



## 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 #6 –  
PI# 0015151, Chatham County  
Ranking Approval

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

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

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

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

1. **Moffat & Nichol**
2. **STV Incorporated**
3. **American Engineers, Inc.**
4. **Michael Baker International, Inc.**
4. **Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.**
6. **Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.**

The Selection Committee recommends the selection of the top ranked firm, **Moffat & Nichol**.

Concurrence with Award from Responsible Division Director:

Certification Procurement Requirements Met:

  
Albert Shelby, Director of Program Delivery

  
Treasury Young, Procurement Administrator

CS:asg

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, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
600 West Peachtree Street, NW  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308  
Phone: (404) 631-1972

**D. Scope of Services**

Under the terms of the resulting Agreements, the selected consultants will provide full engineering design services 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.

<b>PHASE I</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>TIME</b>
a. GDOT issues public advertisement of <b>RFQ-484-052819</b>	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	
<b>PHASE II</b>		
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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](mailto:fbattle@dot.ga.gov).**

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

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

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

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

### C. Questions and Requests for Clarification

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Contract 1:** [mailto:tsp\\_soq\\_tech\\_submittal@dot.ga.gov?subject=RFQ%20484-052819%20Contract%201%20](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](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](mailto:fbattle@dot.ga.gov).****

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

#### D. Questions and Requests for Clarification

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

### X. GDOT Terms and Conditions

#### A. Statement of Agreement

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **C. Non-Discrimination and DBE Requirements**

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

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

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

For more information on the GDOT DBE Program please contact:

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

### **D. Audit and Accounting System Requirements**

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

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

### **E. Submittal Costs and Confidentiality**

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

**F. Award Conditions**

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

**G. Debriefings**

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

**H. Right to Cancel or Change RFQ**

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

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

**I. Substitutions, Alternates, Exceptions, and Extensions**

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

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

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

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



**EXHIBIT I-1**

**Contract 1**

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Number: 0014914
3. County: Glynn
4. Description: CR 583/SEA ISLAND ROAD @ DUNBAR CREEK ON ST SIMONS ISLAND
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

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

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

6. Scope:

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

The Consultant shall provide:

A. Complete Field Surveys:

1. Provide Survey Control Package.
2. Provide Inroads Survey Database.
3. Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
4. Staking for ROW acquisition.

B. Concept Report:

1. Traffic Studies.
2. Cost Estimates.
3. Initial Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
4. Practical Alternatives Review (PAR) Activities.
5. Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
6. Approved Concept Report.
7. Concept Design Data Book.
8. Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's approval).

C. Environmental Document:

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

D. Preliminary Design:

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

2. Bridge Hydraulic Study.
  3. BFI Report.
  4. Pavement Evaluation/UST/Soil Survey.
  5. Constructability Meeting participation.
  6. Cost Estimation with annual updates.
  7. Location and Design Report.
  8. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:
1. Prepare ROW plans and coordinate ROW staking.
  2. Right of Way revisions during acquisition, as needed.
- F. Utilities:  
Subsurface Utility Engineering.
- G. Final Design:
1. Complete Final Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
    - a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
    - b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
    - c. Final ESPCP.
    - d. Final Utility Plans.
    - e. Final Staging Plans.
    - f. Final Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.
  2. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
  3. Corrected FFPR Plans.
  4. CES Final cost estimate.
  5. Final PS&E Package.
  6. Amendments & Revisions.
- H. Construction;
1. Use on Construction Revisions.
  2. Review Shop Drawings.
- I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for all deliverables.
- J. Attendance in and meeting minutes of monthly meetings to discuss progress and/or issues (additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).
7. Key Team Leaders:
- A. Roadway Design.
  - B. Bridge Design.
  - C. NEPA Lead.
8. The following milestone dates are proposed:
- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q4 FY 2020.
  - B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q1 FY 2021 (about 4 months duration).
  - C. FFPR – Q2 FY 2022.
  - D. FFPR – Q3 FY 2023.
  - E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 2024.

**EXHIBIT I- 2**

**Contract 2**

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Numbers: 0016126 and 0016127
3. County: Butts
4. Description: SR 36 @ BIG SANDY CREEK 3.8 MI SW OF JACKSON and  
SR 36 @ NORRIS CREEK 3.2 MI SW OF JACKSON
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Rural Roadway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
4.01a	Minor Bridge Design
	(OR)
4.01b	Minor Bridge Design
4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
5.01	Land Survey
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
6.03	Hydraulic and Hydrologic Studies (Soils & Foundation)
6.05	Hazardous Waste Site Assessment Studies
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

## 6. Scope:

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

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

The Consultant shall provide:

- A. Complete Field Surveys:
  1. Provide Survey Control Package.
  2. Provide Inroads Survey Database.
  3. Staking for Bridge Site Inspection.
  4. Staking for ROW acquisition.
  
- B. Concept Report:
  1. Traffic Studies.
  2. Cost Estimates.
  3. Initial Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
  4. Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
  5. Approved Concept Report.
  6. Concept Design Data Book.
  7. Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's approval).
  
- C. Environmental Document:
  1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies surveys reports and assessment of effects (i.e., Air, Noise, History, Ecology, and Archaeology).
  2. NEPA documents:
    - a. Categorical Exclusion.
    - b. EAFONSI.
    - 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:
1. 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. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
- E. Right-of-Way (ROW) Plans:
1. Prepare ROW plans and coordinate ROW staking.
  2. Right of Way revisions during acquisition, as needed.
- F. Utilities:  
Subsurface Utility Engineering.
- G. Final Design:
1. Complete Final Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
    - a. Final Bridge Plans (LRFD).
    - b. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
    - c. Final ESPCP.
    - d. Final Utility Plans.
    - e. Final Staging Plans.
    - f. Final Drainage Design including MS4, if applicable.
  2. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
  3. Corrected FFPR Plans.
  4. CES Final cost estimate.
  5. Final PS&E Package.
  6. Amendments & Revisions.
- H. Construction:
1. Use on Construction Revisions.
  2. Review Shop Drawings.
- I. Quality Control/Quality Assurance Reviews for all deliverables.
- J. Attendance in and meeting minutes of monthly meetings to discuss progress and/or issues (additional meetings may be required to resolve major project issues).
7. Key Team Leaders:
- A. Roadway Design.
  - B. Bridge Design.
  - C. NEPA Lead.
8. The following milestone dates are proposed:
- A. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Notice to Proceed – Q4 FY 2020.
  - B. Limited Concept report submittal – Q1 FY 21 (about 4 months duration).
  - C. FFPR – Q2 FY 2022.
  - D. FFPR – Q3 FY 2023.
  - E. Let Contract – Q1 FY 2024.

**EXHIBIT I- 5**

**Contract 5**

1. Project Numbers: NA
2. PI Numbers: 0013120
3. County: Monroe
4. Description: SR 74 @ SR 42
5. Required Area Classes:

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

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

Number	Area Class
3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-lane Rural Roadway Design

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

Number	Area Class
1.06(a)	NEPA
1.06(b)	History
1.06(c)	Air Quality
1.06(d)	Noise
1.06(e)	Ecology
1.06(f)	Archaeology
1.06(g)	Freshwater Aquatic Surveys
1.07	Attitude, Opinion, and Community Value Studies (Public Involvement)
1.10	Traffic Analysis
3.06	Traffic Operations Studies
3.07	Traffic Operations Design
3.08	Landscape Architecture Design
3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
3.15	Highway Lighting
5.01	Land Surveying
5.02	Engineering Surveying
5.03	Geodetic Surveying
5.04	Aerial Photography
5.05	Photogrammetry
5.06	Topographic Remote Sensing
5.08	Overhead/Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)
6.01(a)	Soil Survey Studies
6.01(b)	Geological and Geophysical Studies
6.03	Hydraulic and Hydrologic Studies (Soils & Foundation)
9.01	Erosion, Sedimentation, and Pollution Control Plan

## 6. Scope:

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

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

The Consultant shall provide:

- A. Concept Report:
  1. Traffic studies.
  2. Conceptual right of way cost estimate utilizing vendor from GDOT's Right-of-Way services prequalified contractor list.
  3. Conceptual construction cost estimate.
  4. Prepare concept layouts and alignments alternatives.
  5. Initial Concept meeting Preparation and Attendance.
  6. Approved Concept Report.
  7. Concept Design Data Book.
  8. Concept Meeting Preparation and Attendance.
  9. Public Involvement Plan (for GDOT's approval).
  
- B. Environment Document:
  1. Necessary Environmental Special Studies survey reports and assessment of effects for Ecology, History, Archaeology, Air, and Noise.
  2. Agency coordination including multiple meetings to ensure consistency of expectations, design, and clearance limits.
  3. NEPA documents:
    - a. Environmental Approval.
    - b. NEPA Reevaluations, as required.
  4. Preparation of Section 404 Permit Application.
  5. Section 7 Coordination.
  6. Protected Species Surveys including Aquatic & Terrestrial Surveys, as required.
  7. Preparation of a Vegetative Buffer application.
  8. Public Involvement (Public Information Open House (PIOH)) and associated coordination with GDOT.
  9. Prepare for and attend the Preliminary Field Plan Review (PFPR), Constructability Reviews, and Final Field Plan Review (FFPR).
  10. Certification for Right-of-Way.
  11. Certification for Let.
  12. TPro and P6 Updates.
  13. Preparation of Environmental Commitments Table "Green Sheet" and Environmental Resource Impact Table (ERIT).
  
