blank Project Consideration Checklist attached after the Addendums and another one shown at the end of the SOQ.

GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

RFQ 484-052819

Batch #1 – 2019 Engineering Design Services

Contract # 4, PI# 0016129 & # 0016130

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

Coordination and Communication

Andrea Everson 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 v. 3-24-15

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

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

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATING AVAILABILITY

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

Evaluation Meeting:

All completed Scoring Forms with the preliminary scores and comments for each criteria of each firm, must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for **Monday, July 01, 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 TBD. 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 4	1	Lowe Engineers, LLC
Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-052819	2	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc
PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Preliminary Scoring based on Published Criteria			3
(This Page For GDOT Use)			4
			5
			6
			7
			8
SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING)		9
	Sum of	Group	10
	Individual	Ranking	11
	Rankings	Ranking	12
			13
Barge Design Solutions, Inc	64	20	14
Calyx Engineers and Consultants	35	8	15
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C	26	6	16
Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.	68	21	17
CROY Engineering, LLC	79	25	18
EXP US Services, Inc.	54	16	19
Freese and Nichols	87	29	20
HDR Engineering, Inc.	71	23	21
Heath Lineback Engineers, Inc.	39	11	22
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	38	9	23
IDS Global	115	32	24
KCI Technologies, Inc.	53	14	25
Keck & Wood, Inc.	63	19	26
Lowe Engineers, LLC	7	1	27
Mead and Hunt, Inc	70	22	28
Michael Baker International, Inc.	22	5	29
Moffatt & Nichol	74	24	30
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc	61	18	31
Mott MacDonald, LLC	53	15	32
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	46	13	
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	7	2	
QK4, Inc	39	10	
RK Shah Associates, Inc	90	31	
RSH, Inc.	30	7	
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	81	27	
STV Incorporated	17	3	
TY Lin International	81	28	
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	80	26	
TranSystems Corporation	21	4	
Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	88	30	
Wood EIS	57	17	
WSP USA Inc.	41	12	

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
Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	175	22
Calyx Engineers and Consultants	Good	Adequate	325	5
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P C	Adequate	Good	300	8
Cranston Engineering Group, P C.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
CROY Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
EXP US Services, Inc	Good	Good	375	2
Freese and Nichols	Marginal	Poor	75	31
HDR Engineering, Inc.	Good	Good	375	2
Heath Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Marginal	Marginal	125	27
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
IDS Global	Marginal	Marginal	125	27
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Good	300	8
Keck & Wood, Inc	Adequate	Marginal	200	20
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Excellent	425	1
Mead and Hunt, Inc	Poor	Marginal	50	32
Michael Baker International, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Moffatt & Nichol	Adequate	Good	300	8
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	Marginal	Good	225	18
Mott MacDonald, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	175	22
Neel-Schaffer, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	22
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc	Good	Good	375	2
QK4, Inc	Adequate	Marginal	200	20
RK Shah Associates, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	22
RSH, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc	Marginal	Good	225	18
STV Incorporated	Good	Adequate	325	5
TY Lin International	Marginal	Marginal	125	27
Thompson Engineering, Inc	Marginal	Marginal	125	27
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	11
Wood EIS	Good	Adequate	325	5
WSP USA Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	175	22
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	500	%



GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-052819, Contract 4	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 1			
<i>Evaluation Comments should include Rating (optional) and explanation for ratings noted in each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.</i>			
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:	Large Design Solutions, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p><i>Johnny Lee is only the PM for 0013738 and 0013739. The other projects listed were managed by other PMs. Could not confirm PM on TIA project. These two projects are in early preliminary design - 10% roadway design complete and were to go to PFPR in June 2019, and neither one has been requested. These projects are bridges over creeks. Did not demonstrate experience with projects over railroads. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Roadway and Bridge KTLs did not demonstrate experience with bridges over railroads. The Prime's experience listed only showed 1 project with two of the KTLs working together and the one project that involved a railroad, none of the KTLs were involved.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>The org chart listed teams for each project and they listed a person to do railroad coordination who is not a KTL. In additional resource areas and ability, it discussed having a weekly teleconference with the team to manage work efforts, and discussed monthly internal project reviews focusing on budgets, estimates, scope, schedule, invoicing, and receivable items, but did not discuss their QC/QA process.</i></p>			
Firm Name:	Calix Engineers and Consultants		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>Ken is the PM for 9 projects of which 8 were bridge projects with one with a bridge over a railroad. 0013718's concept report submitted 2 months early. 0013816's PFPR was 4 months behind bl. 0013821's PFPR was 5.5 behind bl. 0013888 PFPR was to be held in Oct 2018, and not held due to arch survey. 0013945's PFPR was held on bl. 001489's PFPR was to be held in March 2019 and not held due to late NTP. 0014072 is 12 months behind bl and 0014897 is 15 months behind bl. 0006049 is a widening project with a bridge that is on the shelf with CST in FY34. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Roadway and Bridge KTL did not demonstrate experience with bridges over railroads. The Prime's experience showed that he PM and KTLs have worked together and the Prime demonstrated experience with bridges over water and railroads. 721000- Ken is also the PM of this project. It held PFPR on sch and the ROW plans were submitted on sch.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>The QA/QC plan only discussed doing formal reviews prior to all phases of completion and listed two people to do the reviews. They did not discuss their strategy on keeping the projects on schedule.</i></p>			
Firm Name:	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>Couldn't confirm PM's role on any of the projects listed as PM. 0010327 did require railroad coordination. None of the projects demonstrated bridge experience as a PM, but did as a design engineer. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Bridge KTL demonstrated experience with bridges over water and railroads. The Roadway KTL demonstrated experience with bridges over water. The Prime demonstrated experience with bridges over water. The Prime's experience did not show the KTLs working together. The write up for the Northside Dr involvement listed Bradley Cox as the PM.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>The QC/QA description was not detailed, but did discuss quality control checks throughout the project's schedule and not just at the time of deliverables. They discussed innovative delivery methods that could be used. They are currently involved in a bridge replacement upstream from one of the projects.</i></p>			

Firm Name: <i>Chaswell Engineering Group, P.C.</i>			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>Couldn't confirm PM's role in the Wrightsboro widening project. No PI# was listed. Scott was not the PM on 0000544. Mario Macrina was, but he was on the design team. Scott was the PM on 0011660 and it had railroad coordination, but was not a bridge project. He was not the PM for 0008352 and there is no record of his involvement in the meeting minutes in the project file. Shawn Reese with GS&P was the PM. Was Principal in Charge and Lead Qc/QA on a bridge replacement project. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Roadway and Bridge KTLs demonstrated experience with bridges over water, but no bridges over railroads. Roadway KTL had a project that required railroad coordination. The Prime demonstrated experience with bridges over water and railroads and that the KTLs have worked together before except NEPA.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>The additional resource areas and ability did not discuss their QC/QA process. It restated items in the previous pages. They didn't discuss how they would approach the work or how they would keep the projects on schedule. SOQ states Fm had involvement on 0008352, but is not shown on the commitments table, and it is in ROW acquisition.</i></p>			
Firm Name: <i>CRD Engineering, LLC</i>			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>The PM demonstrated experience with bridges over water. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The SOQ did not demonstrate experience with railroad bridges or railroad coordination. The Bridge KTL has experience with bridges over water. The Roadway KTL has only experience with a pedestrian bridge and the resume did not highlight that he has been the KTL on a project. However, his workload chart states he is a KTL on three projects. The PM and Roadway KTLs have worked together.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>The org chart only listed env KTL and not who would do the work. Only the firms. The additional resource areas and abilities section discusses how to keep the project on schedule by starting utility coordination early and discussed their QC/QA process. However, it discusses providing services to the aviation industry, but doesn't state how that is relevant to these projects. It also talks about this "important widening project". These are bridge replacement projects.</i></p>			
Firm Name: <i>EXP US Services, Inc.</i>			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>The PM and Bridge KTL demonstrated experience with bridges over water and railroads. The PM took the PDP in January 2019. Roadway KTL only has experience with bridges over water. The Prime demonstrated experience with bridges over water and railroads. The PM and KTLs have not worked together.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>The org chart appears to have adequate staff required to deliver these projects with an average 21.25 years of experience for the PM and KTLs. They discussed having experienced staff in construction and maintenance for QC/QA, but didn't discuss their process. They appear to have good availability.</i></p>			
Firm Name: <i>Frantz and Hubbs</i>			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p><i>The projects listed for the PM did not list the PI#s and the descriptions were so vague, it was impossible to confirm his role on these projects. The projects demonstrated that he had experience with bridges over water, but didn't discuss bridges over railroads or railroad coordination. PM took PDP training in 2017. The Roadway and Bridge KTLs demonstrated experience with bridges over water, but railroads or railroad coordination. The Prime demonstrated experience with bridges over water and railroads. When the Prime discussed KTL involvement, they listed people who were not KTLs, and did not show that any of the KTLs have worked together before.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Poor
<p><i>The org chart only listed one individual for each section, i.e., one roadway designer, one bridge designer, one ecologist. The primary office section listed additional personnel who will be working on the project and in what roles. This should have been shown on the org chart. The narrative on additional resource areas and ability discussed meeting or exceeding the DBE goal. They did not discuss how they were going to deliver the projects on schedule and did not discuss their QC/QA plan and how they were going to ensure a quality product would be delivered. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i></p>			

Firm Name: HON Engineering, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>The PM, KTLs, and Prime demonstrated experience with bridges over water and railroads. PM did not list when he took PDP training. HE did discuss having a Procurement Plan. The PM is also the Bridge KTL. The SOQ did not discuss how he would manage both roles. None of the KTLs or PM were in those roles on any of the Prime's experience.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>The Primary Office narrative discusses the PM's approach on how he was going to focus on quality, schedule and budget, but once again did not discuss how he was going to manage his dual roles and how that would not negatively affect the project. They discussed having a good relationship with Norfolk Southern. A brief discussion on the QC/QA plan was presented. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i>			
Firm Name: Heath Lambach Engineers, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<i>Three of the projects listed in the PM's experience he was the assistant PM. He is the PM on the TIA bridge widening project over water (PI was not listed, but is 422470-). Allen Krivsky was the PM for 522300- and 001218. He is PM for 001216. 522300- is being designed in-house. PM did not list when he took PDP training. One of the projects he is the assistant PM has a bridge over a railroad. The Roadway KTL demonstrated experience with bridges, but not over water or railroads, but did have a project that may have had railroad coordination. The Bridge KTL demonstrated experience with bridges over water and railroad. Prime demonstrated experience with bridges over water and railroad. All KTLs have worked together except NEPA.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<i>The org chart shows two bridge design teams, but it lists four individuals for Roadway design, but their role/involvement is unclear. Had a heading of Roadway Design/Hydraulic/Hydraulic Studies/MS4/NEPDES (Road). SOQ states that they have an employee developed "Standard of Care", but don't define it. Only state that it sets a very high bar for expectations and strive to hit them daily. they discuss emphasize designing for construction and that senior staff will be involved throughout the project development, but don't discuss a QC/QA process. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i>			
Firm Name: Hill Consulting Company, LLC			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>PM has managed bridges over water and required railroad coordination. Of the three projects listed for PM experience, one was on schedule and two missed ROW plan submittal due to preliminary plans not starting on time. PM did not list when he took PDP training. Roadway KTL, Bridge KTL, and Prime demonstrated experience with bridges over water and had railroad coordination. All the KTLs except for Bridge have worked together before.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>The org chart only showed the KTL for bridge. Of the five projects listed under primary office - 2 missed baseline PFPR submission, 2 missed ROW plan submission, and one was on schedule. A detailed QC/QA process was discussed. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i>			
Firm Name: GIS Global			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<i>Confirmation of PM's role was only on 621660-. Which had bridges over water and railroad. PI's were not given for GDOT projects. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Roadway KTL did not demonstrate experience with bridges. Bridge KTL did not demonstrate experience with bridges over water or railroads. The Prime demonstrated experience with railroad coordination; did not demonstrate experience with bridges over water or railroads. The KTLs have not worked together.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<i>The org chart only listed one individual for each section, i.e., one roadway designer, one bridge designer, one ecologist. The SOQ discussed holding weekly and monthly meetings to maintain the project schedule. Did not discuss QC/QA. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i>			

Firm Name: KCI Technologies, Inc.		Assigned Rating		Adequate
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%		Assigned Rating		
<p><i>PM demonstrated she has experience with bridges over water, but not railroad coordination. Of her current projects, she is behind schedule on one, but it is due to local opposition and continued public outreach. PM did not list when she took PDP. The Roadway and Bridge KTLs as well as the Prime demonstrated experience with bridges over water, but not railroad coordination. The KTLs have not worked together. The SOQ listed all GDOT PI#s throughout the SOQ.</i></p>				
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%		Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>The org chart appears to have adequate staff required to deliver these projects. The narrative discusses 4 separate project teams, but it not shown on the org chart. It is unclear why 4 teams are needed. They discussed their QC/QA plan.</i></p>				
Firm Name: Mark & Susan, Inc.		Assigned Rating		Adequate
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%		Assigned Rating		
<p><i>PM, Bridge KTL and Prime demonstrated he has experience with bridges over water and railroads. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Roadway KTL demonstrated experience with bridges over water, but not railroad coordination. The Bridge KTL's resume did not call him out as the KTL. The KTLs have had some experience working together.</i></p>				
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%		Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p><i>The org chart did not list all the staff that would be working on the project. In the narrative, it did not discuss how the project was going to be delivered on schedule or the QC/QA process. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i></p>				
Firm Name: Lowe Engineers LLC		Assigned Rating		Good
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%		Assigned Rating		
<p><i>All the PMs experience listed was as initial PM. It did not show that he has experience taking a project all the way through the PDP. The PM, KTLs, and the Prime demonstrated that they have experience with bridges over water and railroads. PM took the PDP in 2017. All the KTLs have worked together before except NEPA.</i></p>				
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%		Assigned Rating		Excellent
<p><i>The org chart shows good depth and good staffing to deliver the projects. The SOQ showed good strategies on how to deliver the project by having a team that has multiple KTLs who have been PMs on other projects, has a survey firm with the capability to used drones, and a constructability engineer on the team. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i></p>				
Firm Name: Maul and Hunt, Inc.		Assigned Rating		Poor
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%		Assigned Rating		
<p><i>The PM demonstrated experience with bridges over water and railroads; however all his project management is with SCDOT. He has not taken the PDP. The Bridge KTL demonstrated experienced with bridges over water and railroads, but he has not done any work in GA and did not discuss any efforts to familiarize himself with the GDOT procedures and standards. The Roadway KTL demonstrated experience with bridges over water, but not railroad coordination. The Prime has experience with bridges over water and railroads and some of the KTLs have worked together before.</i></p>				
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%		Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p><i>The org chart shows a sufficient staffing to deliver the project. The narrative did not discuss how they have prepared themselves to deliver a project for GDOT since they have not done so in the past. They only showed a QC/QA for bridge on the org chart. Since they haven't worked in GA, I would have expected to see a QC/QA person that is familiar with GDOT work for Roadway and NEPA too. They did not discuss how they were going to deliver the project within scope, on schedule and within budget or how they are the best to deliver these projects for GDOT. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i></p>				

Firm Name: Michael Baker International, Inc.

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

All the PMs experience couldn't be verified since the projects descriptions were too vague and the PI#s were not listed. Could only verify his role on 0007021 and 0007128. The Roadway KTL did not have experience with railroad coordination. Bridge KTL has experience with bridges over water and railroads. The Prime has experience with bridges over water and railroads. The KTLs and PM have worked together before. PM did not list when he took PDP training.

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

The org chart showed a Roadway QC/QA person as well as one for Bridge. The narrative was a continuation of the resumes. The QC/QA plan is for an independent review prior to all submittals. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.

Firm Name: Robert & Nichol

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

The PM has experience with bridges over water and railroads. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Bridge and Roadway KTLs and Prime have experience with bridges over water and railroads. All the KTLs and PM have worked together except for NEPA

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

The org chart has sufficient staff to deliver the project. It shows a Roadway, Bridge and NEPA QC/QA person. The narrative discusses experience designing to budget. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.

Firm Name: Morand Atwell Associates, Inc.

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

The PM and Roadway KTL have experience with bridges over water, but no railroad coordination. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Roadway KTL has only 5 years experience. The Prime has experience with bridges over water and railroads. The PM and KTLs have not al worked together.

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

The org chart has sufficient staff to deliver the project. It shows three QC/QA individuals. Sam Allen will lead the MA effort on schedule and budget, but this is a PM responsibility. They have identified a utility and railroad coordinator as well as a constructability reviewer. They discussed their QC/QA process. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.

Firm Name: Hoff MacDonald LLC

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

PM and Roadway and Bridge KTLs have experience with bridges over water, but no railroad coordination. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Prime has experience with bridges over water and railroads. The Prime listed all team members who worked together before that are proposed to work on these projects, but you could not tell what role they played. That section is for KTLs.



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

The org chart has sufficient staff to deliver the project. It shows three QC/QA individuals. The narrative is a continuation of the resumes. It discusses having two design teams, but are not shown on the org chart. The org chart shows three QC/QA Individuals. The narrative mentions QC/QA, but doesn't detail their process. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.

Firm Name: The Dabney, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p><i>The PMs experience could not be verified due to the vague project descriptions and only occasionally providing the PI#s. Only two of the projects listed detailed activities that were project management. Mostly detailed Roadway KTL responsibilities. One project mentioned a bridge over a railroad, but no bridges over water were discussed. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Roadway KTL has experience with bridges over railroads, but not over water. The Bridge KTL did not demonstrate he had experience with bridges over water and railroads. The Prime has experience with bridges over water, but not railroads. The PM and KTLs have not worked together before.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>The org chart lists four QC/QA for hydraulics, roadway, bridge, and NEPA. The narrative discussed the QC/QA process. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i></p>			
Firm Name: Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>The PM has experience with bridges over water and railroads. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Bridge and Roadway KTLs and Prime have experience with bridges over water and railroads. The KTLs have worked together before, but not all on the same project.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>The org chart shows two design teams and QC/QA for bridge, roadway and NEPA. The narrative discussed strategies for keeping the project on schedule and identified risks to the schedule with a plan to eliminate/reduce them. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i></p>			
Firm Name: JQA, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>The PM has experience with bridges over water and railroads. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Roadway KTL did not demonstrate experience with bridges over water or railroads. The Bridge and Prime have experience with bridges over water and railroads. The KTLs have worked together before except NEPA.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p><i>The org chart did not list all the staff that would be working on the project. In the narrative, it discussed their QC/QA process. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i></p>			
Firm Name: HK Shull Associates, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p><i>The PM, Roadway KTL and Prime demonstrated he had experience with bridges over water, but no railroad coordination. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Bridge KTL has experience with bridges over water and railroads. The KTLs have worked together before.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>The org chart has sufficient staff to deliver the project. The PM will do the QC/QA with assistance from senior staff. The narrative didn't discuss any project risks and how they were going to deliver the project on schedule.</i></p>			

Firm Name: NSH, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>The PM, Roadway KTL, and Prime demonstrated experience with bridges over water, but not railroad coordination. The Bridge KTL has experience with bridges over water and railroads. The KTLs have worked together before. PM did not list when he took PDP training.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>The org chart has only 1 person per environmental specialty, instead of having a two team approach to ensure project delivery. It has a Roadway and Bridge QC/QA person. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i></p>			
Firm Name: Statco Consulting Services, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p><i>The PM and Prime have experience with bridges over water and railroads. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Roadway and Bridge KTL did not demonstrate experience with bridges over railroads. Some of the KTLs have worked together before, but not in their proposed roles.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>The org chart listed a QC/QA person for roadway, bridge, constructability and NEPA. They listed a railroad coordination person. The narrative discussed project risks and how to reduce/eliminate it. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i></p>			
Firm Name: STV Incorporated (the STV/Reynolds Whitehead Associates)			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>The PM, Roadway and Bridge KTLs, and Prime have experience with bridges over water and railroads. The KTLs have worked together before.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>The org chart has sufficient staff to deliver the project. It lists railroad coordinator. The narrative discussed their QC/QA process and discussed project risk and how to reduce/eliminate it. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i></p>			
Firm Name: TY Environmental			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p><i>The PMs experience could not be verified due to the vague project descriptions and not providing the PI#s. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Roadway KTL has experience with bridges over water, but not railroad coordination. The Bridge KTL has experience with bridges over water and railroads. Some of the KTLs have worked together. In the Prime's experience, it listed Sarah Percy as the Roadway KTL.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p><i>The PI#s were not listed in the commitments table. The org chart does not appear to detail all the project team members who would be working on the project. The narrative discusses schedule, but only says that the PM will update it monthly, and it mentions QC/QA, but does not detail its process. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i></p>			

Firm Name: Thompson Engineering, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<i>Glynn County is misspelled as "Glenn". The PMs experience could not be verified due to the vague project descriptions and not providing the PI#s. From the descriptions of the projects, it appears that the Sea Island @ Dunbar Creek is not currently being worked on and neither is I-75 at CR 253. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Roadway and Bridge KTLs demonstrated experience with bridges over water, but railroads. Some of the KTLs have worked together before.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<i>The org chart does not appear to detail all the project team members who would be working on the project. It does not list anyone for QC/QA. The narrative didn't discuss any project risks and how they were going to deliver the project on schedule or their QC/QA process. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i>			
Firm Name: Treibhastens Corporation			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>The PM and Prime have experience with bridges over water and railroads. The Roadway and Bridge KTL have experience with bridges over water, but did not demonstrate over railroads. Some of the KTLs have worked together before. PM did not list when he took PDP training.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>The org chart lists QC/QA for Roadway, Bridge and NEPA. The narrative discusses some project risks and how to reduce/eliminate it. It discusses their QC/QA process. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i>			
Firm Name: Vaughn & Mather Consulting Engineers, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>The PM has experience with bridges over water and railroads as well as extensive knowledge of District 3 as a retired D3 Preconstruction Engineer/District Engineer. Listed two Roadway KTLs, but both of them are working on both projects. Neither have experience with railroad bridges/coordination. The Bridge KTL has experience with bridges over water and railroads. The Prime has experience with bridges over water and railroads. The Prime experience listed non KTL in section f. KTLs have not worked together. PM did not list when he took PDP training.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>The org chart was not in the correct location and there was an org chart for each project which made it difficult to verify overlapping resources. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i>			
Firm Name: Wood EN			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<i>The PM has experience with bridges over water and railroads. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Roadway KTL and Prime have experience with railroad coordination, but not bridges over water. The KTLs have worked together, but not in their current roles.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<i>The org chart appears to have adequate resources to deliver the project. It lists a Roadway, Bridge, and constructability QC/QA people as well as a QC/QA lead. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i>			

Firm Name: WSP USA Inc.	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Marginal
<p><i>The PM has experience with bridges over water, but not railroad coordination. PM did not list when he took PDP training. The Roadway and Bridge KTLs and Prime have experience with bridges over water and railroads. In the Prime's experience, it lists team members involvement and does not list their roles. It is impossible to verify if the PM and KTLs have worked together in their current roles. This section is for KTL involvement, not team involvement.</i></p>	
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating  Adequate
<p><i>The org charts lists a QC/QA for Roadway, Bridge, and NEPA. The narrative didn't discuss any project risks and how they were going to deliver the project on schedule or their QC/QA process. The PM and KTLs appear to have sufficient availability.</i></p>	

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications
Resources and Workload Capacity

Evaluator 2

	300	200	Phase One Evaluator 2 Individual	
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	Total Score	Ranking
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼		
Barge Design Solutions, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	20
Calyx Engineers and Consultants	Adequate	Adequate	250	20
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P C	Good	Good	375	2
Cranston Engineering Group, P C.	Adequate	Adequate	250	20
CROY Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	20
EXP US Services, Inc.	Adequate	Good	300	15
Freese and Nichols	Marginal	Adequate	175	29
HDR Engineering, Inc	Poor	Adequate	100	32
Heath Lineback Engineers, Inc	Good	Good	375	2
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Good	Adequate	325	9
IDS Global	Marginal	Marginal	125	31
KCI Technologies, Inc	Adequate	Good	300	15
Keck & Wood, Inc	Good	Good	375	2
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Good	375	2
Mead and Hunt, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	20
Michael Baker International, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	9
Moffatt & Nichol	Adequate	Adequate	250	20
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	9
Mott MacDonald, LLC	Good	Adequate	325	9
Neel-Schaffer, Inc	Good	Good	375	2
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Excellent	Good	450	1
QK4, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	9
RK Shah Associates, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	20
RSH, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	9
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	Adequate	Good	300	15
STV Incorporated	Good	Good	375	2
TY Lin International	Adequate	Adequate	250	20
Thompson Engineering, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	20
TranSystems Corporation	Good	Good	375	2
Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Marginal	Adequate	175	29
Wood EIS	Adequate	Good	300	15
WSP USA Inc	Adequate	Good	300	15
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	500	%

GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-052819, Contract 4	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #:	2		
Evaluation Committee should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25% of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects = 75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name: Barge Design Solutions, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	ADAR
Comments	ROWY - 2 BUNDLES w/ 6 total BR/HR, 1 REAR w/ BR/HR w/ NO ROL = ADAR PM - BUNDLES, 3 BR/HR NO ROL > BELOW "OK" = ADAR/MARG BR - 4 + BR/HR GA+OH = ADAR ENV - 5 BR/HR w/ CE LIGHT OR ROL = ADAR/GOOD		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	ADAR
Comments	ORG SHOWS V2 DEPTH + TEAMS, ENV SEP, 34 QA, WORK ORG NARRATIVE FULL, PARTNERSHIP w/ MM, decent add res. discuss 45-45-40-88		
Firm Name: Carve Engineers and Consultants			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	ADAR
Comments	ROWY - 1 INTERM w BR/ROAD, 1 WIDEN, 2 INT. MPS. WORK ROL = MARG/ADAR PM - PMON 2 BUNDLES WITH 6 BR/HR - NO ROL DESCR. 5 WIDEN, 1 W/RR BR = ADAR BR - 4 BR/HR WITH GOOD DESCRIP OF CURRENT STAFF = ADAR/GOOD ENV - 2 BR BUNDLES WITH MULT BR/HR, GOOD ROL = ADAR/GOOD		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	ADAR
Comments	ORG = VERY GOOD DEPTH, NICELY ORG-ED, 2 Q/A = ADAR/GOOD ENV SEP, SEP. PI NARRATIVE FULL, good Q/A desc = adag 100-76-40-48		
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/EX
Comments	ROWY - 1 BR/HR, INT IMP + BR/HR, INTER w BR/HR, ROL "OK" = ADAR PM - 2 WIDEN w GOOD ROL, 2 WIDEN WORK ROL, 2 INT IMP GOOD/WORK, @ GM/RR, NO BR? = GOOD BR - EXTENSIVE (215) BR/HR + 2 BR/RR - MARG = GOOD/EX ENV - EXTENSIVE MULT BR/HR BUNDLE + 24 GRANT BR INC 4/RR ROW/HR = GOOD/EX		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	GOOD
Comments	ORG - V6 DEPTH, NICELY ORG-ED, SEP & MULT. ENV 5, 2 QA NARRATIVE FULL. nice "philosophy" re: cost. GOOD USE OF EXTRA RESOUR -> WUBS @ CST REV, ABC, INCLUDE KNOWLEDGE OF CURRENT PROJ. UPSTREAM = GOOD AD/GOOD 68-96-80-87		
Firm Name: Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	ADAR
Comments	ROWY - 2 PROJ ROL = PM, 1 RA AS PART OF WID, 1 RESURFACE, WORK ROL = MARG/MARG PM - 3 WIDEN WITH NO/WEAK ROL, 1 RESURFACE, 1 BR/HR PIC/QA ROL = ADAR BR - GOOD BUNDLE w 4 BR/HR + 1 BR/RR = GOOD ENV - 5 BR/HR w/ CE LIGHT/OK ROL = ADAR		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	ADAR

ORG HAS GOOD DEPTH, HAS INT + EXT QA ROLES

ADAR

ADAR

10-92-60-88

NARRATIVE full ~~but~~ good discussion of teaming w/ SIV
PM/adv worked together recently ADAR

Firm Name: CROY Engineering, LLC

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

ROWY - TYP. 1 WIDEN W/WOOD NLS, 1 BR W/NO ROW, 1 CONN DRNG W/AS = MARG/ADAR
PM - 2 BRs + 1 CONN W/EXT ROLES, 2 SUPERVISORS W GOOD ROLES = ADAR
BR - 2 DB BR/H2O INCLUDING BUNDLE + 1 TRAD DB/H2O = ADAR
ENV - 2 WIDEN + 1 EXTENSION, NEPA + PLOT NO OR? = ADAR

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

ORG - 'OK' DEPTH. ENV SEP BUT LISTS FIRMS INSTEAD OF PEOPLE
I QA ADAR
NARR IS GOOD/RECENT LIST OF ADAR RESOURCES
discuss in-house survey, util cond, w/r? ADAR

72-80-100-65

Firm Name: EXP US Services, Inc.

A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating \rightarrow ADAR BR?

ROWY - 2 BRs/H2O, 1 "IMP", W/EXT ROLES = ADAR
PM - USFS 4 BRs/H2O 1 BR/RA - DEC. ROLES - ADAR/GOOD
BR - NO GA EXP (OES/PPP), 3 BRs/H2O BUT 2 REVIEW ONLY - MARG/ADAR?
ENV - NEW LOC, 3 BRs (at least 1 = H2O), PASSIVE LANDS, GOOD ROLES = ADAR

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20% Assigned Rating \rightarrow ADAR/GOOD

GOOD DEPTH (DO MUCH?), 1 QA, TRAFFIC? = ADAR
NARRATIVE has nod to sched + mentioning extra
drainage resource = EUBOND

4-4-80-10

GOOD

Firm Name: Freese and Nichols

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

ROWY = PROBS NOT REL (DECK REPL, 2 RETARD, 1 H2O) ROLE = P-I-C, NO KFL STAKING = POOR
PM = LOTS OF BR/H2O EXP AS PM, SOME GOOD ROLES = ADAR
BR = 2 BRs/H2O, w/ ~~W/~~ ROLES, OTHERS QC ROLE = ADAR
ENV = 4-5 BRs/H2O - LIGHT ROLES = ADAR

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20% Assigned Rating \rightarrow ADAR/GOOD

ORG = LIGHT DEPTH (1 PERSON EXCEPTING), 1 QC/QA = ADAR
NARRATIVE = GOOD USE OF EXTRA RES. = ADAR

16-25-26-18

Firm Name: HDR Engineering, Inc.

A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating \rightarrow POOR/ADAR

ROWY - 1 PROJ ROLE = PM, 1 = TRAF CONTROL ONLY, 2 SEC WIDENING, 1 BR W H2O TR = MARG/ADAR
PM - SOFT PROJ ARE BR/ADV KFL, NOT PM. PM ON PER OR W/NO ROLE, PM ON 1 BR/H2O = MARG/ADAR
BR KFL = PM = MARG/POOR
ENV = 1 TRANSIT IN NC, 2 ENV (ELO) T.O.S, 1 WIDEN W/GOOD ROLE = ADAR

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20% Assigned Rating \rightarrow MARG/ADAR

ORG - GOOD DEPTH, NICELY ORGED, ENV SEP & GOOD DEPTH, 1 ELO?
3 PERSON QA PM = BR KFL MARG/ADAR
NARR = fluff. strong NS EXP, EXPANDED QA (inclop)

80-110-80-80
2-5 same

Comments

SEE PREV. PAGE

Firm Name: Heath Lineback Engineers, Inc.

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

Comments: ROWY - 1 INTRCT + BR/MS, 2 WRITING, 7 BR/TRAIL, OR/GEN/REP ROLES - ADAR/GOOD
PM - 4 BR/H2O + 1 BR/RR WITH DEC ~~roles~~ ROWS = GOOD
BR - 3 BR/H2O + 7 BR/RR = GOOD
ENV - 5 BR/H2O W/ CE'S GOOD/LEAD ROWS = ADAR/GOOD

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

Comments: ORG - V6 DEPTH, IN TEAMS FOR BR, 4 QA, ENV BY DIS W/ EX-ECO/SPEC
NARRATIVE FULL, WELL WRITTEN, COURTESY, EXPERIENCE IS EXTENSIVE
GOOD DISCUSS OF RR SUE
ADAR/GOOD
ADAR/GOOD
100-46-68-20

Firm Name: Holt Consulting Company, LLC

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

Comments: ROWY - 1 WRITING W/ BR/H2O, 2 BR/H2O, ALL V6 ROLES = GOOD
PM - 3 BR/H2O WITH LEAD ROWS = ADAR/GOOD
BR - 2 BR/H2O, 1 BR/RR ALL IN SC. SOLID UNDERSTANDING OF PDP, BR MAN, ER... HOW? = ADAR
ENV - 3 BR/H2O W/ CE & DEC ROLES = ADAR/GOOD

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

Comments: ORG - ONLY 1 BR ENG?, GOOD DEPTH OTHERWISE, 2 QA
NARR - ADD ROS DISCUSSION - EXTENSIVE BR QA, UTILS,
SOME WORKED TOGETHER IN PAST
ADAR/GOOD
ADAR
28-16-64-18

Firm Name: IDS Global

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

Comments: ROWY - 7 IN WRITING, 2 "MULTI-LINE COURTESY IMP PROJ" + NO IDEA WHAT THIS... BUT ARE GENERAL
REACTIVE, NO REAL ATTEMPT TO OBSOBEGE PROVER, NO ATTEMPT AT MENT BR = MARG
PM - 1 OPS WRITTEN FOR SOQ, MOST FOR PRO QUAL, TYPO, GENERAL + CONFUSING DESCR = ADAR/MARG
BR - MISSING TYPING, NO MENTION OF H2O/RR = MARG
ENV - 1 BR/H2O describe, 1 WRITING, 1 CON = ADAR

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

Comments: ORG CHART VERY VAGUE, LACKING DET. KRS NOT INVD, COLOR CHAIN NOT
ID-ED, ONLY 7 BR? ROWY KRL VS SR PM?
NARR = FULL WITH MULTIPLE TYPES CLEARLY LITTLE EFFORT PUT
INTO THIS PROPOSAL, NOT TRYING
MARG/MARG
30-25-20-50

Firm Name: KCI Technologies, Inc.

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

Comments: ROWY - TYPO IN PM ROLE. 1 WRITING, 1 PASSIVE LINES, 1 BR/H2O W/ GOOD ROWS = ADAR/GOOD
PM - IN PM EXP, ONLY 1 OF 9 PARTS INOLATES ROLE DISMPT, 1 INTRCT, 1-2 WRITING, 2 S. OWNERS,
BR - TYPO. 3 BR/ROAD, 1 BR/WRITING, 1 BR WRITING 2 INT. IMP. OWN IMP. = MARG/ADAR
ENV - 15+ BR/H2O IN COST BUNDLES. 2 BR/RR COST BUNDLES = GOOD

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

Comments: ORG - GOOD DEPTH, 2 QA/RR ENV SEP.
NARR -> FULL - GOOD DESIGN DISCUSS, V6 USE OF 4 TEAMS?
ADD REC - ...
ADAR
ADAR/GOOD
40-36-80-80

SEE PREV. PAGE

Comments

Firm Name: Keck & Woot, Inc.

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

COMMENTS
 PM - 2 BR/H2O (DPM + KR) + WIDEN w/ 2 WID BR/H2O. ROLES OK = ADAR
 PM - 3 WIDEN, 2 EXT/PROJ. → INCL 6 BR/H2O + 7 BR/RR, V6 ROLES = GOOD/EX
 BR - 2 BR5/H2O + 1 BR/RR, ALSO QA + CST INSP, ROLES OK = GOOD
 ENV - 5 BR5/H2O w/ CTS OK/LEAD OESC = ADAR/GOOD

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

ORG - OK DEPTH, ONLY 1 BR ENG? vs 5 PROJ? 1 QA
 NAME = TYPO. GOOD DIS OF WORKING TOGETHER (INTERNAL) + SUBS.
 ADAR/GOOD
 2-8-88-0

Firm Name: Lowe Engineers, LLC

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

COMMENTS
 PM - PROJECTS ARE EXCELLENT, BUT WORK ROLLS (3 BR/H2O + 1 BR/RR) = ADAR/GOOD
 PM - SAME → 3 BR5/H2O + 1 BR/RR... ALL "INITIAL PM & LATER QCL LEAD = ADAR/GOOD
 BR - V6 PROJ + ROLES (COPY HIS FORMAT)... 3 BR/H2O + 2 BR/RR + WIDEN = GOOD/EX
 ENV - GOOD PROJ (3 BR BUNDLES + 1 BR BARE) LOTS OVER H2O 1/RR/RES D3 = GOOD

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

ORG HAS V6 DEPTH, WELL ORGANIZED, 3 QA/QC, ENV BROKEN OUT, PI SEP... NOT SURE WHY SHOWING C TRAFFIC + MSY
 NAME → fluff. ALL WORKED ON BUNDLES WORKED TOGETHER, WORKED IN DB, CST ENG RE: DETOUR, ACCESS = V6, PI FIRM = GOOD
 52-74-64-72

Firm Name: Mead and Hunt, Inc.

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

COMMENTS
 PM - BR/H2O IN SC, WIDEN w/ BR/H2O SC, WIDEN w/ BR/H2O GOOD, LIGHT ROLLS = ADAR
 PM - 4 BR5/H2O & 1 BR/RR ALL SUDOT, WORK ROLLS = ADAR
 BR - 3 BR5/H2O, NONE IN QA = ADAR NO PM/KR QA EXP.
 ENV - 1 BR/H2O w/ CE GOOD ROLE, + OWP (EX) + BYPASS EA

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

ORG - GOOD DEPTH + WELL ORG-ED 1 QA ROLE = ADAR
 NAME - MNC FROM LEXINGTON, SC, GOOD EXPLANATION OF FLUFF ATTEMPTING QA WORK, E.G. PILETY OFFICE, MAT W BR IN QA
 105-136-88-88
 KINDA PM

Firm Name: Michael Baker International, Inc.