- C. Preliminary Design, include but not limited to:
  1. Complete Preliminary Roadway Plans, including but not limited to:
    - a. Preliminary Signing and Marking Plans.
    - b. Preliminary Signal Plans.
    - c. Preliminary Staging & Erosion Control Plans.
  2. Cost Estimation System (CES) Preliminary cost estimate with annual updates.
  3. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Reviews.
  4. Location and Design Report.
  5. PFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
  6. Traffic Studies.
  7. Preliminary Construction plans.
  8. Pavement Evaluation/UST & Monitoring wells/Soil Survey.



9. Pavement Type selection.
10. Constructability Review meeting.
11. Approved Pavement Design.
12. SUE Plans (Quality Level B).

D. Survey:

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

E. Right-of-Way Plans:

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

F. Final Design:

1. FFPR participation, report, and responses (all plans sets and other information requested by Engineering Services).
2. Erosion Control Plans.
3. Quality Assurance/Quality Control Reviews.
4. Corrected FFPR Plans.
5. Cost Estimation System (CES) Final cost estimate.
6. Final Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) Package.
7. Amendments & Revisions.
8. Final Design Data Book.
9. Complete Final Roadway Plans. Including but not limited to:
  - a. Final Signing and Marking Plans.
  - b. Final Signal Plans.
  - c. Final Staging & Erosion Plans.
10. Utility Plans.
11. Update all Environmental Special Studies Reports and NEPA reevaluation:
  - a. History.
  - b. Ecology.
  - c. Archaeology.
  - d. Air.
  - e. Noise.
  - f. Freshwater Aquatic and other protected species surveys as needed.
12. Pavement Evaluation.
13. Special Provisions.

G. Construction:

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

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

1. 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.

RFQ-484-052819

- 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.

RFQ-484-052819

- 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)		Hlstory							
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							

RFQ-484-052819

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**

		<b># of Pages Allowed</b>
Cover Page	->	1
<b>A. Administrative Requirements</b>		
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>B. Experience and Qualifications</b>		
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
<b>C. Resources/Workload Capacity</b>		
1. Overall Resources		
a. Organization chart		
b. Primary office to handle project and staff description of office and benefits of office		
c. Narrative on Additional Resource Areas and Ability		
	->	Excluded
		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  
19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

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

**The purpose of this Addendum is to 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. 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.

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  
19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

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

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

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


This form must be completed and included in the Statement of Qualifications as the last page with applicable boxes checked.  
This form **will NOT** be counted in the maximum number of pages.

- ALL The submitted team meets the prequalification requirements for all projects and would like to be considered on all projects.  
**OR**  
The submitted team meets the prequalification requirements and would like to be considered on the following checked contracts.

Contract	County	PI #	Project Description
1	Glynn	0014914	CR 583/SEA ISLAND ROAD @ DUNBAR CREEK ON ST SIMONS ISLAND
2	Butts	0016126	SR 36 @ BIG SANDY CREEK 3.8 MI SW OF JACKSON
	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



## SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

<b>SOLICITATION #:</b>	<b>RFQ-484-052819</b>	 Georgia Department of Transportation
<b>SOLICITATION TITLE:</b>	<b>Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 6</b>	
<b>SOLICITATION DUE DATE:</b>	<b>May 28, 2019</b>	
<b>SOLICITATION TIME DUE:</b>	<b>2:00pm</b>	

No.	Consultants	Date	Time	Exhibit II - Certification	Exhibit III - GSICAA	Signed Addendum if Applicable	Compliant with Page # Limitations	Compliant with Required Format
1	American Engineers, Inc.	5/28/2019	7:27 AM	x	x	x	x	x
2	Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	5/28/2019	10:27 AM	x	x	x	x	x
3	Calyx Engineers and Consultants Inc.	5/28/2019	11:42 AM	x	?	x	x	x
4	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	5/28/2019	1:56 PM	?	?	x	x	x
5	CROY Engineering, LLC	5/28/2019	8:58 AM	x	x	x	x	x
6	EXP US Services Inc.	5/28/2019	7:32 AM	x	x	x	x	x
7	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	5/28/2019	1:12 PM	x	x	x	x	x
8	Holt Consulting Company, LLC	5/28/2019	1:51 PM	x	x	?	x	x
9	Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung, Inc.	5/28/2019	12:38 PM	x	x	x	x	x
10	International Design Services, Inc. /dba/IDS Global, Inc. - Dis	5/28/2019	1:43 PM	x	x	x	No	No
11	KCI Technologies, Inc.	5/28/2019	1:49 PM	x	x	x	x	x
12	Kennedy Engineering Associate Group LLC	5/28/2019	1:45 PM	x	?	x	x	x
13	Low Engineers, LLC	5/28/2019	11:56 AM	x	x	x	x	x
14	Mead and Hunt, Inc.	5/28/2019	9:56 AM	x	x	x	x	x
15	Michael Baker International Inc.	5/28/2019	12:46 PM	x	x	x	x	x
16	Moffatt & Nichol	5/28/2019	1:00 PM	x	x	x	x	x
17	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	5/28/2019	1:15 PM	x	x	x	x	x
18	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	5/28/2019	9:58 AM	x	x	x	x	x
19	Pond & Company	5/28/2019	1:10 PM	x	x	x	x	x
20	R.K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	5/28/2019	11:48 AM	x	x	x	x	x
21	RS&H, Inc.	5/28/2019	8:21 AM	x	x	x	x	x
22	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	5/28/2019	10:29 AM	x	?	x	x	x
23	STV Incorporated	5/28/2019	11:27 AM	x	x	x	x	x
24	T.Y. Lin International	5/28/2019	1:54 PM	x	x	?	x	x
25	Thompson Engineering, Inc.	5/28/2019	9:56 AM	x	x	x	x	x
26	Wolverton & Associates, Inc.	5/28/2019	11:53 AM	x	x	x	x	x
27	WSP USA Inc.	5/28/2019	1:45 PM	x	x	x	x	x

**GDOT GUIDE FOR SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS –**  
**Phase II Evaluation - Revised**  
**RFQ-484-052819**  
**Batch #1 – 2019 Engineering Design Services**  
**Contract #6 , PI# 0015151**

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

**Coordination and Communication**

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

**Evaluation Process**

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

**Phase I**

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

**Phase II**

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

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

**Evaluation of Eligible Submittals**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Evaluation Meeting:**

**All completed Scoring Forms with the preliminary scores and comments for each criteria of each firm, must be brought to the Selection Committee Meeting planned for Friday, July 12, 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 Wednesday, October 16, 2019.** The Selection Committee will discuss and determine a final committee rating for each criteria and will provide summary comments as to why the Committee feels the rating is warranted. The Committee will assign the following ratings:

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

#### **FINAL SCORING AND SELECTION**

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



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

Solicitation Title	Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 6, PI#0015151	1	Moffatt & Nichol	
Solicitation #	RFQ-484-052819	2	Michael Baker International Inc.	
PHASE I - Individual Committee Member Preliminary Scoring based on Published Criteria		3	STV Incorporated	
<b>(This Page For GDOT Use)</b>		4	American Engineers, Inc.	
		5	Lowe Engineers, LLC	
		6	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	
		7	KCI Technologies, Inc.	
		8	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	(RANKING)		9	Barge Design Solutions, Inc.
	Sum of Individual Rankings	Group Ranking	10	Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung, Inc.
American Engineers, Inc.	17	4	11	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.
Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	26	9	12	Kennedy Engineering Associate Group LLC
Calyx Engineers and Consultants Inc.	34	17	13	CROY Engineering, LLC
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C.	27	11	14	Holt Consulting Company, LLC
CROY Engineering, LLC	28	13	15	Wolverton & Associates, Inc.
EXP US Services Inc.	38	22	16	Neel-Schaffer, Inc.
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	25	8	17	Calyx Engineers and Consultants Inc.
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	28	14	18	Southeastern Engineering, Inc.
Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung, Inc.	26	10	19	R.K. Shah & Associates, Inc.
International Design Services, Inc. /dba/IDS Global, Inc. - Disqualified	81	27	20	Pond & Company
KCI Technologies, Inc.	18	7	21	T.Y. Lin International
Kennedy Engineering Associate Group LLC	27	12	22	EXP US Services Inc
Lowe Engineers, LLC	17	5	23	Thompson Engineering, Inc.
Mead and Hunt, Inc.	52	26	24	WSP USA Inc.
Michael Baker International Inc.	11	2	25	RS&H, Inc.
Moffatt & Nichol	3	1	26	Mead and Hunt, Inc.
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	17	6	27	International Design Services, Inc. /dba/IDS Global, Inc. - Disqualified
Neel-Schaffer, Inc.	29	16		
Pond & Company	37	20		
R.K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	37	19		
RS&H, Inc.	40	25		
Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	35	18		
STV Incorporated	11	3		
T.Y. Lin International	38	21		
Thompson Engineering, Inc.	38	23		
Wolverton & Associates, Inc.	28	15		
WSP USA Inc.	37	24		

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications

Resources and Workload Capacity

# Evaluator 1

SUBMITTING FIRMS	Maximum Points allowed		Phase One Evaluator 1 Individual	
	300	200	Total Score	Ranking
American Engineers, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
Barge Design Solutions, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
Calyx Engineers and Consultants Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P.C	Good	Good	375	1
CROY Engineering, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
EXP US Services Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	6
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
International Design Services, Inc /dba/IDS Global, Inc - Disqualified	Poor	Poor	0	27
KCI Technologies, Inc	Good	Good	375	1
Kennedy Engineering Associate Group LLC	Good	Good	375	1
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
Mead and Hunt, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
Michael Baker International Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
Moffatt & Nichol	Good	Good	375	1
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
Neel-Schaffer, Inc	Good	Good	375	1
Pond & Company	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
R K Shah & Associates, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
RS&H, Inc	Adequate	Good	300	7
Southeastern Engineering, Inc	Adequate	Good	300	7
STV Incorporated	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
T Y Lin International	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
Thompson Engineering, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
Wolverton & Associates, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
WSP USA inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	9
<b>Maximum Points allowed</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>%</b>



GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #: 1			
<b>Evaluation Commission 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.</b>			
Poor = Does Not have minimum qualifications/availability = 0% of the Available Points Marginal = Meets Minimum qualifications/availability but one or more major considerations are not addressed or is lacking in some essential aspects = Score 25 % of Available Points Adequate = Meets minimum qualification/availability and is generally capable of performing work = 50% of Available Points Good = More than meets minimum qualifications/availability and exceeds in some aspects =75% of Available Points Excellent = Fully meets qualifications/availability and exceeds in several or all areas = 100% of Available Points			
<b>Firm Name:</b> <i>Business Engineers, Inc.</i>			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed project for which they would like to be considered. The Key Team Leaders display previous work in the area of pedestrian improvements and signal upgrades. Due to the level of public involvement anticipated, expounding on previous PI efforts would have been helpful.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs; however, the Area Class Summary Page does not show much overlap. The combined years of experience of the Team Leads and the number of years they have been at their firm is an added value.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b> <i>Paul Simon Associates, Inc.</i>			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Based on the projects presented in the RFQ, the Project Manager, Key Team Leads and Prime have worked on projects that included bridge replacements, widenings and pedestrian improvements; however projects identifying the design of roundabouts were not included. The team has decades of experience working on DOT projects that include federal funding.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs; however, the Area Class Summary Page does not show much overlap.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b> <i>DATA Engineers and Scientists Inc.</i>			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>The projects presented in the RFQ highlights how the Roadway Team Lead has worked on projects similar to the ones included in the batch; however, the projects highlighted for the PM and the NEPA Team lead do not. The work experience for the NEPA Team Lead is heavy on Cultural Resources Management. The project presented for the Prime shows experience in similar projects with the exception of roundabouts. Based on the projects listed in the commitment table, the Prime and identified team leads have experience working on managing multiple projects.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Comments: The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs, in addition to showing some overlap with area classes.</i>			

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

**Based on the projects identified in the RFQ, the PM, Key Team Leads and the Prime have all worked on projects relevant to the batch. They show that they have experience serving as the lead and working on multiple projects.**

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

**Comments: The firms all display resource availability based on their current workload. They do not identify projects that show that they have worked together on previously; however, all the area classes are represented amongst the firms and even duplicated in some instances.**

<b>Firm Name:</b> <i>PROT Engineering, LLC</i>	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating <b>Adequate</b>

**Comments: Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed project for which they would like to be considered. The Key Team Leaders display previous work in the area of pedestrian improvements and signal upgrades.**

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

**Comments: The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs, and show overlap in some instances.**

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

**Comments: The PM and Key Team Leads did not adequately identify a full range of project experience relevant to the projects in the batch. The PM identified more roundabout projects, the Lead Designer focused on more intersection improvements, and the NEPA Lead focused on more bridge replacements.**

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

**Comments: The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs, in addition to showing some overlap with area classes.**

<b>Firm Name:</b> <i>Smith &amp; Johnson's Engineers, Inc.</i>	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating <b>Good</b>

**Comments: Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed project for which they would like to be considered. The Key Team Leaders display previous work in the area of pedestrian improvements and signal upgrades. The projects identified for the NEPA Lead shows the ability to execute an elevated Public Involvement strategy should the need arise.**

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

**Comments: The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs; however, the Area Class Summary Page does not show much overlap.**



**Firm Name:** TMR Consulting Company, LLC

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

**Comments:**

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

**Comments:**

**Firm Name:** Kincaid, Gray, Hill & Geringer, Inc.

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

**Comments:** Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed project for which they would like to be considered. The PM and the Key Team Leads display previous work in the area of pedestrian improvements, signal upgrades and roundabout construction.

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

**Comments:** The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs; however, the Area Class Summary Page does not show much overlap.

**Firm Name:** T&B Transportation, Inc.

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

**Comments:**

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

**Comments:**

**Firm Name:** Kincaid Engineering Associates Group, LLC

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

**Comments:** Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed project for which they would like to be considered. The Key Team Leaders display previous work in the area of pedestrian improvements and signal upgrades.

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

**Comments:** The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs.

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

**Comments:** Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed project for which they would like to be considered.

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

**Comments:** The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs; however, the Area Class Summary Page does not show much overlap.

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

**Comments:** Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed project for which they would like to be considered.

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

**Comments:** The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs; however, the Area Class Summary Page does not show much overlap.

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

**Comments:** Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the identification of similar projects by the Prime, PM, and Lead Designer was limited and the inclusion of roundabouts and bridge design was small.

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

**Comments:** The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs, and show overlap in some instances.

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

**Comments:** Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed project for which they would like to be considered.

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

**Comments:** The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs, and show overlap in some instances.



<b>Firm Name:</b> [Redacted]		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Adequate</b>
<b>Comments:</b> The PM has designed and managed over 50 highway projects for GDOT and has 27 years of experience with MA; however, the designer has only been with MA since 2014 and the project listed in the RFQ was heavily focused on pedestrian improvements. Additionally, the NEPA Lead is an ecologist by trade and the projects included as relevant experience was heavily focused on ecology deliverables, not NEPA documentation. The Prime has experience with similar projects, having completed pedestrian improvements, bridge replacements, and roundabout designs. What stands out about the firm is that they have experience working with projects with complex Public Involvement and Agency Coordination.		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	<b>Adequate</b>
<b>Comments:</b> The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs; however, the Area Class Summary Page does not show much overlap.		
<b>Firm Name:</b> [Redacted]		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Good</b>
<b>Comments:</b> Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed project for which they would like to be considered. The PM has 27 years of experience and has managed or designed roundabouts, multi-use trails, pedestrian improvements, CD lanes and bridges. He has also served as a Lead Engineer for VE Studies. the Lead Designer has over 16 years of experience and has designed or served as the project manger for major design build projects, LCI projects, roundabouts and interchanges. The Lead has authored multiple EA level documents and has over 24 years experience. The Prime has the experience relevant to be considered for the Road Safety Audit of SR 204.		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	<b>Good</b>
<b>Comments:</b> The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs; however, the Area Class Summary Page does not show much overlap.		
<b>Firm Name:</b> [Redacted]		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Adequate</b>
<b>Comments:</b> Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed projects for which they would like to be considered, with the exception of bridge design projects. The projects highlighted for the PM is heavy in corridor and traffic studies. Not much was provided in the way of experience on similar projects in the batch. The Design Lead's credentials focused mainly on pedestrian and safety improvements, projects that included bridge designs were not highlighted. Lastly, the NEPA Lead has 30 years of consulting experience and has managed and authored environmental studies and conducted public outreach for environmentally complex projects; however experience on similar projects was not highlighted.		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	<b>Adequate</b>
<b>Comments:</b> The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before, and although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs, and shows some overlap.		
<b>Firm Name:</b> [Redacted]		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Adequate</b>
<b>Comments:</b>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	<b>Adequate</b>
<b>Comments:</b>		

<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>NEPA, Inc.</small>	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating  Adequate

**Comments:** Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed project for which they would like to be considered. The PM has 35 years of experience and has worked on multiple bridge bundle projects, some that included extensive coordination with resource agencies due to Cultural Resources or T&E Species. The Design Lead has 15 years of experience and has also work on bridge bundle projects. The credential's for the NEPA Lead also focused heavily on bridge replacements despite the batch including the need for roundabout design and pedestrian and safety improvement designs.

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

**Comments:** The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The firm has over 500 transportation professional across the country, predeominantly in the Southeast. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before; however ,it did mention that they have built relationships with their subs and have worked with the NEPA Lead "extensively for several years". Although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs, and shows some overlap.

<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>Industrial Engineering, Inc.</small>	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating  Adequate

**Comments:** Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed project for which they would like to be considered. The PM has over 21 years of experience; however, the credentials highlighted did not include roundabout project management. The Design LEAD has worked with the firm since 2014 and highlighted experience on multiple roundabout projects the the design of pedestrian enhancements in front of a HS. Teh NEPA Lead has 23 years of experience has served a the envionmental QAQC person for TE projects, and has worked on numerous CMAQ projects.

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

**Comments:** The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ identifies a series of projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before. One includes a potetial roundabout. The Prime also highlighted how they have partnered on the PTIP contract and the support services contract. Although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs, showing some overlap with some area classes.

<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>T.Y. Lin International and T.Y. Lin International Associates</small>	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating  Adequate

**Comments:** Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed project for which they would like to be considered. One project, that included 30 intersection improvements, a road widening, and the construction of sidewalks and pedestrian improvements, was highlighted. The PM has 26 years of experience and has experience working on sidewalk and pedestrian improvements, and bridge replacement projects via a bridge bundle in District 4. The Lead Designer's credentials highlighted experience working on sidewalks and pedestrian improvements; however, bridge replacement projects were not highlighted. The NEPA Lead has 17 yrs of experence that includes public involment, conducting Cultural Resources Surveys and reports, ecology reports, and permits and SBV applications. The NEPA LEAD also has experience working on bridge replacements; however safety and pedestrian improvement projects were not highlighted.

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

**Comments:** The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before; however, it did mention how their business partners are like friends who the have worked with for over 10yrs. And although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs, showing some overlap with some area classes.