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

COMMENTS
 PM - 4 BR5/H2O. ROLES LISTED BUT SOUNDS GENERIC = ADAR/GOOD
 PM - 2 BR5/H2O + BIG BR 2 (MULT BR/H2O), 1 BR/RR, 1 WID, LIMITED = GOOD/EX
 BR - 3 BR5/H2O + 1 BR/RR w/ GOOD ROLLS = ALL OK/GOOD ROLLS = GOOD/EX
 ENV - 4 BR5/H2O w/ DECENT ROLLS (EX) = GOOD

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

ORG - DEPTH = OK/ADAR. → ONLY 1 ECO? 2 QA
 NAME = decent. PM extensive exp w/ BR5 (3 BR5) ADAR
 25-52-40-44

Comments

SEE PREV PAGE

Firm Name: Moffatt & Nichol	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating \rightarrow MARGINAL / <u>ADAR</u>
Comments	<p>ROWY - 2 ASST PM w/ WORK (NO ROWS), 1 COMM ROAD w/ NO ROW = MARGINAL</p> <p>PM - 1 BYPASS (NL) w/ GOOD ROW, 1 BR w/ RR - DECENT ROW, REST = NO ROW = ADAR</p> <p>BR - 1 RR BR w/ GOOD ROW, 1 BR RR + H₂O - GOOD</p> <p>ENV - 4 BRs / WATER, DESCRIB VERY STRONG, LIGHT ROWS = ADAR</p>
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	
Assigned Rating	\rightarrow <u>ADAR</u> / MARGINAL
Comments	<p>V6 DEPTH, BROKEN UP BY SPECIFICITY (ENV), GOOD 3 PERSON QA TEAM</p> <p>TRAFFIC? = GOOD</p> <hr/> <p>LITTLE MORE THAN FLUFF = ADAR</p>
68-32-14-88	

Firm Name: Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating \rightarrow <u>GOOD</u> / MARGINAL
Comments	<p>ROWY - 2 WID, 3 INT. IMP, 1 SW IMP. V4, ROWS 1/2 V4, 1/2 GEN REP = ADAR</p> <p>PM - 1 BR/H₂O, DD, 2 WIDENING (1 W/ BR/H₂O), BR/ROAD, 2 INT = GOOD / ADAR</p> <p>BR - 16 BR/H₂O, 3 BR/RR, 1 W/ BR/ROW - GOOD</p> <p>ENV - LOTS OF INTEREST, NO DUB OF PROS OR ATTEMPT TO SHOW BR EX = ADAR / MARGINAL</p>
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	
Assigned Rating	\rightarrow <u>ADAR</u>
Comments	<p>ONE STRONG V6 DEPTH, WELL ORGD, ENV SEP, 2 GLOS 3 QA, RR COMM</p> <p>NARR REFLECT + good UTIL/RR / CR APP RES.</p>
ADAR / GOOD	
ADAR / GOOD	
48-48-100-56	

Firm Name: Mett MacDonald, LLC	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating \rightarrow <u>GOOD</u>
Comments	<p>ROWY - 2 BRs / H₂O BUT NO ROWS DESCRPT = MARG / ADAR</p> <p>PM - BRs / H₂O IN SC, H₂O STUDIOS, ON-CAM w/ 3 BR/H₂O, WIDENING = GOOD</p> <p>BR - 4 + BRs / H₂O WITH GOOD ROWS = AD / GOOD</p> <p>ENV - 5 BRs / H₂O w/ LIGHT BUT OR ROWS = ADAR / GOOD</p>
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	
Assigned Rating	\rightarrow <u>ADAR</u> / MARGINAL
Comments	<p>ORG - GOOD DEPTH, WELL ORGANIZED, 2 FOR EXECUTEN V SPANITY</p> <p>3 QA.</p> <p>NARR - TYPO. DIS SOME GOOD ADITT. RESOURCES + HISTORY OF WORKING TOGETHER</p>
AD / GOOD	
ADAR	
48-30-40-88	

Firm Name: Niel Schaffer, Inc.	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating \rightarrow <u>GOOD</u>
Comments	<p>ROWY - INTERCONSIST, NEW INTERCH., BYPASS, 2 PROJ w/ BR/RR - GOOD ROWS = GOOD</p> <p>PM - MOSTLY WIDENING / INT PROJ BUT DUBS SHOW DB BR BATCH, 1 BR/RR = ADAR / GOOD</p> <p>BR - BR BUNDLES W LOTS / WATER, VERY GOOD ROWS = GOOD</p> <p>ENV - GOOD CE EXP ON 5 BRs / H₂O PLUS EMB / BILLION = GOOD</p>
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	
Assigned Rating	\rightarrow <u>GOOD</u>

SEE NEXT PAGE



Comments
 Org - VA Depth, NICKY Org & Presented, ENV Split by DIS, \$ person QA Team = GOOD
 95, 60, 90, 18
 NARR >> full. INDEP QA peer review, GOOD JOB AFT DIS
 ADD RES -> H2O, ROWY E.G., SPLIT BUS, NFRM EXP = GOOD

Firm Name: Parsons Transportation Group Inc.
 A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating \rightarrow GOOD/EXC
Comments
 ROWY - 2 BR/HR + 2 BR/RR - ALL EXCELLENT, EXPECTED ROLES = EX
 PM - 2 BR/H2O + 3 BR/RR + 7 WID W/RR COM ROLE OF bitygaric = GOOD/EX
 BR - 1 BR/RR, 3 BR/H2O, GOOD DESCRIPTIONS - GOOD/EX
 ENV - 6 BR/H2O CES + 2 BR ON BR/H2O - GOOD/EX

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20% Assigned Rating \rightarrow GOOD/RR
Comments
 Org = VG. DEPTH... TOO MUCH? CLERK & ORGANIZED, ENV SEP BY DISC & HAS MORE THAN 2 RES PER DISC. 3 PERSON QA, ALSO NOTES FOR VE, CONST REV, COST EST = GOOD/EX
 64-40-60-32
 NARR >> full. GOOD EXAMPLES OF ON OR AHEAD OF BL CRS, PERSONLY, GOOD RES/ENV DIS (ESD/ABM), ABC EXPORT, COST EST, ES OF PO.. = GOOD/EX

Firm Name: QMA, Inc.
 A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating \rightarrow VAAD/GOOD
Comments
 ROWY - BR BUNDLE - 4 BR/HR W/ ANY DESCR OF WTRAL/RR, 2 CONDS, 2 WIDENINGS = AOADR
 PM - TYPD. 3 BR/H2O, 2 WIDEN (BR/RR), 1 BR BUNDLE
 BR - 2 BR/H2O + 1 BR/RR = GOOD
 ENV - 5 BR/H2O w/ CE OR BUT WITH DESCR = GOOD/AN

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20% Assigned Rating \rightarrow SOADR
Comments
 Org = AOADR DEPTH, 3 PERSON QA TEAM AOADR
 NARR & full need to schedule, QA, working to complete AOADR
 79-74-62-87

Firm Name: RK Shah Associates, Inc.
 A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating \rightarrow AOADR
Comments
 ROWY - 2 of 4 PROJ ROLES = ASSISTED PM ON QA REV (NOT RELATED) - 1 BR/H2O + 1 WIDEN = AOADR
 PM - 3 WIDEN, 1 NEW INTERCHANGE, 1 BR/H2O w/ OR ROLES = AOADR
 BR - 1 BR/H2O, BR T.O. (MUST BR/H2O), BR/RR -> led stake w/ cond = AOADR/GOOD
 ENV - 5 BR/H2O w/ CES dec. roles = AOADR

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20% Assigned Rating \rightarrow SOADR
Comments
 Org - GOOD DEPTH, ORGANIZED, BUT QA TEAM = PM + KR? AOADR
 NARR & full, quick met of add resource 24/7 AOADR
 30-32-72-88

Firm Name: RSH, Inc.
 A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating \rightarrow VAAD/GOOD
Comments
 ROWY - 1 BR/H2O, 1 BR BUNDLE w/ AT LEAST 3 BR/H2O, 1 WIDEN w/ BR GOOD ROLES = AOADR/GOOD
 PM -> TYPD
 PM -> SAME 3 PROJ. (IDENTICAL DESCR) BUT NO ROWS + 1 WIDEN & 2 BR/H2O WITH WIDEN ROLES = AOADR/GOOD
 BR - 2 BR/H2O + 1 BR/RR WITH DEC. ROLES = GOOD
 ENV - 5 BR/H2O, decent roles = GOOD

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20% Assigned Rating \rightarrow SOADR/VAAD
 Org = AOADR DEPTH, ENV BROKEN OUT, ROWY + BR QA = AOADR/GOOD SEP P.I.
 NARR >> full... KNOWLEDGE OF SKIB FR OTHER PROJ, NOT TO SCHED, DETAILED EXPLAN OF AVAIL.
 80-140-140-87
 DR. PHILIP IN 2020C NFP

Comments

SEE PREV. PAGE

Firm Name: Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

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

ROWY - SHOWS BRS/H2O AS PM BUT NOT ROWY KTL. KTL = 2 WIO, 1 NL W/NO ROLS = NANA/ADAR
PM - LOTS OF BR/H2O EXP (5 PROJ) AS PM + ROWY KTL ROLS = ENT = ADAR
BR - 3 BRS/H2O, 2 BRS/RR, DEC ROLS = ADAR/GOOD
ENV - 2/6 ANTS, 3/6 ECO, NOT NEAR LEAD, 1 LEAD W/WL = NANA/ADAR

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

ORG - V4 DEPTH, WORK ORG. 4 QA 10-ED = GOOD (+ YRS EXP.) FOLLOW ON NS EMP
NANA > fluff. QA=150, EXP IN D3 W/ BRS, KTL5 HAVE SIM EXP, V4 PROJECT APPROX, TEAM (ENV) WORKED TOGETHER IN PAST

Firm Name: STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates

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

ROWY - BR BUNDLE W 3 BR/H2O, BR/RR, PASSIVE, WIO, AN W/VG ROLS = GOOD
PM - BR BUNDLE W 4 BR/H2O, BR/RR, INTERACT W W/RR, EXT+NL W BR/H2O = AD/GOOD
BR - BR BUNDLE W 3 BR/H2O, BR/RR, DEC BR, CO BR DEC. ROLS = GOOD
ENV - BR BUNDLE W 3 BR/H2O, 3 OTHER BR/H2O, GOOD ROLS = GOOD

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

ORG SHOWS V4 DEPTH, ORGANIZED, ENV SEP, 1 QA/QC, RR COORD = ADAR/GOOD
NANA > fluff. GOOD PROJECT UNDERSTANDING SECTION - ADAR/GOOD

Firm Name: TY Lin International

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

ROWY - 1 WIO + 1 BR W/WEAK ROL, 1 NOT RELATED = ADAR (1 H2O, RR)
PM - 1 BR/H2O, WEAK ROL, 1 RR BUT P-I-C, REST DIFF SCORES = ADAR
BR - 1 BR/RR, WEAK ROL, 1 BR/H2O WEAK ROL = ADAR
ENV = 1 BR/H2O W GOOD ROL WIDEN, STREET SCEN = ADAR

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

ORG - NOT A LOT OF DEPTH (BR+ENV) ENV NOT BROKEN UP BY DISC, ONLY 1 QA, NO EXAMS = NANA/ADAR
NANA - 100% fluff

Firm Name: Thompson Engineering, Inc.

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

ROWY - NO QA EXP, 1 INTERACT, 1 WIO, 1 WIO+BR/H2O, NO/WEAK ROL = NANA/ADAR
PM - 2 BR/H2O, 2 WIO, 1 BYPASS, 1 INTERACT. NO/WEAK ROL = ADAR
BR - 3 BR/H2O, 1 INCLUDES RR TOO = GOOD
ENV - 5 BRS/H2O WITH CE OR LIGHT ROLS = ADAR

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

ORG = OK... repeated roles, decent depth, only 1 BR OUTSIDE KTL? 1 QA, ENV SEP.
NANA x fluff

Comments

SEE PREV PAGE

Firm Name: TranSystems Corporation
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating: GOOD

Comments: ROWY - 2 BR/H2O + 1 WIDEN w MULT. BR/H2O. 1 ROLE GOOD, REST WEAK = ADAQ
PM - 3 BR/H2O, 1 BR/RR, 1 BR/PIPELINE -> EXCELLENT ROLE DESCN = EX/GOOD
BR - 3+ BR/H2O WITH V6 ROLE DESCRIPTION = GOOD
ENV - 5 BR/H2O w/ CE DOCS PER ROLES = ADAQ/GOOD

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

Comments: ORG - V6 DEPTH & SEP TEAMS FOR FRONT BR. 3 PERSON QA, ENI SEPARATED -> BRUNNY = GOOD/ADAQ
MARK > FULL... EXTENSIVE PDP + BR/GOOD EXP. NOD TO PRMCT. DCS. GOOD PM/DESIGN + ENV DISCUSSION, GOOD DIS ON HYDRAULICS + PROJ. APPROXIMATE = GOOD

16-52-76-88

Firm Name: Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating: SLIGHTLY MARGINAL

Comments: ROWY - WHO IS KIL? REZE OR MELANIE? ALL NODOT EXP, 1 UTIL CORR ONLY, 2 WIDEN = MARK
PM - 2 PROS -> 1 BR/H2O WEAK ROLE, 1 BR/H2O GOOD ROLE = ADAQ w/ WEAK ROLES
BR - "PM OR PROT ON FOLLOWING BR'S". LMOV. LIST ONLY, NO DOTS, NO ROLES, = POOR
ENV - 3 BR/H2O w/ CES ~~GOOD~~ OR LIGHT DESCN = ADAQ

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

Comments: 2 ORGS? 2 ROWY KILS? COMBINING INTO 1 & NOTING PI MORE EFFECTIVE
GOOD DEPTH, 3+ QA
MARK = FULL + DEC DISCUSSION OF TEAM WORKING TOGETHER IN PAST

68-55-48-48

Firm Name: WOODS
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30% Assigned Rating: ADAQ MARG

Comments: ROWY - DIFFERENT ROLES BUT APPARANTLY WRITTEN - 1 BR W/RR? INTERCHANGE, INT IMP w/ CULVERT = ADAQ
PM - GOOD ENG EXP w/ BR-H2O + BR-RR, PM - NFS&CSX LOOK IN GEN+PROT, REST NL+WIDEN = ADAQ
BR - 1 BR-RR, 2 BR WATER - DIFFERENT ROLES = GOOD
ENV - GOOD ROLES, EPM ON 2 BR BATTERIES (H2O ASSUMED) + 1 ON CALL - GOOD

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

Comments: ORG - GOOD DEPTH & BROKEN UP BY DISC., V6 3 PERSON IND. DES REV. = GOOD
MARK > FULL. good des of resident exp, plus indep. review team -> des in + const.

80-24-20-42

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

Comments: ROWY - 1 BR/H2O, 7 BR/WAD, 1 CONN w BR/RR, NO ROLES = ADAQ
PM - 2 BR/H2O, 1 BYPASS, 1 WIDEN, WEAK ROLES = ADAQ
BR - 1 BR/RR, 3 BR/H2O, 7 QA, LIGHT/OK = ADAQ/GOOD
ENV - 1 REVISION w 2 BR/H2O, 1 WIDEN, BOTH EAS = ADAQ

B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20% Assigned Rating: ADAQ/GOOD?

Comments: ORG HAS V6 DEPTH, ENV SEP BUT ONLY 1 BR? 3 PERSON QA TEAM
7 REVISIONS NEEDED
MARK IS GOOD USE OF ADD RES -> V6 EXP OF 2 SENIOR-QA,
ADAQ

64-32-26-80

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications
Resources and Workload Capacity

Evaluator 3

	300	200	Phase One Evaluator 3 Individual	
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	Total Score	Ranking
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼		
Berge Design Solutions, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	7
Calyx Engineers and Consultants	Good	Adequate	325	7
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P C	Good	Good	375	1
Cranston Engineering Group, P C	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
CROY Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
EXP US Services, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
Freese and Nichols	Good	Good	375	1
HDR Engineering, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
Heath Lineback Engineers, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	7
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Good	Adequate	325	7
IDS Global	Marginal	Adequate	175	31
KCI Technologies, Inc	Adequate	Good	300	19
Keck & Wood, Inc.	Adequate	Marginal	200	30
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Good	375	1
Mead and Hunt, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	7
Michael Baker International, Inc	Good	Good	375	1
Moffatt & Nichel	Marginal	Adequate	175	31
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc	Adequate	Good	300	19
Mott MacDonald, LLC	Good	Adequate	325	7
Neel-Schaffer, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	7
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc	Good	Good	375	1
QK4, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	7
RK Shah Associates, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
RSH, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	7
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
STV Incorporated	Good	Adequate	325	7
TY Lin International	Adequate	Good	300	19
Thompson Engineering, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	7
TranSystems Corporation	Good	Adequate	325	7
Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
Wood EIS	Adequate	Adequate	250	22
WSP USA Inc	Good	Good	375	1
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	500 %	



GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-052819, Contract 4	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 3			
Evaluation Committee should assign Ratings (options and explanation for ratings below) to each Section. Comments must be written in the boxes provided and should justify the rating assigned.			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
Firm Name: Ergo Design Solutions, Inc.			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>PM (Johnny Lee) has 19 yrs exp and has been PM on numerous similar projects for GDOT; has dealt with large bridges with env challenges such as over Satilla River and Altamaha River, which will share challenges with subject replacement over Ocmulgee. Roadway lead (Jeff Vickery) has 10 yrs exp and good exp in similar role. Bridge lead (Michael Russell) has 30 yrs exp; he lists plenty of bridge projects but does not seem to include one over a large river such as the Ocmulgee. NEPA lead (Jill Brown) has 16 yrs exp and has done CEs on many bridge projects where she helped coordinate the special studies. She does not list a large bridge with NMFS challenges, however. Prime lists work on numerous bridge projects, but not a large bridge such as the Ocmulgee.</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Team is not particularly deep, with just EPEI to do all environmental and the prime to do all design. That is adequate on this contract, as the firms' size allows them to organize into 2 teams for env, road, and bridge. KTLs have good availability. This team seems like it would deliver the projects successfully.</p>			
Firm Name: Calyx Engineers and Consultants			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>PM (Ken McDuff) has 29 yrs exp in roadway design. He has served as PM on numerous bridges, including one over Etowah River and one over the Chattahoochee. Roadway lead (David Jackson) has 13 yrs exp not with particularly long bridges but plenty of different situations. Bridge Lead has 30 yrs exp with a great depth of exp but does not list a large bridge similar to the Ocmulgee. NEPA Lead has 29 yrs exp completing CEs for numerous bridge projects inc over Etowah River. Prime has ample experience with recent bridge bundles inc larger bridges.</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Team is not particularly deep, with prime doing all design and a lot of env and EPEI assisting on environmental. One other firm is on the team to do geotech. That is adequate on this contract, but little redundancy. Team recognizes the importance of early utility coord and avoidance of env when possible. KTLs have good availability. This team seems like it would deliver the projects successfully.</p>			
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
<p>PM (Jennifer Patterson) has 25 yrs exp in diverse roles, inc project management, but does not list any bridge projects among her relevant projects. Bridge lead (David Stricklin) has 23 yrs exp and has served in same role for another bridge over the Ocmulgee, so he has dealt with the same issues that the subject project will deal with. Road lead (Mark Hanson) has 20 yrs exp inc on diverse projects, one with rather large bridges over Interstate. Env lead (Patrick Smith) has 25 yrs exp; has completed numerous documents inc one in progress for another bridge over the Ocmulgee River. Prime lists some relevant bridge projects, but no one large river crossing.</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Team has tremendous depth with 11 subs on-board and redundancy of services in all areas. Org chart is fairly robust, but does not have QA/QC for env. Team has good availability. Approach has a good focus on schedules and QA, plus ABC approach, but not much mention of env.</p>			

Firm Name: Charleston Engineering Group, P.C.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>PM (Scott Williams) has 16 yrs exp inc bridge replacements but not one as large as Ocmulgee. Road lead (David Mills) has 15 yrs exp in same role on a variety of project types but no bridge as large as the subject project. Bridge Lead (Josh Stamm) has 14 yrs exp including same role on a Flint River bridge. NEPA lead (Jill Brown) has 16 yrs exp and has done CEs on many bridge projects where she helped coordinate the special studies. She does not list a large bridge with NMFS challenges, however. Prime lists adequate experience on bridges but not one as large as the Ocmulgee.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Team has adequate depth with redundancy in bridge and road design, but only EPEI to do most env. Org chart clearly layed out. KTLS have good availability.</p>		

Firm Name: CNDY Engineering, LLC		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>PM (Chris Rideout) has 29 yrs of exp covering road design and project management for a variety of project types, but he does not list a bridge the size of the subject Ocmulgee replacement. Roadway lead (Eric Brisse) has 8 yrs exp in road design. He has served as lead designer on a few road projects but does not list a large river crossing like the Ocmulgee replacement, nor even a bridge replacement project. Well versed in PDP w 10 yrs at GDOT. Bridge design lead (Sam Wade) has 13 yrs exp. He lists a large bridge experienc on a 750-ft long structure over a reservoir in Walton County, GA. NEPA Lead (Michelle McIntosh) has 25 yrs exp in env work for transportation projects inc 10 yrs at GDOT. Has exp with NEPA, GEPA, EJ, and Public involvement. However, she does not list a similar bridge project to the subject projects. Prime lists numerous bridge replacements and holds a FY17 bundle of 7 off-system bridges. They do not list a large bridge.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Team has good depth with 6 subs and redundancy in all area classes, but Org chart is bare bones and does not list a lot of names, only has one person for QAQC (not indicted what his area of expertise is). Resource write-up shows that they will conduct extensive and early utility coordination, which should help the project. It's also mentioned that they have staff to review constructability, an important aspect for these bridges.</p>		

Firm Name: EXP MS Services, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>PM (DeWayne Comer) has 28 yrs exp w GDOT, where he did design and project management. From the GDOT side, he oversaw bridge replacements inc over Etowah River (which is much smaller than the Ocmulgee). Road Lead (David McFarlin) has 25 yrs exp inc as designer for bridge projects, although none listed was as large as the Ocmulgee. The Bridge Lead (Kamlesh Kumar) has 14 yrs exp and has designed multiple bridges but no large river crossing. NEPA Lead (Heather Edwards) has 18 yrs exp in env planning and cultural resources. She has prepared CEs for numerous bridge replacements with env issues but does not list a large bridge involving NMFS. Prime lists exp on multiple bridges, has done ABC, but does not list one as large as Ocmulgee River.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Team is fairly deep with 5 subs and redundancy in key design and env areas. Org chart has an incorrect name, listing Mark Grindstaff a EPEI, though he's been with another firm for quite some time. Have other names been vetted? Org chart lists more names for survey than for environmental. Only one name for QAQC also serves as constructability and VE reviewer. QAQC write-up lacks details/specifics. KTLs have good availability.</p>		

Firm Name: Pevens and Pugh		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Good
<p>PM (Keith Franklin) has 37 yrs exp managing a variety of project types, including bridge replacements. The examples he lists do not include a major river bridge replacement but does list several standalone bridge projects a widening that includes bridge work. Bridge lead (Greg Grant) has 34 yrs exp with structures inc a bridge replacement over Altamaha River, which will share many of the same env issues as the subject bridge over the Ocmulgee (e.g., NMFS coordination). Road lead (Tricia Hatley) has 25 yrs exp and has worked on several large bridges but her role was as Principal in Charge rather than lead design. NEPA Lead (Buddy Covington) has 20 yrs exp. He has completed numerous documents including a CE for a Satilla River crossing. Prime has worked on a number of bridge replacements including river crossings in OK.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Team has good depth with 8 subs and redundancy in most areas with archaeology and history being notable exceptions. Org chart does not list a lot of resources, just the KTLs plus a handful of other key players (one per area class). Additional resources include 25 PEs in GA. KTLs have good availability.</p>		

Firm Name: HOB Engineering, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→→ Adequate
<p>PM (Steven Jing) has 18 yrs exp and a structural eng background that would be good for the subject contract. Has worked on variety of bridges inc river crossing at Middle Oconee and Ocmulgee at SR16. Roadway lead (Phil Hutcherson) has 10 yrs exp and has worked on other bridge projects in similar role, but does not list a major river crossing. Bridge lead is also the PM. He seems to be well qualified to handle both roles but this could be a bottleneck. NEPA lead (Jordan Myers) is experienced (19 yrs) managing ecological tasks but does not show expertise as a NEPA lead. Knowledgeable on GDOT processes and PDP. Prime shows experience with bridge replacements but does not list a major crossing.</p>		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→→ Adequate
<p>Team is not particularly deep, with prime doing all design and a lot of env and EPEI assisting on environmental. One other firm is on the team to do geotech. That is adequate on this contract, but with little redundancy. Org chart shows a fair amount of resources to handle the 2 bridges. KTLs have good availability. Team includes QAQC reviewers for all products. Narrative on additional resources does not provide many specifics on who is available in what role.</p>		
Firm Name: Heath Lamborn Engineers, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→→ Good
<p>PM (Rudolph Frampton) has 23 yrs exp inc as PM for Altamaha River crossing that had similar challenges to the subject Ocmulgee River crossing as well as the 2200' Lake Blackshear bridge. Roadway Lead (Matt Calak) has 13 yrs exp but does not list work on a similar major river crossing. Bridge Lead (Theodore Sparks) has 18 yrs exp inc crossing of Chattahoochee River. NEPA lead (Jill Brown) has 16 yrs exp and has done CEs on many bridge projects where she helped coordinate the special studies. She does not list a large bridge with NMFS challenges, however. Prime lists work on numerous bridge projects, but not a large bridge such as the Ocmulgee. Prime has worked on numerous bridges inc major river crossings.</p>		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→→ Adequate
<p>Team has adequate depth but lacks redundancy in env area classes, with EPEI doing all env. Org chart is somewhat jumbled but has a good number of names other than KTLs to handle other area classes. KTLs have good avail.</p>		
Firm Name: Hall Consulting Company, LLC		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→→ Good
<p>PM (Brad Gowen) has 20 yrs exp most in roadway design but has been PM for similar projects such as Satilla River crossing. Roadway Design lead (Jacob Redwine) has 22 yrs exp and was lead eng for Satilla crossing, a similar project. Bridge Lead (Jeff Mulliken) has 29 yrs exp and a PhD. Worked on major river crossing in SC. NEPA Lead (Buddy Covington) has 20 yrs exp. He has completed numerous documents including a CE for a Satilla River crossing. Prime worked on Satilla River crossing as well as other bridges.</p>		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→→ Adequate
<p>Team has 7 subs and redundancy in some area classes, but lacks redundancy in some key areas. Only 1 firm doing NEPA, ecology, history and archaeo which could create a bottleneck. Org chart shows few resources for env and not a lot of names in other area classes. KTLs have good availability. Good QA QC approach with one for road and one for bridge.</p>		
Firm Name: H&H Group		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	→→ Marginal
<p>PM (Samuel Williams) has 20 yrs exp but doesn't list a major river crossing. Has other bridge exp. Road lead (Wendall McCarty) has 20 yrs exp but also does not list a major river crossing or even a bridge replacement over water. Bridge lead (Phil Lombardo) left role off of SOQ, has a minimal write-up that does not include how much engineering experience he has. Does not list a major river crossing experience. NEPA lead (Todd Barker) has 28 yrs of exp on numerous complex projects, but does not list a major river crossing. Prime lists examples of road improvements but not bridge replacements. Presumably the widenings included bridge work, but it was not explicit in write up.</p>		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	→→ Adequate
<p>Team has 8 subs, but no redundancy in env. Org chart is minimal with only 1 name per area class. Write up includes other resources such as aquatics and H&H and utility coordination. KTLs have good avail.</p>		

Firm Name: KST Technologies, Inc		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>PM (Kerrie Boyette) has 20 yrs exp on a variety of widenings and improvements, but does not list a standalone bridge project. Roadway lead (Holly Painter) mentions 13 yrs exp, but inset says "almost two decades", then final section says 15 years). Has worked as lead engineer on several other projects but does not list a standalone bridge project. SOQ also lists Eric Burgess as Roadway lead but he apparently is the Bridge Lead. He has 19 yrs exp. He lists several bridge projects he worked on, but most were as project manager and none was a major river crossing. Env lead (Patrick Smith) has 25 yrs exp; has completed numerous documents inc one in progress for another bridge over the Ocmulgee River. Prime lists some relevant bridge projects, inc Ogeechee River crossing, a 960-ft bridge.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Team has good depth, with 6 subs and redundancy in all area classes. Org chart is fairly bare and only includes the KTLs and a few other names representing each area class. Having a section 20 plan specialists will be helpful with delivery. Narrative shows teams ability to design a large number of bridges. KTLs have good avail.</p>		
Firm Name: Park & Wood, Inc		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>PM (Richard Gurney) has 30 plus years exp as a road designer and PM for road projects. Lists extensive experience as PM on bridge projects but does not include a large river crossing like the subject project. Roadway lead (Robert Renwick) has 12 yrs exp; has worked on large bridges over Chattahoochee and Lake Lanier. The next person identified is Jill Brown, the NEPA lead, though her role is not specifically stated. She has 16 yrs exp and has done CEs on many bridge projects where she helped coordinate the special studies. She does not list a large bridge with NMFS challenges, however. The last person listed is Mark Jones, who apparently is the bridge lead, though it is not specifically stated. He has extensive RR bridge exp but less roadway bridges; also, he does not include a large river crossing. Prime has exp w large bridges such as over Lake Lanier.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<p>Team has adequate depth with 5 subs, but EPEI is the only firm on-board for all env. Lack of redundancy in env could be a negative. Neither the org chart nor the narrative add much insight into their depth of resources or ability to succeed on these projects. KTLs have good avail.</p>		
Firm Name: Lowe Engineers LLC		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Good
<p>PM (Richard Meehan) has 31 yrs exp and has served the same role on similar projects, such as a Towaliga River and a Flint River bridge. Road design lead (Nathan Laird) has 20 yrs exp and has served same role on other large River crossings. Bridge Lead (George Manning) has 19 yrs exp and has served as lead structural engineer on large bridge replacements. Env lead (Patrick Smith) has 25 yrs exp; has completed numerous documents inc one in progress for another bridge over the Ocmulgee River. Prime lists several large bridges among among their projects, inc Flint River at SR 92 and South River at SR 36.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Team has 7 subs but lacks redundancy in key areas like env studies. Org chart is easy to follow, lists a good amount of resources, and includes multiple QAQC staff, inc one for env, which could help with delivery. Narrative lays out approach and select roles but would like to more specifics about meeting schedules and delivering quality.</p>		
Firm Name: Reed and Burn, Inc		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Good
<p>PM (Tony Steffee) has 16 yrs exp inc bridge design and project management. Has served as PM on 1300-ft Lynches River bridge in SC. Bridge Design lead (KV Bala) holds a PhD in structural engineering and has 33 yrs exp. Has designed more than 100 bridges inc large river bridges. Roadway lead (Dan Moses) has 27 yrs exp and served as roadway lead on river crossings. NEPA lead (Jill Brown) has 16 yrs exp and has done CEs on many bridge projects where she helped coordinate the special studies. She does not list a large bridge with NMFS challenges, however. Prime has delivered bridge projects including large river crossings.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Team has 5 subs, with redundancy in most areas. Archaeology has just EPEI, which could be a bottleneck. Org chart lists main resources. Local office is in Lexington, SC, which may not be convenient for meetings. They will have key staff work out of Peachtree City as needed. Part of write-up gets into approach, which should be phase II. Not a lot in the narrative about additional resources not already presented.</p>		

Firm Name: Michael Baker International, Inc		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Good
<p>PM (Al Bowman) has 30 yrs exp in design and construction and has led other major river crossings such as Chattahoochee River and Islands Expressway. Road Lead (Chad Havens) has 14 yrs exp and has served same role on other large crossings, e.g. Chattahoochee River and Islands Expressway. Bridge Lead (George Manning) has 19 yrs exp and has served as lead structural engineer on large bridge replacements. NEPA Lead has 40 yrs exp and worked on similar projects in that role. Prime has worked on other large bridges inc over Lake Lanier.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Team has good depth with 5 subs and redundancy in all key areas. Org chart mainly lists one contact for many area classes and multiple for road and structures. Narrative does not provide a lot of extra resources, and mostly reiterates KTL roles, but it does describe a good QAQC team. Write-up refers to Oconee River when it meant Ocmulgee.</p>		
Firm Name: Mehaff & Nichol		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<p>PM (Darren Walton) has 15 yrs exp mostly as a designer or deputy PM, but has served as PM on a bridge project over the Apalachee River. Road lead (Fahim Attar) has 11 yrs exp and served as roadway lead on the Brampton Road connector which includes multiple bridges. However, 2 of the 3 projects he lists are ones where he served as Assistant PM rather than roadway lead. The bridge lead (Robert Moreman) has just 7 yrs exp. He lists several bridges he's worked on but not in the lead design role. NEPA lead (Jill Brown) has 16 yrs exp and has done CEs on many bridge projects where she helped coordinate the special studies. She does not list a large bridge with NMFS challenges, however. Prime lists work on several bridge projects, but not a large bridge such as the Ocmulgee.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Team has just 2 subs and lacks redundancy in ecology and archaeology, which could be problematic. Org chart looks good with adequate resources and a QAQC team that includes bridge, roadway and environmental reviewers. Narrative has good focus on QC review roles and team availability, and firm's commitment to providing resources to deliver project. Would like to see more details on that.</p>		
Firm Name: Moreland Ansell Associates, Inc		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>PM (Brad Hale) has 27 yrs exp inc design and project management. Served as PM for bridge over Chattahoochee at US41 which is a similar large river to the Ocmulgee subject project. Road Lead (Ben Morden) has 5 yrs exp but never as lead. Bridge lead has 33 yrs exp in structures and project management. Has been structural lead on numerous bridges inc very long ones and river crossings. NEPA Lead has about 5 yrs exp and mostly has served as ecologist, with little exp in NEPA. Prime has worked on numerous bridges, including major river crossings like the subject project.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Team has 3 subs and adequate depth but lacks redundancy in history and archaeology which could be a bottleneck. Org chart shows a good amount of resources and and 3 QCQA staff, but none for environmental. Narrative shows a good amount of resources with a deputy PM added as well as a schedule specialist, constructability specialist, utility and RR coordination specialists. KTEs show availability.</p>		
Firm Name: Hill Macdonald, LLC		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Good
<p>PM (Ed Cullican) has 23 yrs exp in design and project management and lists several bridge projects he's worked on in PM role. Roadway lead (Johnny Lee) has 19 yrs exp and has been roadway lead on numerous similar projects for GDOT; has dealt with large bridges with env challenges such as over Satilla River and Altamaha River, which will share challenges with subject replacement over Ocmulgee. Bridge lead (Michael Russell) has 30 yrs exp; he lists plenty of bridge projects but does not seem to include one over a large river such as the Ocmulgee. NEPA lead (Jill Brown) has 16 yrs exp and has done CEs on many bridge projects where she helped coordinate the special studies. She does not list a large bridge with NMFS challenges, however. Prime lists work on numerous bridge projects, but not a large bridge such as the Ocmulgee.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Team has good depth with 6 subs but only EPEI to do most env, which could create a bottleneck. Org chart shows a good amount of resources, inc QAQC staff for road, structure, and env. Narrative describes that they have 2 distinct design teams for the 2 bridges. Additional staff in the narrative include hydraulics, constructability review and QA QC.</p>		

Firm Name: Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Good
<p><i>PM (Jay Simone) has 27 yrs exp in design and project management. He lists a variety of projects for which he's served as PM but does not include a large river crossing like the subject bridge over the Ocmulgee River. Roadway Lead (Eniel Gonzalez) has 16 yrs exp inc serving in the same role on a variety of projects but does not include a large river crossing. Bridge Lead (Joshua Orton) has 15 yrs exp. He's served as structural engineer for large bridges. NEPA Lead (Buddy Covington) has 20 yrs exp. He has completed numerous documents including a CE for a Satilla River crossing. Prime has worked on a number of bridge replacements but does not list a major river crossing.</i></p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p><i>Team has good depth, with 6 subs but lacks redundancy in arch and history, which could be a bottleneck for env studies. Org chart does not include a large number of names - for env, Buddy Covington is listed as the contact in 4 area classes. QA QC team is robust, with 4 SMEs. Narrative mentions ability to pull from 500-person eng staff plus subs, but does not describe any additional help above what's in org chart. KTLs have avail.</i></p>		



Firm Name: Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Good
<p><i>PM (Bill Rountree) has 33 yrs exp as design and PM. He's managed a number of bridge projects, but does not list a major river widening like the subject crossing of the Ocmulgee River. Roadway lead (Robert Delos Santos) has 21 yrs exp inc as road lead on 2 Flint River bridges. Bridge lead (Ted Davidson) has 32 yrs exp inc serving the lead bridge design role for over Broad River in SC. NEPA Lead (Buddy Covington) has 20 yrs exp. He has completed numerous documents including a CE for a Satilla River crossing. Prime has worked on a number of bridge replacements but does not list a major river crossing.</i></p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Good
<p><i>Team has good depth with 7 subs and redundancy in all major areas. Org chart is very detailed, with 2 teams in most major areas and 3 QAQC team members. Narrative describes local office with 50 engineers. Additional resource narrative focuses more on approach. KTLs have avail.</i></p>		

Firm Name: OHS Inc		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Good
<p><i>PM (Andrew Ballerstedt) has 29 yrs exp in design and PM inc serving as PM for Back River bridge, a major river crossing larger than the subject project, as well as other bridge projects. Road Lead (David Fox) has 14 yrs exp and has served as road lead on a number of bridges, but does not list a major river crossing. Bridge Lead (Scott Caples) has 30 yrs exp as a brige engineer, and has led bridge design for river crossings over the Flint and Tallulah Rivers. NEPA lead (Jill Brown) has 16 yrs exp and has done CEs on many bridge projects where she helped coordinate the special studies. She does not list a large bridge with NMFS challenges, however. Prime lists work on several bridge projects, inc the Back River bridge, a >2000' structur.</i></p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p><i>Team has good depth with 6 subs, but no redundancy in several env areas that could cause delays. Org chart is not very detailed with just 1 name for most area classes. Narrative brings in several additional resources, inc a 2nd bridge lead. Narrative provides a good approach to schedule management and QAQC. KTLs have avail.</i></p>		

Firm Name: RK Shan Associates, Inc		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p><i>PM (Raju Shah) has 40 yrs exp in roadway design and PM. He's led numerous bridge replacements and other types of projects but he does not list a major river crossing. Roadway Lead (Garrett Sauber) has 24 yrs exp but he does not list a major river crossing. Bridge lead (Sammy Powell) has 36 yrs exp on numerous bridges, but he does not list a major river crossing. NEPA lead (Jill Brown) has 16 yrs exp and has done CEs on many bridge projects where she helped coordinate the special studies. She does not list a large bridge with NMFS challenges, however. Same for prime.</i></p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p><i>Team has adequate depth but lacks redundancy in env area classes, with EPEI doing all env. Org chart shows a decent amount of resources, but PM and Road lead are also QAQC team, which id not a good idea in my opinion (need some separation from the project for good QA). Narrative does not bring in a lot of new resources. KTLs have avail.</i></p>		

Firm Name: RSH, Inc.			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p>PM (Dom Saulino) has 35 yrs exp inc design and PM work. He's worked on numerous bridge replacements inc over Satilla River with similar challenges to the subject project and other river crossings. Road Lead (Mac Cranford) has 15 yrs exp, most of that with GDOT. He's served as road lead on a similar crossing over Satilla River. Bridge Lead (Jin Liu) has 27 yrs exp in structures and he also was EOR on Satilla River bridge. NEPA lead (Jill Brown) has 16 yrs exp and has done CEs on many bridge projects where she helped coordinate the special studies. She does not list a large bridge with NMFS challenges, however. Prime worked on several bridges inc over Satilla River.</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>Team has adequate depth but lacks redundancy in env area classes, with EPEI doing most env, which could lead to delays. Org chart just includes 1 contact for most area classes and lacks env QAQC. Narrative lists additional resources w 19 transportation professionals at their GA office and ability to draw on additional staff nationwide. Also, they mention that they are finishing another bundle so will free up time. KTLs have avail.</p>			
Firm Name: Brasas Consulting Services, Inc.			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>PM (Mitchell Greenway) has 20 yrs exp in road design and as a PM. He has served as PM on numerous bridge projects but not a major river crossing like the subject Ocmulgee crossing. Roadway Lead (Anthony Kamburis) has 30 yrs exp inc. Lists some river crossings on which he was PM but not lead engineer. Bridge Lead (Robert Massaro) has 30 yrs exp and has worked on numerous bridges but does not list a major river crossing. NEPA Lead (David Smith) is a very experienced ecologist (21 yrs) who has worked in the NEPA lead role on a few projects. Prime lists bridge replacements but not a major river crossing.</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>Team has adequate depth with 4 subs and redundancy in most key areas. Org chart is clear and has a strong QAQC team 4 SMEs. Narrative talks of 51 people in Atlanta office available to help on this contract. Narrative for additional resources stresses collaboration and QAQC, but does not discuss new resources outside the org chart. KTL avail good.</p>			
Firm Name: STV Incorporated dba STV Hugh Whitehead Associates			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p>PM (Jeff Church) has 26 yrs exp in design and pm roles. He has served as PM on other river crossings. Road lead (David Syen) has served as lead engineer on other bridges inc river crossings. Bridge Lead (Josh Stamm) has 14 yrs exp including same role on a Flint River bridge. NEPA lead (Jennifer Mathis) has 17 yrs exp and has served as NEPA lead on other bridge bundles, including for river crossings. Prime has worked on recent bridge bundles inc bridges over the Flint River.</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>Team has good depth with 6 subs and redundancy in all area classes. Org chart shows good amount of resources but only one QAQC specialist who does not cover env. Narrative does not describe additional resources. KTLs have avail.</p>			
Firm Name: EY US Intellectual			
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>PM (Chuck Deeb) has 38 yrs exp managing and designing road projects but does not list a major river crossing (except feasibility study for one in FL). Road Design Lead has 20 yrs exp; he's served that role on other bridge projects but not a major river crossing. Bridge lead (Dennis Martinez) has 17 yrs exp inc a large crossing in FL. NEPA lead (Todd Barker) has 28 yrs of exp on numerous complex projects, but does not list a major river crossing. Prime does not list a major river crossing but has some complex bridge projects with similar issues.</p>			
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p>Team has 8 subs with redundancy in key areas where needed. Org chart is fairly spare with few names and just 1 QAQC person. Narrative refers to firms' 750 employees in 30 US offices who could assist. Good focus on constructability, schedule, and QAQC in write-up.</p>			