<b>Firm Name:</b> T.Y. Lin International	
A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating  Adequate

**Comments:**

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

**Comments:**



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

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

**Comments:** Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed project for which they would like to be considered. The PM has 29 yrs of experience and has performed various design aspects of roadway design. The relevant project manager experience includes coordinating with sub-consultants; developing scopes, schedules, and budgets; monitoring project progress and reporting project status to the Owner. As PM, the relevant projects included were bridge replacements, an Interchange modification, a bypass. Projects consisting of safety and pedestrian improvements and roundabouts were not highlighted. The Design lead has 19 yrs of experience and has served as the lead engineer for bridge replacements and widenings. Projects consisting of safety and pedestrian improvements and roundabouts were not highlighted. The NEPA Lead has over 16 yrs managing state-aid transportation projects, including streetscapes and pedestrian improvements, safety projects, road widenings, and intersection improvements. Experience highlights GEPA B document preparation and project team coordination.

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

**Comments:** The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before; however a statement was added saying tha the PM has prior experience with the sub-consultants committed to the team. Also, the document mentioned that the PM and Lead Designer have recent experience working together on the design and project management of roadway widening and interchange projects; however, it does not mention which ones.

**Firm Name: Wolverton & Associates, Inc.**

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

**Comments:** Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the firm has completed projects similar to the proposed project for which they would like to be considered. The Prime has an existing on-call contract with both Chatham County Department of Engineering and the City of Savannah resulting in dozens of projects completed in the area, including several traffic signal and pedestrian upgrades. The Prime also helped coordinate and establish project-specific pay items to address the pedestrian push button requirements for the City. The PM has 15yrs of experience and extensive knowledge of the project area via both current and previous projects and has served as PM on similar projects that include ADA and signal upgrades, safety and operational improvements, pedestrian improvements and roundabouts. The Lead Designer has served as PM on the design of signalized intersections and safety analysis. Credentials do not highlight Lead design work. The NEPA Lead has served as PM and Senior NEPA Planner on projects requiring robust public outreach, multi-trail projects ,and widening and safety improvements.

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

**Comments:** The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before. Although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. Also, the committed hours for the NEPA Lead is over 50%. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs, showing some overlap with some area classes.

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

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

**Comments:** Based on the information presented in the RFQ, the relevant experience on similar projects was limited to mostly safety and pedestrian updrades. The document did not make much mention of bridge or roundabout design. The relevant experience listed for the Lead PM included roles a Deputy PM, Task Manager, and Project Engineer. Of the 6 projects highlighted as relevant experience, none lists the role of Lead PM. Additionally, the projects highlighted are mostly related to traffic, pedestrian and safety improvements. The Lead Designer has 11yrs and has served as the lead for multiple pedestrian improvements. The relevant experience highlighted for the NEPA Lead, who served mostly as the Environmental Project Manager for the projects listed, and once as the Environmental task Lead, were heavily concentrated on pedestrian improvements.

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

**Comments:** The resources presented in the organizational chart shows that the sub-consultants chosen will adequately provide the resources needed. The RFQ did not definitively identify projects that show instances where the Prime and Subs have worked together before. Although the committed hours for the Key Team Leads were provided, the committed hours for the subs were not. Also, the committed hours for the PM Lead is over 50%. All the area classes are covered among the Prime and the subs, showing some overlap with some area classes. Additionally, the Prime has listed additional resources that include QA/QC, Drainage/Erosion Control/MS4, Pedestrian Specialist, and Senior Technical Advisor.

# Evaluator 2

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications

Resources and Workload Capacity

Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	Phase One	
SUBMITTING FIRMS	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Engineers, Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Barge Design Solutions, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Calyx Engineers and Consultants Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P C	Marginal	Adequate	175	18
CROY Engineering, LLC	Marginal	Adequate	175	18
EXP US Services Inc.	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	1
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Good	Adequate	325	1
Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung, inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
International Design Services, Inc /dba/IDS Global, Inc - Disqualified	Poor	Poor	0	27
KCI Technologies, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Kennedy Engineering Associate Group LLC	Marginal	Adequate	175	18
Lowe Engineers, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Mead and Hunt, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	18
Michael Baker International Inc	Good	Adequate	325	1
Moffatt & Nichol	Good	Adequate	325	1
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Neel-Schaffer, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	18
Pond & Company	Marginal	Adequate	175	18
R K Shah & Associates, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	18
RS&H, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Southeastern Engineering, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	18
STV Incorporated	Good	Adequate	325	1
T.Y. Lin International	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Thompson Engineering, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	7
Wolverton & Associates, Inc	Good	Adequate	325	1
WSP USA Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	18
Maximum Points allowed =	300	200	500	%

GDOT Solicitation #:	<b>RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6</b>	Phase of Evaluation:	<b>PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings</b>
Evaluator #: 2			

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

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

**Firm Name:** American Engineering, Inc.

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM and Team and has adequate experience. Most project listed aren't GDOT. Prime also only lists non GDOT projects</i>			

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Team has adequate resources and capacity.</i>			

**Firm Name:** Build Design Solutions, Inc.

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM-limited PM experience on GDOT and some lead design experience. Lead Design doesn't have detail on experience leading design team through entire process. Team and has adequate experience. Most project listed aren't GDOT. Prime also only lists many projects in other states with limited GDOT.</i>			

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Team has adequate resources and capacity.</i>			

**Firm Name:** City Engineers and Designers, Inc.

A. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	—————→	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM-limited PM experience. Lead Designer experience one GDOT TIA and others local. doesn't have detail on experience leading design team through entire process. Prime limited GDOT managed projects.</i>			

B. Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	—————→	<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Team has adequate resources and capacity.</i>			



<b>Firm Name:</b> Clark Peterson Engineers, Architects and Architects P.E.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Marginal</b>

*PM prior experience as a PM not clear. Doesn't give detail on what she did as the PM. Lead designer list roundabout and on-call for GDOT.*

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

*Team has adequate resources and capacity.*

<b>Firm Name:</b> DIRT Engineers, LLC		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Marginal</b>

*PM-limited GDOT PM experience. Doesn't state what role he had as PM. Design Lead designer doesn't adequately specify what their role as lead designer was in projects. Prime doesn't list GDOT projects*

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

*Team has adequate resources and capacity.*

<b>Firm Name:</b> CDMS Engineers		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Adequate</b>

*PM didn't provide clear role and responsibility as PM. Lead designer lacked experience leading a design team. Role was more of PM. Other team and prime experience good.*

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

*Team has adequate resources and capacity.*

<b>Firm Name:</b> Hahn & Associates Engineers, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Good</b>

*PM, lead design, NEPA and prime show good examples of prior experience*

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

*Team has adequate resources and capacity.*



<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>John Canning Company, LLC</small>	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Good

*PM has good experience demonstrated on GDOT projects. Could just more safety related. Team and prime also have good experience with GDOT projects.*

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

*Team has adequate resources and capacity.*

<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>Harvey Cox, Bell &amp; Dickinson, Inc</small>	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Adequate

*PM didn't specify what roles was a previous PM. Other team was adequate. Prime adequate.*

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

*Team has adequate resources and capacity.*

<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>ES&amp;S Technologies, Inc</small>	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Adequate

*PM didn't specify what roles was a previous PM. Other team was adequate. Prime adequate.*

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

*Team has adequate resources and capacity.*

<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>Harvey Engineering Associates, Inc LLC</small>	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Marginal

*PM and lead designer shown as same person. Many prime projects are out of state.*

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

*Team has adequate resources and capacity. The fact one person is to do two roles may be a factor with resources.*

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

*PM didn't specify what roles was a previous PM. Other team was good to adequate. Prime adequate.*

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

*Team has adequate resources and capacity.*

<b>Firm Name:</b> Wood and Stone, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Marginal</b>

*PM didn't specify what roles was a previous PM. Lead design and prime experience not a lot in GDOT. Other team good.*

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

*Team has adequate resources and capacity.*

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

*PM, team and prime experience good.*

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

*Team has adequate resources and capacity.*

<b>Firm Name:</b> WRM & Partners		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Good</b>

*PM roles weren't heavily PM but design. Design and Env lead good. Prime good.*

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

*Team has adequate resources and capacity.*

<b>Firm Name:</b>	Shannon Beckett Associates, Inc.	Assigned Rating	→→	<b>Adequate</b>
-------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------

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

**PM didn't specify what roles as actual PM. Some was more lead design. Lead designer no previous work as lead designer. Nepa good. Prime good.**

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

**Team has adequate resources and capacity.**

<b>Firm Name:</b>	Shannon Beckett Associates, Inc.	Assigned Rating	→→	<b>Marginal</b>
-------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------	----	-----------------

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

**PM didn't specify what roles as actual PM but more design. Lead design and NEPA good. Prime adequate. Mainly design build and studies examples given.**

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

**Team has adequate resources and capacity.**

<b>Firm Name:</b>	Paul & Company	Assigned Rating	→→	<b>Marginal</b>
-------------------	----------------	-----------------	----	-----------------

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

**PM lacks experience as PM on GDOT projects. Mainly have studies as examples. Lead design adequate examples not GDOT projects. NEPA good. Prime adequate.**

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

**Team has adequate resources and capacity.**

<b>Firm Name:</b>	Paul & Company	Assigned Rating	→→	<b>Marginal</b>
-------------------	----------------	-----------------	----	-----------------

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

**PM examples lead design not PM. Design lead previous design eng more than lead design on most. NEPA good. Prime adequate.**

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

**Team has adequate resources and capacity.**

<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>PM</small>			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM didn't specify role as PM. Design lead adequate. NEPA and prime good.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Team has adequate resources and capacity.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>PM</small>			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Marginal</b>
<i>PM examples not specific roadway (Air and TAP). Lead design is adequate but low on GDOT work. NEPA and Prime adequate.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Team has adequate resources and capacity.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>PM</small>			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Good</b>
<i>all team and prime good experince with GDOT projects.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Team has adequate resources and capacity.</i>			
<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>PM</small>			
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>PM good experience. Lead design examples are designer and utility coordination. NEPA and prime adequate.</i>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating		<b>Adequate</b>
<i>Team has adequate resources and capacity.</i>			