Firm Name: Thompson Engineering, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>PM (Tom Harjung) has 29 yrs exp in design and PM roles. Typo "Glenn" County. He lists a number of projects; includes one major river crossing at MacKay River but it was not a replacement, just a fender repair. Road Lead (Greg Lowe) has 31 yrs exp inc Mobile River bridge. Bridge Lead (Scott Caples) has 30 yrs exp as a bridge engineer, and has led bridge design for river crossings over the Flint and Tallulah Rivers. NEPA lead (Jill Brown) has 16 yrs exp and has done CEs on many bridge projects where she helped coordinate the special studies. She does not list a large bridge with NMFS challenges, however. Prime lists a large bridge over Mobile River which would face similar challenges.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>Team has 4 subs but lacks redundancy in key env areas with just EPEI, which could lead to delays. Org chart shows just contacts for area classes but just one QAQC person. Narrative for additional resources does not bring many new resources not shown on org chart.</i></p>			
Firm Name: TransSystems Corporation			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p><i>PM (Alex Stone) has 24 yrs exp in design and PM roles inc one with a major river crossing over Chattahoochee. Roadway lead (David Henry) has 25 yrs exp but not a major river crossing the scale of the Ocmulgee bridge. Bridge Lead (John McWhorter) has 25 yrs exp; served as lead design on several bridges; none as large as Ocmulgee, but a river in north ga. NEPA lead (Jill Brown) has 16 yrs exp and has done CEs on many bridge projects where she helped coordinate the special studies. She does not list a large bridge with NMFS challenges, however. Prime has worked on large bridges in GA.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>Team has adequate depth with 4 subs but lacks redundancy in key env areas. Org chart has teams for each bridge for design and env, but most team members are same. They list 3 qaqc people which is good. Narrative for additional resources lists 18 staff in Atlanta area and 800 nationally who could assist. Discussion focuses on approach to project management more than additional resource.s</i></p>			
Firm Name: Vaughn & Walsh Consulting Engineers, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>PM (David Millen) has 33 yrs exp in design and pm roles and is former district engineer for D3. He has worked on other large river crossings but not in this same role. Bridge lead (Hardy Willis) has 28 yrs exp. Inc over Ogeechee River and Sidney Lanier bridge. Unclear if he did so as lead bridge engineer in those cases. Road lead (Reece Schuler) has 20 yrs exp but does not list a major river crossing. Road lead 2 (Melanie Hale) has 12 yrs exp but does not list a major crossing. They do not explain why 2 leads are provided (one per bridge?). NEPA lead (Jill Brown) has 16 yrs exp and has done CEs on many bridge projects where she helped coordinate the special studies. She does not list a large bridge with NMFS challenges, however. Prime does not list a major river bridge replacement but worked to rehab a Chattahoochee River RR bridge.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>Team has adequate depth with 4 subs but lacks redundancy in key env areas. Org chart is provided (twice) at the beginning of SOQ rather than in appropriate section. They show 5 QAQC team members along with other contracts per area class. Narrative recaps team makeup but does not bring in additional resources.</i></p>			
Firm Name: Wood EB			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>PM (David Griffin) has 47 yrs exp and retired from GDOT as Assistant District Eng, 32 yrs at GDOT and 17 yrs in consulting. His exp as PM inc a bridge replacement over the Savannah River which would face similar env challenges. Roadway Lead (Mohammed Azim) has 16 yrs exp. Projects listed involve bridges but not a large river crossing like the subject bridge over the Ocmulgee. Bridge Lead (Sam Deeb) has 29 yrs exp with structures, inc large bridges such as over the Chattahoochee. NEPA Lead (Erin Murphy) has 14 yrs exp. She has led env on numerous bridge replacement projects, but does not list one as large or complex as the subject Ocmulgee replacement. Prime lists a number of projects involving bridges but not a major river crossing.</i></p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p><i>Team has 4 subs and redundancy in all major areas. Org chart lists 3 QAQC reviewers, but they could use one specializing in env. Narrative mostly reiterates the KTLs qualifications and adds good attention to schedules and QAQC. KTLs have good avail.</i></p>			

Firm Name: WEP USA III		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating 	Good
<p>PM (Steve Linley) has 30 yrs exp in design and pm roles. He lists large bridges that he was road designer for (Chattahoochee) and several bridge projects where he was PM. Road Lead (Tori Brinkley) has 11 yrs exp but does not list a major river crossing like the subject replacement over the Ocmulgee. Bridge Lead (Arun Saha) has 26 yrs exp on structures inc as lead on a 660-ft bridge over Coosawatee River as well as a number of other bridges. NEPA Lead (Emily Ritzler) has 20 yrs exp and has worked on a number of bridge projects, but not one as large as the subject bridge involving NMFS coordination. Prime lists a few bridge projects but not a major river crossing like the subject project.</p>		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating 	Good
<p>Team has 4 subs with redundancy in key areas with the exception of archaeology. Org chart is fairly robust, with a good number of resources on the engineering side, but just one per area class for env. They have 3 QAQC team members inc an environmental, but she's also the env lead, which means she may not have enough distance from the project to be an objective reviewer. Additional resources describes corporate depth as well as some experts added to the team in various capacities such as QAQC, erosion control, and constructability.</p>		

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications
Resources and Workload Capacity

Evaluator 4

	300	200	Phase One Evaluator 4 Individual	
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	Total Score	Ranking
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼		
Barge Design Solutions, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	15
Calyx Engineers and Consultants	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C	Marginal	Adequate	175	15
Cranston Engineering Group, P.C	Marginal	Adequate	175	15
CROY Engineering, LLC	Marginal	Marginal	125	26
EXP US Services, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	15
Freese and Nichols	Marginal	Marginal	125	26
HDR Engineering, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	15
Heath Linebeck Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Marginal	200	11
IDS Global	Marginal	Marginal	125	26
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Marginal	200	11
Keck & Wood, Inc	Adequate	Marginal	200	11
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Mead and Hunt, Inc	Adequate	Marginal	200	11
Michael Baker International, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	1
Moffatt & Nichol	Marginal	Adequate	175	15
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	15
Mott MacDonald, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	175	15
Neel-Schaffer, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	15
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
QK4, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
RK Shah Associates, Inc	Marginal	Marginal	125	26
RSH, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc	Marginal	Marginal	125	26
STV Incorporated	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
TY Lin International	Marginal	Adequate	175	15
Thompson Engineering, Inc	Marginal	Marginal	125	26
TranSystems Corporation	Good	Adequate	325	1
Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc	Marginal	Marginal	125	26
Wood EIS	Marginal	Adequate	175	15
WSP USA Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	3
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	500	%



GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-052819, Contract 4	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #:	4		
Evaluation Committee: 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			
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			
Firm Name:	Bargh Design Solutions, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	Marginal
<p>No PI numbers are provided for GDOT projects in PM and KTLs experience, except for the NEPA leader's experience.</p> <p>PM has 18 years of engineering experience. He presented 4 projects that he managed and 1 project he worked as a design lead. In two of the presented projects, his roles are different from the ones in another firm's proposal that he is listed as a roadway lead.</p> <p>RDL's experience shows the general scope of the works, but doesn't show the current status or works he has done.</p> <p>BDL has 30 years of experience, including the work as a senior bridge design engineer for the bridges over stream. His experience presents relevance to a wrong contract (referenced to Contract 2, not this Contract 4).</p> <p>Prime experience shows only one project that PM and RDL are commonly involved, but RDL's role is not clear. BDL shows no experience with PM or RDL.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	Adequate
<p>Org chart shows a reasonable depth of the design squads, with multiple QA/QC personnel.</p> <p>PM and KDLs are highly available for the contract, except for NEPA lead with about 50% of commitment to 12 existing projects.</p> <p>PM's commitment table doesn't match with the one provided in another firm's proposal that he is listed as a roadway lead.</p>			
Firm Name:	Calva Engineers and Consultants		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	Adequate
<p>PM has 29 years of experience in roadway design. PM's experience presents many projects with only brief description of the projects. Unique challenges of the projects and PM's work on those are not presented.</p> <p>RDL's experience shows most of the projects that he worked as the project engineer, and his role on most of the projects is not clear. One project is presented that he worked as a PM.</p> <p>BDL has 30 years of experience in various bridge and structure design. His experience shows multiple stream crossing bridge projects that he managed the structure design.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	Adequate
<p>Org chart shows a reasonable depth of the design squads, with QA/QC manager.</p> <p>PM has less than 50% of availability on this contract. KDLs are highly available for the contract.</p>			
Firm Name:	Clark Peterson Engineers, Surveyors and Architects, P.C.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	—————>	Marginal
<p>PM has over 25 years of experience, including project management of multiple road widening and intersection improvement projects. None of her experience shows a similar scope of work with this contract.</p> <p>RDL shows experience in various projects, but his role in those is not clear.</p> <p>BDL's experience shows many projects with very brief description. No detailed information was provided regarding the unique challenges or achievements in the projects.</p> <p>Prime's experience shows six projects PM and KTLs were not involved in any of those.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————>	Adequate
<p>Org chart shows a depth of the design squads with multiple experienced QC/QA members.</p> <p>PM is fully available for this contract. RDL has less than 50% of availability for the contract. BDL and NEPA lead have about 50% of availability for this project, but they are committed to 10 or more current projects.</p>			

Firm Name: CH2M HILL ENGINEERING GROUP, P.C.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Marginal
<p>PM has 16 years of experience, but shows no solid project management experience for similar projects with this contract. RDL has shows only one project with similar work scope with this contract, that he worked as a project manager. BDL's experience shows one bridge over railroad and one pedestrian bridge that he works as the bridge lead. His roles in other presented projects are not clear. Prime experience shows no projects similar to this contract.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
<p>Org chart shows reasonable depth in design squad and multiple QC/QA personnel. PM is almost fully available for the project. RDL has less than 50% of availability on this contract. NEPA lead has about 50% of commitment to 12 existing projects.</p>			
Firm Name: CROY Engineering, LLC			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Marginal
<p>PM has 29 years of experience, and shows experience of managing a multiple projects with similar work scope. Owner information and PI numbers are not provided for most of the projects in his experience. RDL has 8 years of experience, and shows two projects he worked as a roadway design lead. One is widening and the other is roundabout, so they not similar to the projects in this contract. BDL has 13 years of experience. His experience includes lead structure engineer for two projects in early stage, and one project that he worked as a lead designer. Prime experience shows four projects, but they are working as a sub-consultant for all of them.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Marginal
<p>A relatively short org chart is presented. Personnel from prime and sub-consultants are not identified in the org chart. No names in NEPA teams are presented, except for the lead. PM and KTLs are reasonably available for the contract, except for BDL with less than 50% of availability.</p>			
Firm Name: EXP US Services, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Marginal
<p>PM has 28 years of experience, including managing the projects with bridges over railroad and stream. RDL presented only projects that he worked as a project manager. BDL shows three projects, but no projects were performed by him as a lead design engineer. He doesn't show knowledge or experience with GDOT PDP and bridge design manuals. Prime's experience shows a project that PM worked with his former employer. No common involvements of the PM and KTLs are shown in the prime experience.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Adequate
<p>A deep org chart is shown with QA/QC personnel. PM, RDL, and NEPA lead are almost fully available for this project. BDL has about 50% of availability, but all of his current projects are out-of state ones.</p>			
Firm Name: Pease and Hubbs			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Marginal
<p>No PI numbers are provided for the GDOT projects throughout the statement. PM has 36 years of extensive experience, including project management of bridge replacement and roadway widening projects. RDL has broad experience, but doesn't present the roadway design lead experience. She worked as a Principle-in-Charge or PM for the projects presented. She shows no experience or knowledge on GDOT PDP process. BDL has 34 years of extensive experience, but only one design-build project he presented shows his role as a bridge design lead. Prime experience shows only roadway improvement and bridge rehabilitation projects. Only BDL is involved in those projects.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	Marginal
<p>A very short org chart is presented with only one bridge design personnel. PM and KTLs are highly available for this contract.</p>			

Firm Name: RDL Engineering, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p>No PI numbers are provided for the GDOT projects throughout the statement. PM will perform as BDL for the contract. RDL's experience lists only projects out of state, but he took GDOT PDP training and experience in the GDOT projects. Prime experience doesn't provide the information on the involvement of KTLs.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>A reasonable depth in org chart is presented with multiple QCQA personnel. PM is committed 50% to one out of state project. RDL has over 65% of time committed to the current out of state project, so he has limited availability on this project. NEPA lead has 50% of availability on this contract.</p>			

Firm Name: Heath Litchbeck Engineers, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>PM has 23 years of experience and shows PM and assistant PM experience in the stream crossing bridge replacement projects. RDL has 13 years of experience, including the design lead on widening and bridge replacement projects. BDL shows his lead design experience for the projects with bridges over water and railroad. Prime experience presents briefly the unique challenges and achievements on the projects. PM and KTLs have common involvement in those projects.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>A reasonable depth in org chart is presented with two bridge design teams. Multiple QCQA personnel are included. PM and NEPA lead have less than 50% of availability for this contract. RDL and BDL are highly available</p>			

Firm Name: Hill Consulting Company, LLC			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>No PI numbers are provided for the GDOT projects throughout the statement. PM has 20 years of experience, and he shows project management experience for the projects with stream crossing bridges. RDL has 22 years of experience, including a lead roadway engineer for the similar projects to this contract. BDL's experience presents only out of state projects. He doesn't show his knowledge and experience with the GDOT PDP, bridge design manuals and other guidelines. Prime experience presents bridge replacement projects that are in the early stage, so there are no detailed descriptions on the challenges and achievements presented. In one roadway project completed for a local government, the proposed PM was involved but his role is not clear.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p>A relatively short org chart is presented. Only BDL is shown in the bridge design squad. PM and RDL have over 50% of availabilities for the contract. BDL and NEPA lead are over 90% available on the project.</p>			









Firm Name: DB Group			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p>PM's experience shows the projects worked as a sub-consultant. RDL's experience presents the projects too briefly. His role is not clear in those projects. BDL's experience doesn't show his position or role in those projects. Prime experience listed all projects worked as a sub-consultant. Prime experience doesn't provide the information on the involvement of KTLs.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p>Org chart doesn't match with Section B for the roles of the members. No design squad members are listed. PM and all KTLs are highly available.</p>			

Firm Name: RCI Technologies, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>PM's engineering experience shows her project management experience for various projects including the bridge replacements. Her project management experience shows many projects with very brief descriptions. No detailed challenges or achievements are described for those projects.</p> <p>RDL experience shows her roles as the project manager or lead transportation engineer. PI numbers are not provided for the GDOT projects. BDL's position is wrong in the title: it is presented as Roadway Lead. His position in most of the projects is PM, with only one project as PM/Lead bridge design. His knowledge in GDOT bridge design manual and guidelines is not clear.</p> <p>Prime experience presented no projects that the PM and KTL were commonly involved.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p>A very short org chart is presented for bridge design squad with BDL and only one other member from sub-consultant. PM and KTLs are highly available, except for the NEPA lead with about 50% availability.</p>			

Firm Name: Mack & Wood, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>PM shows project management experience in multiple widening projects that include the stream and railroad crossing bridges. His roles in those projects are clearly described.</p> <p>RDL's experience presents projects that includes the stream crossing bridge replacements.</p> <p>BDL shows experience in managing and serving as EOR in multiple bridge projects, but not as a lead design engineer.</p> <p>BDL and NEPA lead's positions in this contract are not shown in the Section B.</p> <p>Prime experience shows projects that the PM and KTLs were commonly involved.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p>There is no bridge design squad in the org chart, except for the BDL from a sub-consultant. PM and KTLs are almost fully available for this contract. NEPA lead has about 50% availability.</p>			

Firm Name: Lowe Engineers, LLC			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>PM has 31 years of experience. He presented five projects with bridges over stream and railroad in his experience, which he started the projects as the PM and moved to QC Manager later.</p> <p>RDL has 20 years of experience including multiple projects for stream/railroad crossing bridge replacements that he worked as a roadway design lead.</p> <p>BDL shows experience as "structural engineer" in multiple projects, but it is not clear if he served as lead designer for those projects. His roles in the current projects in his commitment table are all design leads.</p> <p>Prime's experience shows multiple bridge replacement projects that the PM and KTLs worked together as their proposed roles.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>A reasonable depth in org chart is shown with multiple QC/QA personnel. PM and all KTLs have over 50% availabilities for this contract.</p>			

Firm Name: Reed and Hunt, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>PM's experience shows all projects out of state, and does not provide his knowledge or experience with GDOT PDP process and other guidelines. Project descriptions are too brief and no unique challenges or achievements are addressed.</p> <p>RDL's experience shows projects he served as PM, EOR, roadway designer. His role is not clear in those projects.</p> <p>BDL has 33 years of experience, and shows the stream crossing bridge projects.</p> <p>Prime experience lists bridge replacement projects that the PM and KTLs are commonly involved.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p>A reasonable depth in org chart is shown with QC/QA personnel. PM and BDL are committed 60% and 80% to the current out of state projects. RDL and NEPA lead have about 50% availability on this contract.</p>			

Firm Name: Michael Baker International, Inc.	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Good
<p>No PI numbers are provided for the GDOT projects throughout the statement.</p> <p>PM has 30 years of experience, including bridges over water and railroad. PM's experience briefly shows the unique features of projects and works performed.</p> <p>RDL's experience includes the projects with stream crossing bridges.</p> <p>BDL has 19 years of experience, and his experience includes projects as lead designer for bridges over stream and a project as structural engineer for a bridge over railroad.</p> <p>Prime experience presents projects that include the bridges over stream and railroad. The proposed PM and KTLs are commonly involved in those projects.</p>	
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating  Adequate
<p>A reasonable depth in org chart is shown with multiple QC/QA personnel. The supporting areas, such as geotechnical, survey and SUE, list only one design member from sub-consultants.</p> <p>PM and all KTLs have high availabilities for this contract.</p>	
Firm Name: Mullan & Hooper	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Marginal
<p>PM's experience shows the Assistant or Deputy PM for most of the projects and PM for one project that is in early stage. Those projects included the bridges over stream and railroad.</p> <p>RDL shows experience as a design lead for one project that includes the bridge over railroad and experience as assistant PM for two projects. His experience doesn't provide the PI numbers for GDOT projects.</p> <p>BDL has relatively short experience with no projects as a lead engineer. His experience includes the hydraulic studies for stream crossing bridges, but no bridges over railroad.</p> <p>Prime experience shows the common involvement of the proposed PM and KTLs, but their roles in those projects are not provided.</p>	
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating  Adequate
<p>A reasonable depth in org chart is provided with multiple QC/QA personnel.</p> <p>PM, RDL and BDL are highly available for this contract. NEPA lead has about 50% of availability.</p>	
Firm Name: Morland Ansell Associates, Inc.	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Marginal
<p>PM has 27 years of experience. The provided experience shows mixed roles in various projects.</p> <p>RDL shows no experience as lead design engineer.</p> <p>BDL has 33 years of experience including the bridge design lead for the projects with the bridges over stream and railroad. The provided project descriptions are too brief.</p> <p>NEPA lead shows experience as an ecologist, but not as an entire environmental team leader.</p> <p>Prime's experience shows projects that the proposed PM worked with the KTLs, but their roles in some of those projects are not clear.</p>	
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating  Adequate
<p>A reasonable depth in the org chart is presented with multiple QC/QA personnel.</p> <p>PM, RDL, and NEPA lead are highly available for this contract. BDL has less than 50% of availability.</p>	
Firm Name: Mor MacDonnell LLC	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Marginal
<p>PM has 23 years of experience including the management of projects that have stream crossing bridges.</p> <p>RDL from a sub-consultant shows the same projects that he provided as a proposed PM in his firm's proposal, but his roles on those projects don't match.</p> <p>BDL has over 30 years of experience, including design lead in projects that have the stream crossing bridges.</p> <p>Prime's experience shows projects that PM and BDL are involved together, but their roles on those projects are not provided.</p>	
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating  Adequate
<p>A reasonable depth in org chart is shown with multiple QC/QA personnel.</p> <p>PM, RDL, and BDL are highly available for this contract. The RDL's commitment table is different from the one he provided in the separate proposal as a PM for his firm. NEPA lead has about 50% of availability.</p>	

Firm Name: [Redacted]	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating Marginal
<p>PM has 27 years of experience, including PM for the projects that have bridges over stream and railroad. The experienced project descriptions are very brief and no unique challenges or achievements on those projects are not presented. No PI numbers for GDOT projects are not provided in his experience.</p> <p>RDL shows a number of projects he worked on as roadway task leader, lead wall coordinator, and lead project engineer. Those projects' work scopes are briefly presented, but his work performed is not clear.</p> <p>BDL's experience shows 4 projects that he worked as PM or sub-consultant PM.</p> <p>Prime experience shows only projects that the proposed PM has been working as a PM. No projects show the common involvement of the proposed PM and KTLs.</p>	
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating Adequate
<p>A reasonable depth in org chart is shown with multiple QC/QA personnel.</p> <p>PM and BDL have less than 50% of availability on the contract, while RDL has over 50%.</p>	

Firm Name: [Redacted]	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating Adequate
<p>PM has 32 years of experience, including managing a current widening project as PM and previous projects as GDOT PM. The listed projects' descriptions are too brief, and no unique challenges or achievements on those projects are not provided.</p> <p>RDL shows experience as a design lead on projects with bridges over stream and railroad.</p> <p>BDL has 32 years of experience, including GDOT bridge projects that he worked as supervising structural engineer and out of state projects he worked as lead structural engineer. Project descriptions are very brief.</p> <p>Prime experience shows multiple widening projects with the common involvement of PM and KTLs, but their roles in the listed projects are not provided.</p>	
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating Adequate
<p>A deep org chart presented with multiple design squads and QC/QA personnel.</p> <p>PM and RDL are highly available for this contract. NEPA lead's commitment table is different from the ones provided in other proposals that he is a proposed lead in.</p>	

Firm Name: [Redacted]	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating Adequate
<p>PI numbers are not provided for GDOT projects in the PM and KTLs experience.</p> <p>PM has 29 years of experience. PM's experience shows managing various projects, including roadway widening and bridge replacements.</p> <p>RDL shows experience as lead engineer in multiple widening and bridge replacement projects.</p> <p>BDL has 30 years of experience. His experience shows bridge design manager and PM role in projects with bridges over stream and railroad.</p> <p>Prime experience shows one project with PM and KTLs' common involvement, which is in PFPR stage.</p>	
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating Adequate
<p>A relatively short org chart is presented. Multiple QC/QA personnel are assigned.</p> <p>PM, RDL and BDL have over 50% of availabilities for the contract. NEPA lead has about 50% of availability.</p>	

Firm Name: [Redacted]	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating Marginal
<p>PM has 40 years of experience, but his experience shows the roadway design management only for most projects.</p> <p>RDL's experience shows two projects as design lead and other two projects as QC reviewer. Those projects include stream crossing bridges.</p> <p>BDL has 36 years of experience. His experience shows multiple bridge bundles, but works he performed in most of those projects are not clearly presented.</p> <p>Prime experience shows the projects that PM and proposed KTLs are commonly involved.</p>	
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating Marginal
<p>PM and RDL are listed as QC/QA. No other independent QC/QA personnel are listed.</p> <p>PM and RDL are highly available for this project. BDL and NEPA lead have about 50% of availabilities.</p>	

Firm Name: RDL, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>PI numbers of the GDOT projects are not provided in PM and KTLs' experience.</p> <p>PM has 35 years of experience. PM's experience explains briefly well the unique features of the projects and the coordination work performed with federal and local public organizations. PM is not a registered PE.</p> <p>RDL's experience shows his design lead role on the projects that include stream crossing bridges.</p> <p>BDL has 27 years of experience. His experience shows three projects that he worked as structural EOR.</p> <p>Prime experience shows a number of stream crossing bridge projects that PM and KTLs are commonly involved. No projects are shown for bridge over railroad.</p>		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Relatively short list for the bridge design team in the org chart is shown. Multiple QC/QA personnel is shown in the org chart.</p> <p>PM and NEPA lead have about 50% of availabilities on this contract. RDL and BDL are committed over 80% of their time to the current projects, but it is claimed that RDL will be much more available by the time of NTP for this contract.</p>		
Firm Name: Skentis Consulting Services, Inc.		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 50%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<p>PM has 20 years of experience. His experience shows most of the projects he worked as a double role (PM and lead roadway designer). In some of those project, he worked as a sub-consultant so didn't manage the entire project scopes.</p> <p>RDL shows experience as a lead engineer in local government projects and as a PM in one bridge bundle contract.</p> <p>BDL has 30 years of experience, including lead bridge engineer for projects that have stream crossing bridges.</p> <p>Prime experience shows no projects that PM and KTLs are commonly involved.</p>		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<p>A reasonable depth in org chart is shown with separate QC/QA personnel in each areas.</p> <p>BDL's commitment table is not provided.</p> <p>PM and KTLs have over 50% of availabilities for the contract. NEPA lead's hours of availability is calculated incorrectly.</p>		
Firm Name: STV Incorporated dba STV Raigh Whitmead Associates		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>PM has 26 years of experience. He shows experience in managing projects with bridges over stream and railroad.</p> <p>RDL has 10 years of experience, including lead roadway engineer and roadway engineer's role on GDOT and local government projects.</p> <p>BDL has 14 years of experience, including senior or lead bridge engineer's role on projects that have bridges over stream and railroad.</p> <p>Prime experience includes the projects that PM and KTLs work together.</p>		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>A reasonable depth is shown in the org chart, with QC/QA personnel.</p> <p>PM and all KTLs have over 50% of availabilities for the project.</p>		
Firm Name: TV 310 International		
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<p>No PI numbers of the GDOT projects are provided throughout the statement.</p> <p>PM has 38 years of experience. His experience various projects with various roles, but the project descriptions are too brief and no project specific challenges and achievements are presented. A better editorial QC is needed on highlighting and bolding the titles of the projects.</p> <p>RDL shows experience as senior design engineer and project manager.</p> <p>BDL's experience includes the projects he worked as a structural engineer or deputy PM, not the design lead. it describes the projects' general and roadway features, not the bridges.</p> <p>Prime experience shows the involvement of Ms. Sarah Percy as a roadway design lead. It is not clear if she was the design lead on those projects, or editorial mistake that designates her as a proposed lead for this contract.</p>		
B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>A relatively short depth in org chart is presented with one QA/QC person.</p> <p>PM, RDL, and BDL are highly available on this project. NEPA lead has about 40% of availability.</p>		

Firm Name: Thomson Engineering, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p>No PI numbers of the GDOT projects are provided PM and KTLs experience.</p> <p>PM has 29 years of experience and presented the projects he performed "senior project manager" role, but his role on those projects is not clearly presented. The projects' descriptions are too brief, and no project specific challenges and achievements are presented.</p> <p>RDL's experience shows only out of state projects, and his knowledge on GDOT PDP and other guidelines is not clearly presented.</p> <p>BDL's experience shows two projects he worked as bridge design manager, and one project as a bridge design lead and he performed QC for bridge design/plans.</p> <p>Prime experience shows all projects with the involvement of only the proposed PM, except for one out of state project that the proposed RDL worked with PM.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p>The org chart is not well organized. Only one roadway designer and bridge designer are assigned to each squad except for PM and KTLs. PM is almost fully available on this contract. RDL is committed over 60% of his time to all out of state projects. BDL and NEPA lead are reasonably available on this contract.</p>			
Firm Name: TransSystems Corporation			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Good
<p>No PI numbers of the GDOT projects are provided throughout the statement.</p> <p>PM shows management experience in projects that include stream crossing bridges. The listed projects briefly describe the works he performed.</p> <p>RDL shows experience as lead roadway design for the bridge replacement projects.</p> <p>BDL has 25 years of experience including the bridge design lead for stream crossing bridge replacement projects.</p> <p>Prime experience shows no involvement of the proposed PM, but presented two projects that RDL (as PM) and BDL are commonly involved.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Adequate
<p>Org chart shows multiple design squads, separately assigned to each bridge, and multiple QC/QA personnel.</p> <p>PM is highly available on this contract. RDL also has over 70% of availability. BDL and NEPA have 50% or more of availabilities.</p>			
Firm Name: Vaughn & Mullen Consulting Engineers, Inc.			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p>PM's experience shows bridge replacement projects he worked as GDOT district preconstruction engineer. PM possesses PLS license, but no PE.</p> <p>Two RDLs are assigned on this contract, but their separate roles on this contract are not clearly presented. One RDL listed projects that he worked as PM or lead roadway engineer, but his works performed in the individual projects are not clear. The other RDL shows no experience as a design lead in her listed projects.</p> <p>BDL's experience listed the projects with no information presented on his roles in the individual projects. It is mentioned that he worked as PM or PE for those projects.</p> <p>Prime's experience shows the involvement of individuals that are not the proposed key members in this projects. No projects show the common involvement of PM and KTLs of this project.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		Marginal
<p>Two separate org charts are presented, one for each bridge. Both RDLs are assigned as key lead in both org chart. Same persons are assigned in the design squads and QA/QC.</p> <p>There is an editorial mistake: the org chart (Section C1A) is placed before Section B.</p> <p>PM, RDL, and BDL are reasonably available on this contract. NEPA lead's commitment table is different from the one provided in other firms' proposals.</p>			

Firm Name: Wood EIR		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Marginal
<p>PM's experience includes multiple widening projects and one of them includes the bridges, but his roles in the listed projects are not clearly provided. PM doesn't possess a BS degree or a PE license.</p> <p>RDL has 16 years of experience including the roadway project lead on widening and intersection improvement projects. No projects shown include the bridge.</p> <p>BDL has over 29 years of experience. His experience lists the projects that includes bridges over stream and roadway that he worked as the "bridge project manager".</p> <p>Prime experience included projects that PM and KTLs are commonly involved.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>A reasonable depth is shown in the org chart, with QC/QA and independent design review personnel.</p> <p>PM and all KTLs are highly available on the project.</p>		

Firm Name: WSP USA Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>PM has 30 years of experience including the management of the projects for bridge replacements. Experienced projects are presented with very brief descriptions. No detailed challenges or achievements are described for those projects.</p> <p>RDL shows experience as a roadway design lead for the roadway widening and bridge replacements. The projects' descriptions are very brief and no detailed challenges or achievements for those projects are presented.</p> <p>BDL has 26 years of experience including bridge design projects that he worked as a lead bridge design engineer, senior bridge engineer and QC/QA bridge engineer.</p> <p>Prime experience shows no projects that the PM and KTLs are commonly involved.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>A deep org chart is presented with balanced prime's design squad and subconsultants' support teams. Multiple QC/QA personnel is presented.</p> <p>PM and all KTLs are highly available on this contract.</p>		

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

Solicitation Title	Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 4	1	Lowe Engineers, LLC	
Solicitation #	RFQ-484-052819	1	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	
PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria FOR TOP FIFTEEN SUBITTALS		3	STV Incorporated	
(This Page For GDOT Use)		3	Michael Baker International, Inc.	
		5	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING)		6	TranSystems Corporation
		Group	6	RSH, Inc.
		Score	6	Calyx Engineers and Consultants
		Ranking	6	QK4, Inc.
			6	Heath Lineback Engineers, Inc.
			6	WSP USA Inc.
			6	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.
			6	KCI Technologies, Inc.
			14	Holt Consulting Company, LLC
			15	Mott MacDonald, LLC
	Lowe Engineers, LLC	375	1	
	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	375	1	
	STV Incorporated	325	3	
	TranSystems Corporation	250	6	
	Michael Baker International, Inc.	325	3	
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	300	5		
RSH, Inc.	250	6		
Calyx Engineers and Consultants	250	6		
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	200	14		
QK4, Inc.	250	6		
Heath Lineback Engineers, Inc.	250	6		
WSP USA Inc.	250	6		
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	250	6		
KCI Technologies, Inc.	250	6		
Mott MacDonald, LLC	175	15		

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications

Resources and Workload Capacity

SUBMITTING FIRMS	Maximum Points allowed =		Phase One Scores and Group Ranking	
	300	200	Total Score	Ranking
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Good	375	1
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	Good	Good	375	1
STV Incorporated	Good	Adequate	325	3
TranSystems Corporation	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
Michael Baker International, Inc.	Good	Adequate	325	3
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	Adequate	Good	300	5
RSH, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
Calyx Engineers and Consultants	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Marginal	200	14
QK4, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
Heath Lineback Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
WSP USA Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
KCI Technologies, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	6
Mott MacDonald, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	175	15
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	500	%

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Lowe Engineers, LLC	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Lowe Engineers- The PM and Roadway Key Team Lead (KTL) showed strong relatable project experience but the specific roles could have been better defined. For example, the team is unsure as to what "Initial project manager" entails. The Bridge KTL had good projects listed and well defined roles. Environmental Lead showed good relevant projects. The PM initial experience was as the Project Manager but did not show experience taking the project all the way through the PDP. All Key team leads worked together on previous projects except for the NEPA Lead. The PM started as a project manager on projects listed and then switched roles to a QA/QC reviewer.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Lowe Engineers- Showed good strategy on delivering the project by having multiple KTLs that have been PMs on other project. As a survey firm, they are capable of using drones and constructability engineer on the team. The proposal only shows one Environmental firm which could lead to delays. The narrative was well written and the organizational chart showed good depth. The firm also showed a three person QA team. The team has worked together on previous projects. The organizational chart does not clearly state the Prime members and sub-consultant members.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Parsons Transportation-the Roadway KTL had very relevant project experience with bridges over water and railroad and the roles were well defined. The PM showed experience with bridges over railroad and water and also showed extensive knowledge of District 3. The PM used to be the Pre-construction Engineer for District 3. The NEPA Lead had extensive experience and worked on similar major river crossings. The KTLs have worked together on previous projects, but their roles in the listed project were not clearly identified. The SOQ listed the PI numbers for each project listed.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Parsons- The team showed multiple redundancies in all Environmental areas. The firm also showed multiple design squads for the Roadway and Bridge KTL. The proposal identified a four (4) person QA team. The roles were identified for VE, Constructability and Cost. The proposal showed a very detailed organizational chart. The narrative discussed strategies for keeping projects on schedule and identified risks with a plan to reduce or eliminate them. The proposal had a good discussion on Design Coordination, Environmental Survey Boundary and A3M. The PM and KTL are reasonably available for project. The same NEPA Lead's commitment table is different on other proposals for this project.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	STV Incorporated	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>STV- The PM, Bridge and Roadway KTL showed experience with bridges over water and railroads. All members have worked together on previous projects. The NEPA Lead showed extensive experience with similar projects. The Roadway KTL showed good project role descriptions including phases and tasks. The Prime's experience includes projects with scope similar to this contract.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>STV-The proposal listed a Railroad coordinator but showed redundancy in all Environmental area classes. The organizational chart showed good depth. The narrative had a good write up of understanding and discussed their QA/QC process. The proposal also identified risk to the schedule and identified a way to mitigate those risks. The PM and KTLs have over 50% availability for this contract.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	TranSystems Corporation	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>TranSystem-The Roadway KTL showed two bridge replacement projects over water and one widening project which contained over water criteria. The descriptions of the Roadway KTL roles, on the listed projects, were either missing or lightly described. The PM role was well described. The Roadway and Bridge KTL did not demonstrate experience with bridges over railroad. The NEPA lead is very experienced but did not list a major river crossing.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>TranSystem- The proposal showed only one person listed for Environmental. The organizational chart lacks depth for Environmental. The proposal also showed three QA/QC for Roadway, Bridge and Environmental. The narrative discussed how to eliminate risk and the QA/QC process. The PM showed a strong availability for the project.</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- The NEPA Lead shows 40 years of experience and has worked on numerous similar projects. All of the Project Manager's experience could not be verified since the project descriptions were too vague and the PI numbers were not listed. The Roadway KTL did not have experience with railroads. The PM is a structural engineer and listed experience with projects including bridges over water and railroads. The Roadway KTL showed experience with bridges over water.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Michael Baker- The narrative showed an adequate depth for Roadway and Bridge but only one Ecology person listed. The organizational chart showed limited resources for the project in some area classes. The delivery of bridge plans were not detailed. The narrative reiterated KTL roles rather than bringing in additional resources. The PM showed an adequate availability for the project, as well as all KTL.</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-The PM showed projects for road widening and intersection improvement but no projects with similar scope to this project. The PM also showed Railroad coordination experience. The Environmental Lead was very experienced with similar projects. The Prime's experience listed Bradley Cox as the PM but he is not listed as a KTL within the proposal. The Prime and the Roadway KTL did not have experience with projects over railroads.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Clark-The QC/QA description was good and the quality control schedules were discussed throughout the process but it lacked detail. The proposal discussed innovative delivery methods that could possibly be used. The firm is currently involved with a bridge replacement on an upstream bridge. The team has eleven (11) sub-consultants which shows great depth. The Environmental member was not a part of the QA/QC team listed. The narrative showed a good process on meeting schedules.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	RSH, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>RSH-The Roadway KTL discussion contained one typo. The Roadway KTL listed experience with multiple bridge over water projects with good roles defined. The PM showed extensive project history with bridges over water but the roles were not defined. The Bridge KTL showed experience with bridges over railroad and water. The other KTL lacked experience with railroad and water. The NEPA Lead listed experience but does not list a major river crossing.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>RSH-The team lacked depth in Environmental. The narrative showed Roadway and Bridge QA/QC. The narrative showed knowledge of the route from a nearby project and gave detailed discussion of the availability</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-The Roadway KTL showed experience with one bridge over a road but not with bridges over water or railroad. The project role descriptions were light. The NEPA Lead stressed experience managing contracts more than handling Environmental documents. The Bridge KTL did not demonstrate experience with bridges over railroad. The PM listed experience working as a lead project engineer instead of a PM. The PM demonstrated experience with bridges over railroad and water.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Calyx- The QC/QA only discussed doing formal reviews prior to all phase completion and listed two people to do the reviews. The proposal did not discuss their strategy on keeping the project on schedule. The organizational chart showed sufficient depth to complete the project. The Archeology only showed one firm. The PM showed less than 50% availability.</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
Holt-The PM and all KTLs showed experience with bridges over water. The PM and Roadway had roles that were well described. The Bridge KTL showed experience with bridges over Railroads. The PM, Roadway and Environmental KTL lacked railroad experience. The Bridge KTL showed all of their experience out of state and the knowledge of GDOT Bridge Design manual and other guidelines was not clearly stated.			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Marginal
HOLT- The team lacked depth in Environmental. The narrative only showed one person assigned to Bridge. The narrative also mentioned that some of the team had worked together in the past on projects. The narrative also showed an external QA team for Bridge but the QA/QC does not mention Environmental.			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	QK4, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
QK4-The NEPA Lead was experienced but did not list a major river crossing. The PM, Bridge and Prime has experience with bridges over railroad and water however the Roadway KTL does not have experience in either. The Roadway KTL did not demonstrate similar type of work and did not show experience with bridges over water or railroad. The PM's write-up showed a typo. The PM's role description was well stated. The KTLs have worked together on previous projects except for the NEPA Lead. The proposal did not provide PI numbers for the past projects listed.			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
QK4-The Organizational chart did not show depth. The narrative only showed one name for each area class. The narrative also showed two bridge teams on the organizational chart. The narrative lacked substance. The PM and Roadway KTL have worked together on previous projects.			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Heath Lineback Engineers, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Heath Lineback- The PM and Bridge KTL listed experience with bridges over water and railroad. The Roadway KTL showed experience with bridge over trails and other project types with decent but repetitive roles. The PM was the assistant PM on three of the projects listed. The Prime listed project # 522220 where the PM and KTLs worked on the project but this project is currently listed as an in-house project for GDOT. The proposal roles need to be better defined. The NEPA Lead is experienced but does not list a major river crossing.			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Heath Lineback-The organizational chart shows two bridge teams. The organizational chart showed 4 people for Roadway but their roles were unclear. The team lacked depth in Environmental and the Environmental QA/QC person was missing. The SOQ stated that they have an "Employee Standard of Care" but they did not define this term or give additional details. The QA/QC process lacked details. The narrative mentioned adding additional resources for the railroad.			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	WSP USA Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
WSP-The Roadway KTL showed one bridge over water project and one over railroad but did not provide any details of their role on the project, with respect to phases on task. The Prime experience listed team member involvement but did not include their roles. The PM showed two bridge replacement projects over water but details on the roles were lacking. The Bridge KTL showed experience with bridges over water and railroad. The NEPA Lead showed experience but listed only two projects and neither were a bridge stand alone project. The project also did not include a major railroad crossing.			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
WSP-The narrative listed a QC/QA for Roadway, Bridge and NEPA. The narrative also lacked to mention how to handle any project risks, delivery of the project on schedule nor did it mention their QA/QC process. The evaluators could not verify the NEPA commitment table. The team has only one Archeology firm listed.			