<b>Firm Name:</b> <i>Paragon Engineering, Inc.</i>		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Adequate</b>

**PM and lead designer need more recent GDOT experience. Safety examples would be good. NEPA good. Prime adequate. Age of GDOT projects referenced and one out of state. Only 2 GDOT recent projects.**

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

**Team has adequate resources and capacity.**

<b>Firm Name:</b> <i>Wichman &amp; Associates, Inc.</i>		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Good</b>

**Team has good experience in their roles and shows excellent projects related to the area and type. Design Lead could have more lead design experience shown. Prime good.**

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

**Team has adequate resources and capacity.**

<b>Firm Name:</b> <i>ES&amp;P, Inc.</i>		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Marginal</b>

**Prime, PM, lead design low on GDOT experience with let projects. Design Lead design lead no GDOT let projects listed. NEPA good.**

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

**Team has adequate resources and capacity.**

Evaluation Criteria

Experience and Qualifications

Resources and Workload Capacity

# Evaluator 3

SUBMITTING FIRMS	Maximum Points allowed =		Phase One	
	300	200	Evaluator 3 Individual	Total Score
	▼	▼	Total Score	Ranking
American Engineers, Inc	Good	Good	375	1
Barge Design Solutions, Inc	Adequate	Good	300	10
Calyx Engineers and Consultants Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	18
Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, P C	Good	Adequate	325	8
CROY Engineering, LLC	Good	Good	375	1
EXP US Services Inc	Marginal	Good	225	22
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	18
Holt Consulting Company, LLC	Adequate	Adequate	250	18
Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung, Inc	Adequate	Good	300	10
International Design Services, Inc /dba/IDS Global, Inc - Disqualified	Poor	Poor	0	27
KCI Technologies, Inc	Adequate	Good	300	10
Kennedy Engineering Associate Group LLC	Good	Adequate	325	8
Low Engineers, LLC	Good	Good	375	1
Mead and Hunt, Inc	Marginal	Adequate	175	25
Michael Baker International Inc	Good	Good	375	1
Moffatt & Nichol	Good	Good	375	1
Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc	Good	Good	375	1
Neel-Schaffer, Inc	Adequate	Good	300	10
Pond & Company	Adequate	Good	300	10
R K Shah & Associates, Inc	Adequate	Good	300	10
RS&H, Inc	Marginal	Marginal	125	26
Southeastern Engineering, Inc	Adequate	Good	300	10
STV Incorporated	Good	Good	375	1
T Y Lin International	Marginal	Good	225	22
Thompson Engineering, Inc	Marginal	Good	225	22
Wolverton & Associates, Inc	Adequate	Adequate	250	18
WSP USA Inc	Adequate	Good	300	10
<b>Maximum Points allowed =</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>%</b>



GDOT Solicitation #:	RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6	Phase of Evaluation:	PHASE I - Preliminary Ratings
Evaluator #:	3		
Evaluation Commenters 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 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:	Asphalt Engineers, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
<p>Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 21 years experience (4 roadway projects presented, 3 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades, 36 similar); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 21 years experience (3 roadway projects presented, 3 of 3 signal/ADA/ped upgrades, mostly roadway/drainage design engineer experience); ENV Lead = BA History, MS Urban/Regional Planning, 34 to 36 years experience; Prime (5 roadway projects presented, 5 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 4, Rodway Lead on 1, none together.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
<p>Comments: PM = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; Roadway Lead = 10/160 Committed = 94% Available; ENV Lead = 45/160 Committed = 72% Available; Firm + Resources 7 roadway, 4 traffic operations (Atkins) staff, 2 QA. Narrative - basic restatement of org chart.</p>			
Firm Name:	Boyd Design Solutions, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
<p>Comments: PM = BSCE, PE, 18 years experience (6 roadway projects presented, 4 of 6 widening projects with sidewalk and some signals); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 23 years experience (5 roadway projects presented, 5 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades, 3 as PM); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 16 years experience; Prime (4 roadway projects presented, 2 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 1, Rodway Lead on 0, none together.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Good
<p>Comments: PM = 45/160 Committed = 72% Available; Roadway Lead = 52/160 Committed = 68% Available; ENV Lead = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; Firm + Resources 9 roadway, 4 traffic operations staff, 3 QA. Narrative mentions additional company resources.</p>			
Firm Name:	Civil Engineers and Constructors, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
<p>Comments: PM = BCET, PE, 29 years experience (10 roadway projects presented, 8 sidewalks, 2 widenings); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 13 years experience (5 roadway projects presented, 3 of 5 sidewalk, intersection improvements); ENV Lead = BA History/Philosophy, MA History, 23 years experience; Prime (5 roadway projects presented, 4 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades, 1 widening), PM on 5, Rodway Lead on 0, none together.</p>			
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity - 20%	Assigned Rating	→	Adequate
<p>Comments: PM = 100/160 Committed = 38% Available; Roadway Lead = 76/160 Committed = 53% Available; ENV Lead = 28/160 Committed = 83% Available; Firm + Resources 5 roadway, 2 traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Narrative - additional staff, QC/QA, key items.</p>			



<b>Firm Name:</b> The Pollution Engineers, Surveyors and Architects, P.C.	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Good

**Comments:** PM = BSCE, PE, 25 years experience 8 roadway projects presented, 6 of 8 signal/ADA/ped upgrades, 2 widenings); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 12 years experience (6 roadway projects presented, 5 of 6 signal/ADA/ped upgrades, 1 multiple intersections); ENV Lead = BA English Lit., BS/MS ENV Econ., 10 years experience; Prime (4 roadway projects presented, 2 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades, 2 roundabouts), PM on 0, Rodway Lead on 6, none together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; Roadway Lead = 108/160 Committed = 33% Available; ENV Lead = 72/160 Committed = 55% Available; Firm + Resources 6 roadway, 6 traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Narrative mentions additional company resources.

<b>Firm Name:</b> ERM Engineering LLC	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Good

**Comments:** PM = BSCE, PE, 29 years experience (5 roadway projects presented, 4 urban widenings, 1 urban bridge, with signal, roundabout); Roadway Lead = BSCE, MSCE, PE, PTOE, ?? years experience (1 roadway projects presented, 2 corridor studies, 1 urban widening project with 1 signals); ENV Lead = BA Cultural Geography, 25 years experience; Prime (4 roadway projects presented, 3 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades, 1 urban widening), PM on 4, Rodway Lead on 3, 3 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 72/160 Committed = 40% Available; Roadway Lead = 60/160 Committed = 63% Available; ENV Lead = 65/160 Committed = 59% Available; Firm + Resources 4 roadway, 2 traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Narrative - basic restatement of org chart.

<b>Firm Name:</b> EOP Inc	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Marginal

**Comments:** PM = BSCET, PE, 28 years experience (5 roadway projects presented, 3 roundabouts, 1 intersection improvement, 1 widening); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, PTOE, 25 years experience (3 roadway projects presented, 1 turn lanes, 1 realignment, 1 widening w/ signal and bike lanes); ENV Lead = BS/MS Biology, PhD Soil Science, ?? years experience; Prime (5 roadway projects presented, 3 roundabouts, 2 intersection improvements), All by PM's other company and not the Prime's experience.

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

**Comments:** PM = 4/160 Committed = 98% Available; Roadway Lead = 4/160 Committed = 98% Available; ENV Lead = 10/160 Committed = 94% Available; Firm + Resources 16 roadway, no traffic operations staff listed, 1 QA. Narrative does not mention anything about traffic operations.

<b>Firm Name:</b> Hunt & Cook Inc Engineers PC	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating  Adequate

**Comments:** PM = BSCE, PE, ?? years experience (5 roadway projects presented, 2 widenings, bypass, new roadway, intersection improvement); Roadway Lead = BSCET, PE, 18 years experience (4 roadway projects presented, gateway local road, 2 widenings, intersection improvement); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 16 years experience; Prime (5 roadway projects presented, 2 widenings, bridge, interchange, viaduct), PM on 5, Rodway Lead on 5, 5 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 90/160 Committed = 44% Available; Roadway Lead = 64/160 Committed = 60% Available; ENV Lead = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; Firm + Resources 3 roadway, 2 bike ped, no traffic operations staff listed. Narrative mentions additional resources, team organization.



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

**Comments:** PM = BSCE, PE, 20 years experience (6 roadway projects presented, bypass improvement, turn lanes/signal, 2 widenings, bridge, interchange); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 20 years experience = same person shown as PM on Clark Patterson Lee SOQ (3 roadway projects presented, 3 of 3 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BS Geology/Marine Science, 24 years experience; Prime (4 roadway projects presented, intersection improvements, 3 bridges). PM on 5, Roadway Lead on 0, 0 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 78/160 Committed = 51% Available; Roadway Lead = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; ENV Lead = 18/160 Committed = 89% Available; Firm + Resources 4 roadway, 2 traffic operations staff, 2 QA. Narrative mentions team coordination, availability (75%).

<b>Firm Name:</b> Henry, Shi, Bell & Company	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating  Adequate

**Comments:** PM = BSCE, PE, 23 years experience 5 roadway projects presented, 4 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BCE, PE, 25 years experience (2 roadway projects presented, 2 signal/ADA/ped upgrades, 1 corridor study); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 16 years experience; Prime (4 roadway projects presented, 3 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), completed corridor study for this project. PM on 4, Roadway Lead on 1, 0 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 52/160 Committed = 68% Available; Roadway Lead = 16/160 Committed = 90% Available; ENV Lead = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; Firm + Resources 10 roadway, 2 traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Narrative mentions additional availability.