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-The PM experience could not be verified due to the vague project descriptions and only sometimes providing PI numbers. Only two projects detailed PM roles. The PM and Roadway KTL had bridge over railroad experience but non over water. The Bridge KTL did not demonstrate experience with bridge over railroad but did show experience with bridges over water. The NEPA Lead has experience with similar projects. The Roadway KTL showed a different title on the listed projects. The roles on the project were not clearly stated. The Prime experience with the KTL involvement only listed the PM.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Neel- The narrative listed 4 QA/QC people in the organizational chart. The narrative discussed the QA/QC process which included specialist outside of the office. The team only has one firm for Hlstory and Archeology.</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- The PM, Roadway, Bridge and Prime did not list experience with railroads. The KTLs have not worked together. The SOQ listed PI numbers for projects. There were several typos withIn the SOQ. The NEPA lead showed experience with similar projects. The Roadway KTL showed experience with one bridge over water and listed well defined roles overall. The PM listed experience but the roles were not well defined. The Roadway KTL listed projects with different titles.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>KCI-The organizational chart showed good depth for Environmental but displayed redundancy in all area classes. The narrative showed section 20 plan lead which would be helpful for Environmental. The Bridge Design team has only one member except for Bridge KTL. The narrative discussed four (4) different project teams but they were not reflected on the organizational chart.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Mott MacDonald, LLC	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Marginal
<p>Mott-The Roadway KTL showed experience with bridges over water but lacked description of his role on this project. The Roadway KTL listed the same project on two different SOQs and gave two different titles. The PM, Roadway and Bridge KTLs have experience with bridges over water but not railroads. The Prime had experience with Bridges over water and railroads. The NEPA Lead had experience but did not list experience with a major railroad crossing. The Prime listed all of the team members, who proposed to work on the project, under the Prime but did not list their roles. This section is for KTL involvement.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Mott- The organizational chart showed sufficient depth to complete the project. The narrative listed three QA/QC people and only listed one firm for Environmental. The narrative is a continuation of the resumes and displayed some typos. The narrative discussed having two design teams but those teams are not shown on the organizational chart. The narrative also mentioned QC/QA but lacked details regarding the process. The Constructability was good and showed two SMEs.</p>			



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

September 3, 2019

NOTICE TO SELECTED FINALISTS - REVISED

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

Please send an e-mail confirming receipt of this notice to Folayan Battle (fbattle@dot.ga.gov).

Re: RFQ 484-052819, Batch #1 – 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract #4, PI#s 0016129 and 0016130, Monroe and Jones Counties

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 Folayan Battle, and congratulations, again, to each of you!

Folayan Battle
fbattle@dot.ga.gov
404-631-1466



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.

SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

SOLICITATION #:	RFQ-484-052819		
SOLICITATION TITLE:	Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 4		
SOLICITATION DUE DATE:	October 1, 2019		
SOLICITATION TIME DUE:	2:00pm		

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Compliant with Page # Limitations	Meets Required Area Classes
1	Lowé Engineers, LLC	10/1/2019	1:09 PM	X	X
2	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	10/1/2019	1:10 PM	X	X
3	STV Incorporated	10/1/2019	10:26 AM	X	X
4	Michael Baker International, Inc.	10/1/2019	10:34 AM	X	X
5	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	10/1/2019	12:59 PM	X	X

SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST

Solicitation #: RFQ-484-052819

Solicitation Title: Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 4

Primes and Subconsultants

	1.06(a)	1.06(b)	1.06(c)	1.06(d)	1.06(e)	1.06(f)	1.06(g)	1.07	1.10	3.01	3.12	4.01a	4.01b	4.04	5.01	5.02	5.08	6.01(a)	6.01(b)	6.02	6.05	9.01	Certificate Expires	Comments	
3 Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.								X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	4/1/2020	
Accura Engineering and Consulting Services, Inc.															X								X	1/31/2022	
Aulick Engineering, LLC																							X	1/9/2020	
Ecological Solutions, Inc.	X					X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	2/28/2022	
KCI Technologies, Inc.										X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/10/2020	
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8/31/2021	
Long Engineering, Inc.										X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	12/14/2020	
MC SQUARED, INC.																							X	11/9/2020	
New South Associates, Inc.						X	X																X	6/7/2020	
Pritchett Steinbeck Group, Inc	X			X	X																			2/1/2022	
14 Lowe Engineers, LLC									X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8/9/2021	
Aulick Engineering, LLC															X								X	1/9/2020	
Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	4/1/2020	
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8/31/2021	
MC SQUARED, INC.																							X	11/9/2020	
Sycamore Consulting, Inc.									X										X	X	X	X	X	7/13/2020	
United Consulting, LLC																									
16 Michael Baker International, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	11/9/2020	
Aulick Engineering, LLC															X								X	11/9/2020	
Edwards-Pitman Environmental, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	4/1/2020	
Long Engineering, Inc.										X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	12/14/2020	
Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	X					X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	12/31/2021	
Willmer Engineering, Inc.																			X	X	X	X	X	2/9/2020	
21 Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	12/14/2020	
Bowlby & Associates, Inc.					X																			5/31/2021	
Conlour Engineering, LLC																			X	X	X	X	X	4/1/2020	
Ecological Solutions, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	2/28/2022	
Kennedy Engineering & Associates Group, LLC																							X	7/17/2021	
New South Associates, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	6/7/2020	
Surveying and Mapping, LLC															X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	12/14/2020	
Vardina & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.										X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9/24/2021	
26 STV Incorporated					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	4/30/2022	
CARDNO, INC.					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	3/8/2021	
CCR ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.															X								X	6/7/2020	
Craton Engineering Group, P.C.										X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/10/2020	
New South Associates, Inc.										X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	6/7/2020	
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	4/30/2021	
Willmer Engineering, Inc.																			X	X	X	X	X	2/9/2020	

GDOT SELECTION COMMITTEE SCORING AND OVERALL RANKING OF SUBMITTALS

Solicitation Title	Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 4	1	STV Incorporated	
Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-052819	2	Lowe Engineers, LLC	
PHASE I AND PHASE II - Individual Committee Member Scoring and Overall Ranking based on Published Criteria			2	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.
(This Page For GDOT Use)			4	Michael Baker International, Inc.
			5	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
		(RANKING)		
		Sum of		
		Total		Group
SUBMITTING FIRMS		Score		Ranking
Lowe Engineers, LLC		650		2
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		550		5
STV Incorporated		700		1
Michael Baker International, Inc.		600		4
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.		650		2

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications
 Resources and Workload Capacity
 Technical Approach
 Past Performance

	PHASE I		PHASE II		Group Scores and Ranking	
	300	200	400	100	Total Score	Ranking
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	400	100		
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	▼	▼		
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Good	Good	Adequate	Good	650	2
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc	Good	Good	Marginal	Good	550	5
STV Incorporated	Good	Adequate	Good	Good	700	1
Michael Baker International, Inc	Good	Adequate	Adequate	Good	600	4
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects P.C	Adequate	Good	Good	Adequate	650	2
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	400	100	1000 %	

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Lowe Engineers, LLC		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Lowe-The language in the proposal refers to culverts instead of the project. Typos were also discovered within the proposal. Roadway-recommended an offset alignment to the north and good discussion of North vs. South. The write-up mentioned combining the projects into one plan set. The firm also mentioned corrective deficient vertical alignment. The offset detour length was defined to be 34 miles and considered not viable. It appears the 34 miles refers to the total distance from Forsyth to Gray along the assumed detour route rather than the difference between the detour route and the route along State Route 18. The proposal mentioned the coordination with Environmental for sturgeons in the area. The write-up mentioned that this bridge was not a good candidate for an ABC bridge which the review team finds reasonable. The writ-up also mentioned that the bridge was in FEMA Zone A. The proposal mentioned the railroad bridge deck runoff can not be discharge into the railroad drainage system. It was also mentioned that the 3D laser scanners and drones would deliver the Survey. The write-up mentioned that the project had an aggressive schedule but felt that schedule could be recovered by PFPR. The initial recommendation for super structure and sub-structure were provided. The firm showed a good discussion on the need of a PIOH and needing to avoid historic homes in the area. The Environmental team had recent experience doing work on this river.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>The score of "Good" was given based on the past performance scores. The review team did not have past knowledge working with the firm.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Marginal
<p>Parsons-The offset detour length was defined to be 32 miles and considered to long for practical consideration. It appears the 32 miles refers to the total distance from Forsyth to Gray along the assumed detour route rather than the difference between the detour route and the route along State Route 18. The write-up also recommended a permanent realignment to the North. The write up did not provide an initial recommendation for super structure and sub-structure and also mentioned an unrealistic two rounds of task orders for the project. The reviewers felt that this was not enough for the project. Scoping to available budget implies that you are not scoping for project needs. The Consultant failed to define A3M correctly. The write up mentioned changing from a nationwide permit to a regional permit but this does not save time or money. PCE over CE is implied but this method would save time on the project, the discussion on this effort is inadequate. The proposal discussed a permanent alignment shift for the river bridge and transitioning back to the existing alignment for the railroad. This does not seem feasible. The bridges are too close together. ABC was mentioned as a critical tool but the reviewers do not agree. The write up mentioned the a core monitoring gauge to be reinstalled on the new bridge but there was no mentioning of the sturgeons in the area. The write up mentioned Survey and Environmental teams to accelerate the project.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>The score of "Good" was given based on the past performance scores. Some of the review team members presented past knowledge working with the firm and provided additional performance information.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	STV Incorporated		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>STV- The offset detour length was defined to be 12 miles and was not eliminated from consideration as an alternative, which the review team thinks is reasonable. It appears the 12 miles refers to the difference between the detour route and the route along State Route 18. The write-up also discussed the fact that the river bridge is the county line and two bus route and emergency services will not be impacted. The write up mention that according to the Norfolk Southern map, this area is designated as a super core corridor, requiring clearance for three lines of track. The initial recommendation for super structure and sub-structure were provided. The write up mentioned FEMA Zone A. Environmental-the proposal did not mention the coordination of sturgeons. The in-depth discussion of staging details were mentioned, including providing access to the house between bridges. The firm showed unique skills and knowledge working with Norfolk southern providing design and other services for 37 years. The write-up also mentioned investigating ABC on the project but no conclusion was presented. The need for Public Involvement coordination was also mentioned within the proposal.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>The score of "Good" was given based on the past performance scores. The review team had no past knowledge working with the firm. One of the past performance scores given to the firm showed a one (1) but the write up detailed information not related to the firm. Due to this, the reviewers considered the Consultant's score without this past performance review.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Michael Baker International, Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Michael Baker-The cover page shows wrong project. The offset detour length was defined to be 20 miles with local roads and much longer with state routes. It was deemed to be unacceptable. It appears the 20 miles refers to the total distance from Forsyth to Gray along the assumed detour route rather than the difference between the detour route and the route along State Route 18. The write-up recommended permanent alignment to the North and included a layout of the alignment in the proposal. The write up also mentioned an unrealistic two rounds of task orders for the project but the reviewers felt that this was not enough for the project. The risk matrix table showed good detail on both bridges. Environmental-the proposal mentioned the coordination needed for sturgeons and the coordination of FEMA Zone A. The initial recommendation for super structure and sub-structure were provided. the write-up also recommended a single span bridge for railroad but did not mention roadway grade line adjustment. Environmental-PCE was recommended and the write-up provided good detail to support their understanding of the project and documents needed.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>The score of "Good" was given based on the past performance scores. The review team did not have any past knowledge working with the firm.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS	
Firm	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Clark Patterson-The proposal stated that there were no feasible off sight detours and recommended permanent realignment to the North. They recognized FEMA Zone A. The proposal showed a good overview of A3M and section 20 plans. The proposal went into good detail on the Environmental considerations, construction methods within the water and the likely restrictions due to sturgeons. However, there were no mentioning of Environmental document type or Public Involvement. The schedule discussion did not provide a lot of detail. The initial recommendation for super structure and sub-structure were provided. The Environmental team had recent experience doing work on this river.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>The firm's past performance score was below the reviewers 4.5 cut off score and the score of "Adequate" was given. The review team had past knowledge working with the firm and stated that the consultant's performance substantiated the 'Adequate' rating.</p>			

Reference Check Summary for
RFQ 484-052819 Contract #4
Batch #1-2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract #4

	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects	Lowe Engineers	Michael Baker International, Inc.	Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.	STV
Questions answered on a 1, 3, 5 scale.					
1 = Below Expectations, 3 = Met Expectations, 5 = Exceeded Expectations					
1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project.					
Reference 1	5	5	5	5	3
Reference 2	5	5	5		5
Reference 3			5		3
Reference 4					5
Reference 5					
Reference 6					
Reference 7					
Section Average	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.					
Reference 1	3	5	5	5	3
Reference 2	5	5	3		5
Reference 3			5		3
Reference 4					5
Reference 5					
Reference 6					
Reference 7					
Section Average	4.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	4.00
3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.					
Reference 1	5	5	5	3	1
Reference 2	5	5	5		5
Reference 3			5		5
Reference 4					5
Reference 5					
Reference 6					
Reference 7					
Section Average	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.00
4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management.					
Reference 1	3	5	5	5	3
Reference 2	3	5	5		5
Reference 3			5		5
Reference 4					5
Reference 5					
Reference 6					
Reference 7					
Section Average	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50
5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.					
Reference 1	5	3	5	5	1
Reference 2	5	5	5		5
Reference 3			5		3
Reference 4					5
Reference 5					
Reference 6					
Reference 7					
Section Average	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.50
Overall Average	4.40	4.80	4.87	4.60	4.00

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Email Invitation 1 (Email)
Started: Wednesday, October 16, 2019 2:30:08 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, October 16, 2019 2:49:58 PM
Time Spent: 00:19:50
Email: smann@dot.ga.gov
IP Address: 143.100.55.12

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Name	Scott Mann
Company	AECOM
Title	Project Manager
Email Address	smann39@gmail.com
Phone Number	4049311304

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

3 - Met expectations

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

3 - Met expectations

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

1 - Below expectations

GDOT RFQ 484-052819 Consultant Reference Check Survey for STV Incorporated; PI# 0013992; GDOT Bridge Replacement for SR 520BU over Flint River

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

3 - Met expectations

Q7 Rate the overall success of the project thus far

1 - Below expectations

Q8 Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings

Delays in the procurement of the preliminary design & environmental document task order (TO).

1. Scoping of the preliminary design phase TO began in April 2018 and the initial request was submitted to RTS in late July 2018. 2 months after the submittal, the PM realized there was an issue with the newly implemented RTS system, and the request had not been assigned to a negotiator. Per the Procurement Office the issue could not be corrected, and the request had to be rejected.

2. After the request was rejected, the PM was informed that additional concurrences needed to be included in the request package. The additional concurrences were requested and received and the 2nd request was submitted to RTS on 11/19/18.

3. Once the request was resubmitted, and during negotiations, the request was denied 2/26/19, because the Consultant's cost proposal exceeded the internal estimates, by more than 96% in some areas.

4. After the request was rejected, an additional scoping meeting was held on 3/25/19. The 2nd finalized procurement request was submitted to the new RTS system on 5/9/19.

5. After the 2nd request was made, the cost of the task order exceeded the PE funds remaining in the contract allotment, the project manager was not informed by the designer additional funding may be necessary until negotiations were nearly complete, causing additional delays to receive the notice to proceed (NTP), which as subsequently provided on 8/28/19 approximately 12 months behind schedule.

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Email Invitation 1 (Email)
Started: Wednesday, October 09, 2019 8:34:06 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, October 09, 2019 8:47:03 AM
Time Spent: 00:12:56
Email: nguilford@dot.ga.gov
IP Address: 143.100.53.12

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Name	Nona S Guilford
Company	AECOM/TIA/GDOT
Title	TIA Deputy Program Manager
Email Address	Nguilford@dot.ga.gov
Phone Number	404-631-1193

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 Consultant Reference Check Survey for STV Incorporated; PI# 0011429; GDOT SR 1/US
27 Northbound Passing Lane

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

STV was extremely proactive in managing this project. The team required minimal direction and was extremely responsive. When issues arose, there was no issue with STV expediting on behalf of the Department. The project manager was attentive to the budget and time restraints for this project. Additionally, the leadership at STV checked in with the TIA program to ensure that there was a high level of service on at least two occasions. Overall, this consultant team delivered a quality product, which is under construction, currently proceeding without issue.

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Email Invitation 1 (Email)
Started: Tuesday, October 08, 2019 8:43:56 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, October 08, 2019 8:48:19 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:22
Email: jhenry@dot.ga.gov
IP Address: 143.100.53.12

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Name	Jeff Henry
Company	AECOM/GDOT Bridge Program
Title	Project Manager
Email Address	jhenry@dot.ga.gov
Phone Number	404-663-8649

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

3 - Met expectations

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

Parsons is responsive and highly technically competent. As a firm, they have breadth and depth to their knowledge base. In a recent request for assessment of a construction issue, they went above and beyond in their analysis and provided a detailed response within 24 hours.