<b>Firm Name:</b> TSP Engineering Inc.	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating  Adequate

**Comments:** PM = BCE, PE, 20 years experience (14 roadway projects presented, 6 of 14 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 13 years experience (4 roadway projects presented, 3 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BA English Lit., BS/MS ENV Econ., 10 years experience; Prime (3 roadway projects presented, 2 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades, 1 corridor study). PM on 4, Roadway Lead on 0, 0 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 40/160 Committed = 75% Available; Roadway Lead = 36/160 Committed = 78% Available; ENV Lead = 72/160 Committed = 55% Available; Firm + Resources 4 roadway, 1 traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Narrative mentions additional resources, QA.

<b>Firm Name:</b> Trench Engineering Associates, Inc.	
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications - 30%	Assigned Rating  Good

**Comments:** PM = BSCE, PE, 25 years experience (3 + 2 multiple roadway projects presented, 3 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = PM; ENV Lead = BS Geology/Marine Science, 24 years experience; Prime (6 roadway projects presented, 4 of 6 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM/Roadway Lead on 2.

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

**Comments:** PM/Roadway Lead = 84/160 Committed = 48% Available; ENV Lead = 18/160 Committed = 89% Available; Firm + Resources 5 roadway, 2 traffic operations staff, 2 QA same as Roadway. Narrative - basic restatement of org chart.

#3

<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>Local Engineers, LLC</small>		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Good</b>

**Comments:** Text Hard to read. PM = BSCE, MSCE, MBA, PE, 31 years experience (4 roadway projects presented, 1 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BS Construction, BSCE, PE, 20 years experience (4 roadway projects presented, 3 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 16 years experience; Prime (5 roadway projects presented, 4 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 5, Rodway Lead on 5, 5 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 52/160 Committed = 68% Available; Roadway Lead = 74/160 Committed = 54% Available; ENV Lead = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; Firm + Resources 6 roadway, 4 traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Narrative mentions additional resources and traffic experience.

<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>Blair and Hill, Inc.</small>		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Marginal</b>

**Comments:** PM = BSCE, PE, 27 years experience (5 roadway projects presented, 2 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 14 years experience (4 roadway projects presented, 2 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), No GDOT or GA experience; ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 16 years experience; Prime (4 roadway projects presented, 2 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 2, Rodway Lead on 0, 0 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 88/160 Committed = 45% Available; Roadway Lead = 110/160 Committed = 31% Available; ENV Lead = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; Firm + Resources 6 roadway, 3 traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Narrative mentions close proximity to OGC.

<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>Project Based Identification Co.</small>		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Good</b>

**Comments:** PM = BSME, PE, PTOE, 19 years experience (8 roadway projects presented, 6 of 8 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 14 years experience (5 roadway projects presented, 5 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BS/MS Biology, PhD Soil Science, 40 years experience; Prime (5 roadway projects presented, 5 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 5, Rodway Lead on 1, 1 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 60/160 Committed = 63% Available; Roadway Lead = 40/160 Committed = 75% Available; ENV Lead = 44/160 Committed = 73% Available; Firm + Resources 10 roadway, 3 traffic operations staff, 3 QA. Narrative mentions organizational help from another firm.

<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>Primm &amp; Sons</small>		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Good</b>

**Comments:** PM = BSCE, PE, PTOE, ?? years experience (5 roadway projects presented, 4 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades, including adjacent corridor project); Roadway Lead = BS Business, BCE, PE, ?? years experience (3 roadway projects presented, 3 of 3 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BA International Relations, MHP, ?? years experience; Prime (4 roadway projects presented, 4 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 4, Rodway Lead on 0, 0 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 52/160 Committed = 68% Available; Roadway Lead = 45/160 Committed = 72% Available; ENV Lead = 42/160 Committed = 74% Available; Firm + Resources 8 roadway, 4 traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Narrative mentions close proximity to the project and QC.



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

**Comments:** PM = BSCE, PE, 27 years experience (7 roadway projects presented, 4 of 7 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BSCE, MSCE, PE, 5 years experience (6 roadway projects presented, 4 of 6 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BS/MS ES, ?? years experience; Prime (5 roadway projects presented, 5 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 5, Rodway Lead on 0, 0 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 48/160 Committed = 70% Available; Roadway Lead = 48/160 Committed = 70% Available; ENV Lead = 56/160 Committed = 65% Available; Firm + Resources 7 roadway, 2 traffic operations staff, 2 QA. Narrative mentions additional resources and QC.

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

**Comments:** PM = BSCET, PE, 27 years experience (10 roadway projects presented, 6 of 10 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 16 years experience (5 roadway projects presented, 4 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BS Geology/Marine Science, 24 years experience; Prime (3 roadway projects presented, 1 of 3 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 5, Rodway Lead on 0, 0 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 95/160 Committed = 41% Available; Roadway Lead = 60/160 Committed = 63% Available; ENV Lead = 18/160 Committed = 89% Available; Firm + Resources 4 roadway, 2 traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Narrative mentions details of staff capabilities and QA.

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

**Comments:** PM = BSCE, MSCE, PE, PTOE, 25 years experience (9 roadway projects/studies presented, 4 of 9 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 20 years experience (5 roadway projects/studies presented, 5 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BA English, M NR, Communications, 30 years experience; Prime (4 roadway projects/studies presented, 1 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 4, Rodway Lead on 1, 1 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 76/160 Committed = 53% Available; Roadway Lead = 60/160 Committed = 63% Available; ENV Lead = 100/160 Committed = 38% Available; Firm + Resources 7 roadway, 4 traffic operations, 2 bike/ped staff, 1 QA. Narrative mentions firms experience/project approach.

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

**Comments:** PM = BSCE, MSCE, PE, 40 years experience (11 roadway projects presented, 7 of 11 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BCE, PE, 24 years experience (4 roadway projects presented, 2 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 16 years experience; Prime (3 roadway projects presented, 2 of 3 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 3, Rodway Lead on 3, 3 together. Mostly widenings.

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

**Comments:** PM = 30/160 Committed = 81% Available; Roadway Lead = 32/160 Committed = 80% Available; ENV Lead = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; Firm + Resources 5 roadway, 4 traffic operations staff. Narrative mentions experience of staff.

<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>BS&amp;J, Inc.</small>		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Marginal</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> PM = BSCE, No PE, 35 years experience (6 roadway projects presented, 1 of 6 signal/ADA/ped upgrades) mostly rural projects; Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 15 years experience (2 roadway projects presented, 0 of 3 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BS Ecology, Etology, Evolution, 16 years experience; Prime (4 roadway projects presented, 1 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 4, Rodway Lead on 3, 3 together. Mostly bridges.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	<b>Marginal</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> PM = 40 to 80/160 Committed = 50 to 75% Available; Roadway Lead = 60 to 140/160 Committed = 13 to 63% Available; ENV Lead = 88/160 Committed = 45% Available; Firm + Resources 4 roadway, No traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Neither org chart nor narrative mention traffic operations.</p>		
<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>Equilibrium Engineering, Inc.</small>		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Adequate</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> PM = BSCET, PE, 21 years experience (5 roadway projects presented, 2 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 77 years experience (5 roadway projects presented, 3 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BS Biology, 23 + 10 years experience; Prime (5 roadway projects presented, 3 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 4, Rodway Lead on 5, 5 together.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	<b>Good</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> PM = 54/160 Committed = 66% Available; Roadway Lead = 40/160 Committed = 75% Available; ENV Lead = 36/160 Committed = 78% Available; Firm + Resources 7 roadway, 3 traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Narrative mentions additional resources, ability.</p>		
<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>PTC Incorporated and PTC Management Associates</small>		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Good</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> PM = BSCE, PE, 26 years experience (10 roadway projects presented, 7 of 10 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BCE, PE, 77 years experience (4 roadway projects presented, 4 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BS Chemistry, 17 years experience; Prime (3 roadway projects presented, 3 of 3 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 3, Rodway Lead on 3, 3 together.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	<b>Good</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> PM = 70/160 Committed = 56% Available; Roadway Lead = 60/160 Committed = 63% Available; ENV Lead = 64/160 Committed = 60% Available; Firm + Resources 6 roadway, 3 traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Narrative mentions team's similar experience.</p>		
<b>Firm Name:</b> <small>US Engineers</small>		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Marginal</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> PM = BSCE, PE, 38 years experience (10 roadway projects presented, 6 of 10 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 20 years experience (2 roadway projects presented, 1 of 2 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BA English, M NR, Communications, 28 years experience; Prime (4 roadway projects presented, 4 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 4, Rodway Lead on 0, 0 together.</p>		
B Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Resources and Workload Capacity – 20%	Assigned Rating	<b>Good</b>
<p><b>Comments:</b> PM = 34/160 Committed = 79% Available; Roadway Lead = 60/160 Committed = 63% Available; ENV Lead = 100/160 Committed = 38% Available; Firm + Resources 4 roadway, 2 traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Narrative mentions additional resources.</p>		



<b>Firm Name:</b> Thompson Processing, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Marginal</b>

**Comments:** PM = BSCET, PE, 29 years experience (6 roadway projects presented, 2 of 6 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BSCET, PE, 19 years experience (4 roadway projects presented, 2 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 16 years experience; Prime (5 roadway projects presented, 2 of 5 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 5, Rodway Lead on 5, 5 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 10/160 Committed = 94% Available; Roadway Lead = 40/160 Committed = 75% Available; ENV Lead = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; Firm + Resources 3 roadway, 2 traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Narrative list additional resources.

<b>Firm Name:</b> Watson & Associates, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Adequate</b>

**Comments:** PM = BSCE, PE, 15 years experience (9 roadway projects presented, 4 of 9 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BSCET, EIT, No PE, ?? years experience (2 roadway projects presented, 2 of 2 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BS Zoology, 16 years experience; Prime (6 on-call contract projects presented, 6 of 6 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 2, Rodway Lead on 6, 2 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 46/160 Committed = 71% Available; Roadway Lead = 42/160 Committed = 74% Available; ENV Lead = 68/160 Committed = 58% Available; Firm + Resources 1 roadway/traffic operations staff, 1 QA. Narrative mentions current relationship to Chatham County.

<b>Firm Name:</b> P&H, Inc.		
A Project Manager, Key Team Leader(s) and Prime's Experience and Qualifications – 30%	Assigned Rating	<b>Adequate</b>

**Comments:** PM = BSCE, MSCE, PE, PTOE, 8 years experience (6 on-call projects presented, 6 of 6 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); Roadway Lead = BSCE, PE, 11 years experience (X roadway projects presented, 4 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades); ENV Lead = BA Geography, MCRP, ?? years experience; Prime (4 roadway projects presented, 4 of 4 signal/ADA/ped upgrades), PM on 4, Rodway Lead on 0, 0 together.

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

**Comments:** PM = 44/160 Committed = 73% Available; Roadway Lead = 32/160 Committed = 80% Available; ENV Lead = 50/160 Committed = 69% Available; Firm + Resources 9 roadway, 3 traffic operations, 1 ped staff, 1 QA. Narrative highlights experience of other resources.





RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Moffatt & Nichol	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Moffatt &amp; Nichol's PM is a P.E. and P.T.O.E. (Professional Traffic Operations Engineer) and listed 4 projects that contained signals and pedestrian upgrades, including the adjacent corridor project to Contract 6. Key team leaders: Roadway lead presented 3 projects that contained signals and pedestrian upgrades. NEPA lead developed public involvement plans, and is currently involved in a regional on-call project for environmental services, where it's required to coordinate the work orders amongst a large sub-consultant team. Prime presented 4 projects that contained signal and pedestrian upgrades, and the PM was listed on all 4.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Moffatt's Organizational Chart showed an overlap with the firms. There was an overlap in the area classes, which means more than 1 resource is available to complete the work if necessary. Organizational Chart contained 8 roadway, 4 traffic operations and 1 Q/A staff. The PM and all the key team leads have sufficient ability to complete the work. The Narrative mentioned that the firm is in close proximity to Contract 6 (they have familiarity with the coastal plain of Georgia). The Evaluation Team felt that more information could've been provided for the committed hours for the resource teams.</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's PM is a P.E. and P.T.O.E. , and has 19 years of experience. PM also has a traffic background, which is relevant to this project, and listed 6 projects for pedestrian upgrades. Roadway lead had 14 years of experience, and 5 projects that contained signals for pedestrian upgrades. NEPA lead has over 40 years of experience, technical oversight for environmental investigations, and NEPA documentation and coordination. NEPA also has experience in 404 permitting, SBV (Stream Buffer Variance), and agency coordination. Prime presented 5 projects that included signals or pedestrian upgrades, and the PM was listed on all 5.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Michael Baker's Organizational Chart listed 10 roadway, 3 traffic operations and 3 Q/A staff. For the NEPA team, there seemed to be an overlap with the listed firms. There was an overlap in the area classes, which means more than 1 resource is available to complete the work if necessary. The Narrative mentioned organizational help from another firm. The firm has sufficient availability to complete the work. The evaluation team felt that more information could've been provided for the committed hours for the resource teams.</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's PM has a P.E. and 26 years of experience and presented 7 projects that contained signal or pedestrian upgrades. Roadway lead listed 4 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades. NEPA lead has 17 years of experience that included public involvement, conducting cultural resources surveys and ecology reports, permits and SBV applications. Also, the NEPA lead has documentation experience. Prime listed 3 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades; the PM and Roadway lead were listed on all 3.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>STV's Organizational Chart listed 6 roadway, 3 traffic operations and 1 Q/A staff. There was an overlap in the area classes, which means more than 1 resource is available to complete the work if necessary. The firm has sufficient availability to complete the work. The evaluation team felt that more information could've been provided for the committed hours for the resource teams.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	American Engineers, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>American Engineer's PM has a P.E. with 21 years of experience, and presented 3 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades. Also, the PM was involved with 36 projects similar in scope to this project. Roadway lead has 21 years of experience, and presented 3 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades. However, most of that experience was roadway and drainage design engineering experience (not the lead). NEPA lead identified as serving as the environmental lead for design services, ITS and Signal projects contract, which required coordinating sub-consultants in the completion of work orders under the contract. Prime listed 5 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades; the PM was listed on 4 and the Roadway lead was listed on the other.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>American Engineer's Organizational Chart listed 7 roadway, 4 traffic operations and 2 Q/A staff. For the NEPA team and traffic operations, they're using 2 different firms. The environmental resource firm seems to be well-staffed. The evaluation team felt that more information could've been provided for the committed hours for the resource teams. The firm has sufficient availability to complete the work.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Lowe Engineers, LLC	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Lowe's PM has a P.E. (as well as an MSCE and MBA), and 31 years of experience; also presented 1 project that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades. Roadway lead has 20 years of experience and presented 3 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades. Also, the Roadway lead served as the lead for all the projects presented. NEPA lead conducted environmental analysis and document preparation, conducted public outreach and was involved in the preparation of ecology 404 permits and SBV. Prime listed 4 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades; the PM and Roadway lead were listed on all 4.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Lowe's Organizational Chart listed 6 roadway, 4 traffic operations and 1 Q/A staff. For the NEPA team, each SME is doubled and the public involvement resources have 4 individuals listed, which shows adequate coverage for each environmental resource area. The Narrative mentions traffic experience in detail. The firm has sufficient availability to complete the work.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications	Assigned Rating	Good	
<p>Moreland's PM is a P.E. with 27 years experience, and listed 4 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades. Roadway lead has an MSCE, 5 years experience, and most of that experience seems to be design experience (not as a lead); also, the Roadway lead listed 4 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades. NEPA lead presented 9 projects, but only served as the lead for 2 of those projects. For the remaining projects, the NEPA lead served as the Ecology lead. The NEPA lead seems to have more experience in ecology documentation, some experience in public involvement activities and NEPA documentation. Prime listed 5 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades; the PM was listed on all 5.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity	Assigned Rating	Adequate	
<p>Moreland's Organizational Chart listed 7 roadway, 2 traffic operations and 2 Q/A staff. For the NEPA team, the resources seemed sufficient for the project. There are 2 environmental resources listed for History, Ecology and public involvement. The firm has sufficient availability to complete the work.</p>			



RFQ		PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	# of Evaluators	
Firm	KCI Technologies, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>KCI's PM has a P.E., 20 years experience, and 6 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades. The Evaluation Team felt the PM's role seems to be unclear for the majority of the safety or pedestrian projects listed. Roadway lead has 13 years of experience and listed 3 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades. NEPA lead has experience with Innovative public involvement strategies, working on an EIS (environmental impact statement) level of documentation; NEPA lead was an author of a reader-friendly draft of environmental assessment. Also, the NEPA lead has Section 4F experience. Prime listed 2 signal or pedestrian upgrades, and 1 corridor study; the PM was listed on all 3.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>KCI's Organizational Chart listed 4 roadway, 1 traffic operations and 1 Q/A staff. KCI exceeds more than sufficient availability to complete the work, and they have additional resources listed in the Narrative. Their area classes were represented amongst different firms, which shows they have additional coverage in those areas if necessary.</p>			
RFQ		PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	# of Evaluators	
Firm	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Heath &amp; Lineback's PM has a P.E., and listed 5 roadway projects which included 2 widenings, a bypass, a new roadway and intersection improvements. Roadway lead has 18 years experience, and listed 4 roadway projects which included a gateway local road, 2 widenings, and intersection improvements. NEPA lead has served as the NEPA planner for environmental analysis and document preparation, specifically environmental assessment level of documentation. The NEPA lead has experience conducting robust public outreach, preparing ecology permits, and coordinating with resource agencies. In addition, the NEPA lead has Section 4F documentation experience. Prime listed 5 roadway projects which included 2 widenings, 1 bridge, 1 interchange and a viaduct; the PM and Roadway lead were listed on all 5.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Heath &amp; Lineback's Organizational Chart listed 3 roadway, 2 bike/pedestrian and 1 traffic operations staff. For the NEPA team, 2 SMEs are listed for each resource area; however, only 1 environmental firm is listed with all the area classes. The firm has sufficient availability to complete the work.</p>			
RFQ		PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	# of Evaluators	
Firm	Barge Design Solutions, Inc.		
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Barge Design's PM has a P.E., 18 years of experience and 4 projects were listed with some sidewalks and some signals. Roadway lead has 23 years experience, and listed 5 projects that contained signal or pedestrian upgrades (3 as a PM). NEPA lead has served as the NEPA planner for environmental analysis and document preparation, specifically environmental assessment level of documentation. The NEPA lead has experience conducting robust public outreach, preparing ecology permits, and coordinating with resource agencies. In addition, the NEPA lead has Section 4F documentation experience. Prime listed 2 projects that contained signal or pedestrian upgrades; the PM was listed on 1 project.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Barge Design's Organizational Chart listed 9 roadway, 4 traffic operations and 3 Q/A staff. For the NEPA team, 2 SMEs are listed for each resource area; however, only 1 environmental firm is listed with all the area classes. The firm has sufficient availability to complete the work.</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung's PM has a P.E., 23 years of experience and listed 4 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades. Roadway lead has 25 years experience and listed 2 signal or pedestrian upgrades and 1 corridor study. NEPA lead has experience operating as a project manager conducting environmental analysis, preparing environmental documentation, specifically CE (Categorical Exclusion) level of documentation, and coordinating with the project team. Prime has 3 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades; the PM was listed on all 3 projects, and the PM completed a corridor study for Contract 6.			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung's Organizational Chart listed 10 roadway, 2 traffic operations and 1 Q/A staff. For the NEPA team, 2 SMEs are listed for each resource area; however, only 1 environmental firm is listed with all the area classes. The firm has sufficient availability to complete the work.			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Clark Patterson Engineers, Surveyor and Archi	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Clark Patterson's PM has a P.E., 25 years of experience and listed 6 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades. Roadway lead has 12 years experience and listed 5 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades with 1 of those being multiple intersections. NEPA lead has experience with innovative public involvement strategies, working on an EIS (environmental impact statement) level of documentation; NEPA lead was an author of a reader-friendly draft of environmental assessment. Also, the NEPA lead has Section 4F experience. Prime listed 2 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades with the Roadway			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Clark Patterson's Organizational Chart listed 6 roadway, 6 traffic operations and 1 Q/A staff. For the NEPA team, they listed multiple NEPA ecology, air and noise and public involvement analysts. The area classes are duplicated amongst multiple firms. The firm has sufficient availability to complete the work.			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Kennedy Engineering Associate Group LLC	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Kennedy Engineering listed the same person for the PM and Roadway Lead. The PM/Roadway lead has a P.E. , 25 years experience and 3 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades plus 2 multiple roadway projects. NEPA lead has experience leading environmental analysis, public involvement, NEPA documentation - specific experience includes authoring and environmental assessment level of documentation with Section 4F. Prime listed 4 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades; the PM/Roadway lead are listed on 2.			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
Kennedy Engineering's organizational chart listed 5 roadway, 2 traffic operations and 2 Q/A staff but they're listed twice on the chart. The environmental resources are sufficient, 3 SMEs are listed for Ecology. There was an overlap in the area classes, which means more than 1 resource is available to complete the work if necessary. The firm has sufficient availability to complete the work.			