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Email Invitation 1 (Email)
Started: Tuesday, October 08, 2019 3:15:05 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, October 08, 2019 3:25:55 PM
Time Spent: 00:10:49
Email: thompsonJA@scdot.org
IP Address: 167.7.17.3

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Name	Allen Thompson
Company	SCDOT
Title	Acting District Construction Eng.
Email Address	thompsonja@scdot.org
Phone Number	803-737-1847

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

3 - Met expectations

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

3 - Met expectations

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

5 - Exceeded expectations

GDOT RFQ 484-052819 Consultant Reference Check Survey for STV Incorporated; SCDOT I-20 Widening

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

5 - Exceeded expectations

Q7 Rate the overall success of the project thus far

3- Met expectations

Q8 Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings

STV met or exceeded goals for timeliness of submittals and for assistance with technical questions.

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Email Invitation 1 (Email)
Started: Tuesday, October 08, 2019 1:59:51 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, October 08, 2019 2:02:48 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:57
Email: ahoenig@dot.ga.gov
IP Address: 143.100.53.12

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Name	Andrew Hoenig
Company	Georgia DOT
Title	Design-Build Program Manager
Email Address	ahoenig@dot.ga.gov
Phone Number	4046311757

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 Consultant Reference Check Survey for Michael Baker International, Inc. Jimmy Deloach
connector Design 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

This was a very challenging project on a compressed timeframe that included multiple Preliminary Engineering disciplines - geotechnical, environmental, right-of-way, utility coordination, bridge & roadway design - all managed by Michael Baker. The project opened to traffic on time and on budget.

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Email Invitation 1 (Email)
Started: Tuesday, October 08, 2019 10:40:49 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, October 08, 2019 11:05:34 AM
Time Spent: 00:24:44
Email: brian.mchugh@aecom.com
IP Address: 165.225.34.115

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Name	Brian McHugh
Company	AECOM
Title	Transportation Planning Manager
Email Address	brian.mchugh@aecom.com
Phone Number	404-514-4882

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 Consultant Reference Check Survey for Lowe Engineers, LLC; PI# 270900-; CS
685/Barrows Ferry Rd Over Tobler Creek Bridge Replacement

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

**5 - Exceeded
expectations**

Q7 Rate the overall success of the project thus far

**3- Met
expectations**

Q8 Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings

The firm completed tasks on time and as scoped. Public involvement and other unforeseen circumstances created schedule shifts on two of five projects.

Project solutions and deliverable quality were high.

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Email Invitation 1 (Email)
Started: Tuesday, October 08, 2019 10:10:00 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, October 08, 2019 10:20:34 AM
Time Spent: 00:10:33
Email: injoku@dot.ga.gov
IP Address: 143.100.55.12

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Name	Achor Njoku
Company	GDOT
Title	P3 Project Manager
Email Address	injoku@dot.ga.gov
Phone Number	404.640.1748

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

3 - Met expectations

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

5 - Exceeded expectations

GDOT RFQ 484-052819 Consultant Reference Check Survey for Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, PC; SR 17 Widening & Reconstruction

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

3 - Met expectations

Q7 Rate the overall success of the project thus far

5 - Exceeded expectations

Q8 Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings

Project was delivered on schedule and within the contracted budget and currently progressing in construction with limited design issues

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Email Invitation 1 (Email)
Started: Tuesday, October 08, 2019 10:07:11 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, October 08, 2019 10:09:25 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:14
Email: injoku@dot.ga.gov
IP Address: 143.100.55.12

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Name	Achor Njoku
Company	GDOT
Title	P3 Project Manager
Email Address	Injoku@dot.ga.gov
Phone Number	404.640.1748

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

3 - Met expectations

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

5 - Exceeded expectations

GDOT RFQ 484-052819 Consultant Reference Check Survey for Michael Baker International, Inc. SR 369 Over Six Mile Creek Bridge Replacement

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

Project was delivered on schedule and within the contracted budget and currently progressing in construction with limited design issues

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Email Invitation 1 (Email)
Started: Wednesday, October 16, 2019 1:16:02 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, October 16, 2019 1:18:04 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:02
Email: cford@dot.ga.gov
IP Address: 143.100.53.12

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Name	Clinton Ford
Company	GDOT
Title	Manager
Email Address	cford@dot.ga.gov
Phone Number	4043470645

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

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

Lowe did a great job delivering this project

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Email Invitation 1 (Email)
Started: Monday, September 30, 2019 12:02:24 PM
Last Modified: Monday, September 30, 2019 12:04:37 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:13
Email: mnadoiski@cwmatthews.com
IP Address: 209.92.166.35

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Name	Mike Nadolski
Company	CW Matthews
Title	Project Manager
Email Address	mnadoiski@cwmatthews.com
Phone Number	4043169919

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 Consultant Reference Check Survey for Michael Baker International, Inc. Courtland Street
Over CSX Design-Build

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

MBI has experienced project managers as well as task leads. They present common sense and cost effective solutions.

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Email Invitation 1 (Email)
Started: Tuesday, September 24, 2019 1:45:10 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, September 24, 2019 1:52:24 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:14
Email: mayo@AtlantaGa.Gov
IP Address: 209.64.56.2

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Name	Michael Ayo
Company	City of Atlanta, Dept. of Public Works
Title	Bridge Engineer, Senior
Email Address	mayo@atiantaga.gov
Phone Number	(404) 330-6467

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 Consultant Reference Check Survey for Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, PC; Northside Drive Pedestrian Bridge

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

3 - Met expectations

Q7 Rate the overall success of the project thus far

5 - Exceeded expectations

Q8 Please provide comments to substantiate your ratings

Team was responsive, cooperative and worked with the Project Manager to achieve good project result.

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Email Invitation 1 (Email)
Started: Tuesday, September 24, 2019 12:33:51 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, September 24, 2019 12:35:53 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:01
Email: kkeeney@prime-eng.com
IP Address: 174.47.45.162

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Name	Kalyn Keeney
Company	Prime Engineering, Inc.
Title	Project Manager
Email Address	kkeeney@prime-eng.com
Phone Number	4043168661

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 Consultant Reference Check Survey for STV Incorporated; City of College Park Gateway
Pedestrian Bridge

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

Respondent skipped this question

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : STV INCORPORATED*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY STV Incorporated **Status: Active**

DUNS: 048357735 +4: CAGE Code: 1CMZ0 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 06/27/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 225 Park Ave S Fl 5
City: New York State/Province: NEW YORK
ZIP Code: 10003-1604 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV INCORPORATED **Status: Active**

DUNS: 106768252 +4: CAGE Code: 0HAW1 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 06/27/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 205 W WELSH DR
City: DOUGLASSVILLE State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA
ZIP Code: 19518-8713 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV INCORPORATED **Status: Active**

DUNS: 121340855 +4: CAGE Code: 1P9D1 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 06/27/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 7125 AMBAMDADOR RD STE 200
City: BALTIMORE State/Province: MARYLAND
ZIP Code: 21244-2708 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY STV GROUP, INCORPORATED **Status: Active**

DUNS: 044520146 +4: CAGE Code: 2N222 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 06/27/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 205 W WELSH DR
City: DOUGLASSVILLE State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA
ZIP Code: 19518-8713 Country: UNITED STATES

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : Cardno*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY Cardno, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 078391683 +4:	CAGE Code: 6PWA1 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 05/16/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 10004 Park Meadows Dr Ste 300 City: Lone Tree ZIP Code: 80124-5444	State/Province: COLORADO Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY CARDNO, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 153672147 +4:	CAGE Code: 4QFE0 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/01/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 801 2ND AVE STE 1150 City: SEATTLE ZIP Code: 98104-1544	State/Province: WASHINGTON Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY Michael Baker-Cardno JV	Status: Active
DUNS: 117009138 +4:	CAGE Code: 89Q73 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 06/10/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 100 Airside Dr City: Moon Township ZIP Code: 15108-2783	State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY Stanley-UC-Cardno JV	Status: Active
DUNS: 080602583 +4:	CAGE Code: 7UFZ3 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 03/27/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 225 Iowa Ave City: Muscatine ZIP Code: 52761-3730	State/Province: IOWA Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY	CARDNO-EA JOINT VENTURE	Status: Active
DUNS: 079676864	+4:	CAGE Code: 7BBC4 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 02/04/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2496 OLD IVY RD STE 300		
City: Charlottesville	State/Province: VIRGINIA	
ZIP Code: 22903-4895	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Baker-Stanley-Cardno JV	Status: Active
DUNS: 078483333	+4:	CAGE Code: 6VA93 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 04/10/2020	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	CARDNO CHEMRISK, LLC	Status: Active
DUNS: 969231815	+4:	CAGE Code: 6J2C0 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 07/04/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 235 PINE ST		
City: SAN FRANCISCO	State/Province: CALIFORNIA	
ZIP Code: 94104-2736	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Cardno TEC GmbH	Status: Active
DUNS: 328979534	+4:	NCAGE Code: DK535 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 10/31/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: Carl-Benz-Str. 5		
City: Schwetzingen	State/Province:	
ZIP Code: 68723	Country: GERMANY	
ENTITY	Cardno GS, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 611603457	+4:	CAGE Code: 0L251 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 10/31/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2496 OLD IVY RD STE 300		
City: CHARLOTTESVILLE	State/Province: VIRGINIA	
ZIP Code: 22903-4895	Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY Cardno - GEC Joint Venture Status: Active

DUNS: 080176414 +4: CAGE Code: 7KML4 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 10/31/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 2496 Old Ivy Rd Ste 300

City: Charlottesville

State/Province: VIRGINIA

ZIP Code: 22903-4895

Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY Cardno-Versar JV Status: Active

DUNS: 081137280 +4: CAGE Code: 82YQ8 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 10/31/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 2496 Old Ivy Rd Ste 300

City: Charlottesville

State/Province: VIRGINIA

ZIP Code: 22903-4895

Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY Cardno TEC-Leidos, LLC Status: Active

DUNS: 078483423 +4: CAGE Code: 6RMN5 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 10/31/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 2496 Old Ivy Rd Ste 300

City: Charlottesville

State/Province: VIRGINIA

ZIP Code: 22903-4895

Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY HDR/Cardno ENTRIX Joint Venture Status: Active

DUNS: 969141527 +4: CAGE Code: 6HTT8 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 02/20/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 2365 Iron Point Road Ste 300

City: Folsom

State/Province: CALIFORNIA

ZIP Code: 95630-8712

Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY Stantec-Cardno USCG Joint Venture Status: Active

DUNS: 081030620 +4: CAGE Code: 811B5 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 09/26/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 10010 San Pedro Ave Ste 390

City: San Antonio

State/Province: TEXAS

ZIP Code: 78216-3815

Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY Cardno GS - AECOM Pacific JV Status: Active

DUNS: 080846882 +4: CAGE Code: 7XZC8 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 08/27/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 2496 Old Ivy Rd #300

City: Charlottesville

State/Province: VIRGINIA

ZIP Code: 22903-4895

Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY Buchart Horn Cardno Joint Venture Status: Active

DUNS: 081266891 +4: CAGE Code: 853W5 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 04/07/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 445 W PHILADELPHIA ST

City: YORK

State/Province: PENNSYLVANIA

ZIP Code: 17401-3383

Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY Cardno Emerging Markets Usa, Ltd. Status: Active

DUNS: 877698936 +4: CAGE Code: 1R4G2 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 07/22/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 2107 Wilson Blvd Ste 800

City: Arlington

State/Province: VIRGINIA

ZIP Code: 22201-3096

Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY M&J Engineering - Cardno, LLC Status: Active

DUNS: 117082791 +4: CAGE Code: 8BNT2 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 06/03/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 2003 Jericho Turnpike

City: New Hyde Park

State/Province: NEW YORK

ZIP Code: 11040-4739

Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY Scout-cardno Joint Venture LLC Status: Active

DUNS: 081318254 +4: CAGE Code: 857E0 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 11/11/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 169 Saxony Rd Ste 214

City: Encinitas

State/Province: CALIFORNIA

ZIP Code: 92024-6781

Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY	Cardno TEC-GMI Joint Venture	Status: Active
DUNS: 078855513	+4:	CAGE Code: 6X7U6 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 10/31/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2496 Old Ivy Rd Ste 300	City: Charlottesville	State/Province: VIRGINIA
ZIP Code: 22903-4895		Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY	Stantec-Cardno-Baker - a Joint Venture	Status: Active
DUNS: 078526197	+4:	CAGE Code: 6VJ49 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 03/19/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 70 NE Loop 410 Ste 1100	City: San Antonio	State/Province: TEXAS
ZIP Code: 78216-5893		Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY	AECOM-BAKER-CARDNO NAVFAC ATLANTIC PLANNING JV	Status: Active
DUNS: 081323109	+4:	CAGE Code: 8BH23 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 06/06/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 3101 Wilson Blvd Ste 900	City: Arlington	State/Province: VIRGINIA
ZIP Code: 22201-4446		Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY	CARDNO - AMEC FOSTER WHEELER Joint Venture	Status: Active
DUNS: 079818879	+4:	CAGE Code: 7DLU3 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 10/31/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2496 Old Ivy Rd Ste 300	City: Charlottesville	State/Province: VIRGINIA
ZIP Code: 22903-4895		Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY	Cardno TEC-AECOM Atlantic Joint Venture	Status: Active
DUNS: 079238953	+4:	CAGE Code: 71WH6 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 10/31/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2496 Old Ivy Rd Ste 300	City: Charlottesville	State/Province: VIRGINIA
ZIP Code: 22903-4895		Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY	Cardno TEC-AECOM Italy Joint Venture	Status: Active
DUNS: 313005413	+4:	NCAGE Code: CH956 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 10/31/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: Carl-Benz-Str. 5		
City: Schwetzingen		State/Province:
ZIP Code: 68723		Country: GERMANY
ENTITY	Cardno - Amec Foster Wheeler Public Works Joint Venture	Status: Active
DUNS: 081016224	+4:	CAGE Code: 81UL1 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 10/31/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2496 Old Ivy Rd Ste 300		
City: Charlottesville		State/Province: VIRGINIA
ZIP Code: 22903-4895		Country: UNITED STATES

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : CCR ENVIRONMENTAL INC*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY CCR ENVIRONMENTAL INC Status: Active

DUNS: 120290635 +4: CAGE Code: 1QXB2 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 09/04/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 3772 PLEASANTDALE RD STE 150

City: ATLANTA

State/Province: GEORGIA

ZIP Code: 30340-3709

Country: UNITED STATES

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY Cranston Engineering Group, P.C.	Status: Active
DUNS: 010128643 +4:	CAGE Code: 0H6W5 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 09/09/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 452 Ellis St	
City: Augusta	State/Province: GEORGIA
ZIP Code: 30901-1631	Country: UNITED STATES

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : New South Associates, Inc.*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY New South Associates, Inc. Status: Active

DUNS: 197533573 +4: CAGE Code: 0K629 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 04/03/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 6150 E Ponce De Leon Ave

City: Stone Mountain

ZIP Code: 30083-2253

State/Province: GEORGIA

Country: UNITED STATES

SAM Search Results
List of records matching your search for :

Search Term : VANASSE HANGEN BRUSTLIN, INC.*
Record Status: Active

ENTITY VANASSE HANGEN BRUSTLIN, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 095874384 +4: CAGE Code: 0LYL1 DoDAAC:	
Expiration Date: 08/12/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 101 WALNUT ST City: WATERTOWN State/Province: MASSACHUSETTS ZIP Code: 02472-4026 Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY VANASSE HANGEN BRUSTLIN, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 803128540 +4: CAGE Code: 58UW5 DoDAAC:	
Expiration Date: 08/12/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 40 IDX DR # 100 City: SOUTH BURLINGTON State/Province: VERMONT ZIP Code: 05403-7771 Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY VANASSE HANGEN BRUSTLIN, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 957317936 +4: CAGE Code: 3RQJ3 DoDAAC:	
Expiration Date: 08/12/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 351 Mclaws Cir Ste 3 City: WILLIAMSBURG State/Province: VIRGINIA ZIP Code: 23185-5797 Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY VANASSE HANGEN BRUSTLIN, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 192518335 +4: CAGE Code: 432K0 DoDAAC:	
Expiration Date: 08/12/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 1775 GREENSBORO STATION PL STE 200 City: MC LEAN State/Province: VIRGINIA ZIP Code: 22102-5214 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

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
STV, INC. 3700 Crestwood Parkway NW, Dunwoody, GA 30086-7155		May 9, 2019	April 30, 2022
SIGNATURE <i>Neil Reed</i>			
1. Transportation Planning		3. Highway Design Roadway (continued)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.01	State Wide Systems Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.09	Traffic Control System Analysis, Design and Implementation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.02	Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.10	Utility Coordination
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.03	Aviation Systems Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.11	Architecture
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.04	Mass and Rapid Transportation Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.05	Alternate System and Corridor Location Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.06	Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.14	Historic Rehabilitation
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.06a	NEPA Documentation	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.15	Highway Lighting
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.06b	History	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.16	Value Engineering
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06c	Air Studies	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.17	Design of Toll Facilities Infrastructure
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06d	Noise Studies		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.06e	Ecology	4. Highway Structures	
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.06f	Archaeology	<input type="checkbox"/> 4.01a	Minor Bridges Design
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.06g	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys	<input type="checkbox"/> 4.01b	Minor Bridges Design CONDITIONAL
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.06h	Bay Surveys	<input type="checkbox"/> 4.02	Major Bridges Design
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.07	Attitude, Opinion and Community Value Studies	<input type="checkbox"/> 4.03	Movable Span Bridges Design
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.08	Airport Master Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.09	Location Studies	<input type="checkbox"/> 4.05	Bridge Inspection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.10	Traffic Studies	5. Topography	
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.11	Traffic and Toll Revenue Studies	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.01	Land Surveying
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.12	Major Investment Studies	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.02	Engineering Surveying
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.13	Non-Motorized Transportation Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.03	Geodetic Surveying
2. Mass Transit Operations		<input type="checkbox"/> 5.04	Aerial Photography
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.01	Mass Transit Program (Systems) Management	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.05	Aerial Photogrammetry
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.02	Mass Transit Feasibility and Technical Studies	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.06	Topographic Remote Sensing
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.03	Mass Transit Vehicle and Propulsion System	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.07	Cartography
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.04	Mass Transit Controls, Communications and Information Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.08	Subsurface Utility Engineering
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.05	Mass Transit Architectural Engineering	6. Soils, Foundation & Materials Testing	
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.06	Mass Transit Unique Structures	<input type="checkbox"/> 6.01a	Soil Surveys
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.07	Mass Transit Electrical and Mechanical Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> 6.01b	Geological and Geophysical Studies
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.08	Mass Transit Operations Management and Support Services	<input type="checkbox"/> 6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.09	Aviation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6.03	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Soils and Foundation)
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.10	Mass Transit Program (Systems) Marketing	<input type="checkbox"/> 6.04a	Laboratory Materials Testing
		<input type="checkbox"/> 6.04b	Field Testing of Roadway Construction Materials
		<input type="checkbox"/> 6.05	Hazard Waste Site Assessment Studies
3. Highway Design Roadway		8. Construction	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Rural Generally Free Access Highway Design	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8.01	Construction Supervision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.02	Two-Lane or multi-Lane with Curb and Gutter Generally Free Access Highways Design Including Storm Sewers	9. Erosion and Sedimentation Control	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.03	Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Widening and Reconstruction, with Curb and Gutter and Storm Sewers in Heavily Developed Commercial industrial and Residential Urban Areas	<input type="checkbox"/> 9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control and Comprehensive Monitoring Program
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.04	Multi-Lane, Limited Access Expressway Type Highway Design	<input type="checkbox"/> 9.02	Rainfall and Runoff Reporting
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.05	Design of Urban Expressway and Interstate	<input type="checkbox"/> 9.03	Field Inspections for Compliance of Erosion and Sedimentation Control Devices Installations
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.06	Traffic Operations Studies		
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.07	Traffic Operations Design		
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.08	Landscape Architecture		