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Holt Consulting Company, LLC	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Holt Consulting Company's PM has a P.E., 20 years experience and listed 6 roadway projects, including a bypass, turn lanes/signals, 2 widenings, a bridge and an Interchange. Roadway lead is the Principal of Clark Patterson, 20 plus years experience, and listed 3 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades. NEPA lead has experience leading environmental analysis, public involvement, NEPA documentation - specific experience includes authoring and environmental assessment level of documentation with Section 4F. Prime listed 1 intersection improvement project; the PM and NEPA lead were listed on that project.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Holt Consulting Company's organizational chart listed 4 roadway, 2 traffic operations and 2 QA staff. The Narrative mentions team coordination and an availability of 75%. For the NEPA team, the resources seem sufficient with a minimum of overlap. The firm has sufficient availability to complete the work.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	Wolverton & Associates, Inc.	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Wolverton's PM has a P.E., 15 years experience and presented 4 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades. The PM has extensive knowledge for the City of Savannah in Chatham County specifically the Abercorn Street Corridor. Roadway lead is an EIT not a P.E., and listed 2 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades and has previous experience with the Abercorn Street Corridor. NEPA lead has project management and senior NEPA experience, environmental analysis, NEPA documentation, agency coordination, and public involvement. Prime has 6 on-call projects presented, all signals or pedestrian upgrades; the PM is listed on 2, and the Roadway lead is listed on 6.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Wolverton's organizational chart listed 1 roadway/traffic operations lead, 40 additional support staff and 1 Q/A staff. For the NEPA team, the firm listed 12 additional support staff. However, the area class summary only listed 1 firm (not much overlap). The firm has sufficient availability to complete the work.</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	PHASE 1 SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR TOP SUBMITTALS	
Firm	CROY Engineering, LLC	# of Evaluators	
Experience and Qualifications		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>CROY Engineering's PM has a P.E., 29 years experience and presented 5 roadway projects; 4 of which are urban widenings and 1 urban bridge, with 1 signal and a roundabout on either end of the bridge. Roadway lead has a P.E., PTOE and AICP, and presented 1 roadway project, 2 corridor studies, and an urban widening project with 1 signal. NEPA lead has experience leading environmental analysis, facilitating public meetings, preparing environmental documentation including Section 4F analysis. Prime listed 3 projects that contained signals or pedestrian upgrades, and 1 urban widening; the PM was listed on 4, and the Roadway lead was listed on 3.</p>			
Resources and Workload Capacity		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Croy's Organizational Chart listed 4 roadway, 2 traffic operations and 1 Q/A staff. The NEPA team has sufficient resources (not much overlap). The firm has sufficient availability to complete the work.</p>			



## SELECTION OF FINALISTS

RFQ-484-052819

Batch #1 – 2019 Engineering Design services

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

**Contract #1: PI# 0014941, Glynn County**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Contract #5: PI# 0013120, Monroe County**

**American Consulting Professionals, LLC**

**Mead and Hunt, Inc.**

**Michael Baker International, Inc.**

**Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.**

**Pond & Company**

**Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.**

**Contract #6: PI# 0015151, Chatham County**

**American Engineers, Inc.**

**Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.**

**Michael Baker International Inc.**

**Moffatt & Nichol**

**Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.**

**STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates**

**Contract #7: PI# 0015667, Baldwin County**

**American Consulting Professionals, LLC**

**Development Planning & Engineering, Inc.**

**Mott MacDonald, LLC**

**Pond & Company**

**Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.**

**WSP USA, Inc.**

**Contract #8: PI# 0015688, Butts County**

**CHA Consulting, Inc.**

**Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.**

**Mott MacDonald, LLC**

**Pond & Company**

**Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.**

**Contract #9: PI# 0015690, Muscogee County**

**Barge Design Solutions, Inc.**

**CHA Consulting, Inc.**

**Clark Paterson Engineers, Surveyor and Architects, PC**

**TranSystems Corporation**

**Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.**





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

September 3, 2019

**NOTICE TO SELECTED FINALISTS - REVISED**

**To: American Engineers, Inc. ; Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc. ; Michael Baker International Inc. ; Moffatt & Nichol ; Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc. ; and STV Incorporated dba STV Ralph Whitehead Associates**

**Please send an e-mail confirming receipt of this notice to Amber Shakir-Greer (ashakir@dot.ga.gov).**

**Re: RFQ-484-052819, Batch #1 – 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract #6, PI# 0015151, Chatham County**

On behalf of the Selection Committee for the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) referenced above, we congratulate you and your firm on being selected as a finalist for further consideration. This notice shall serve as an official request for additional required information and action from finalists. **Please refer to the original solicitation (RFQ-484-052819), page 9, VII. Instructions for Preparing Technical Approach and Past Performance Response – Phase II Response, A&B and pages 10-12, IX. Instructions for Submittal for Phase II – Technical Approach and Past Performance Response, A-D for instructions to submit your package.** As a finalist, your firm is required to comply with the written instructions and remaining schedule below:

**A. Technical Approach - 40%**

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

Furnish information that may serve to differentiate your firm from other firms and evidence of the firm's fit to the project and/or needs of GDOT, including:

1. Provide any unique technical approaches your firm offers relative to addressing anticipated design concepts, use of any alternative methods for delivery (if applicable), and/or management of the project.
2. Identify any unique challenges of the project and how your firm intends to mitigate these challenges, including quality control, quality assurance procedures. Provide any specific qualifications, skills, knowledge of the project and project area which may uniquely benefit the firm and project, and your ability and willingness to meet time requirements.

**B. Past Performance - 10%**

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

Remaining Schedule

d. GDOT completes evaluation and issues notification and other information to finalist firms	09/03/2019	-----
e. Deadline for submission of written questions from finalists	09/20/2019	2:00 PM
f. Phase II Response of Finalist firms due	10/01/2019	2:00 PM



### C. **Finalist Selection**

Final selection will be determined by carrying the scores from **Phase I** forward for each Finalist and by evaluating the **Technical Approach** and **Past Performance** criteria for **Phase II**. For each evaluator, the points assigned to each criterion will be totaled and a rank will be determined. The rankings of all evaluators will be totaled for each finalist in order to determine the sum of the individual rankings. The finalists will be ranked in descending order of recommendation using the sum of individual rankings from the Selection Committee members. Should a tie exist for the highest ranking firm on the contract/project, and qualifications appear to be equal, the Selection Committee shall defer to the sum of the individual points and the award shall be made to the finalist with the highest sum.

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

Please address any questions you may have to Amber Shakir-Greer, and congratulations, again, to each of you!

Amber Shakir-Greer  
[ashakir@dot.ga.gov](mailto:ashakir@dot.ga.gov)  
404-631-1329

## SUBMISSION & PRESCREENING CHECKLIST

<b>SOLICITATION #:</b>	<b>RFQ-484-052819</b>				
<b>SOLICITATION TITLE:</b>	<b>Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 6, PI#0015151</b>				
<b>SOLICITATION DUE DATE:</b>	<b>October 1, 2019</b>				
<b>SOLICITATION TIME DUE:</b>	<b>2:00pm</b>				
<b>No.</b>	<b>Consultants</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Compliant with Page # Limitations</b>	<b>Meets Required Area Classes</b>
1	Moffatt & Nichol	10/1/2019	1:09 PM	X	X
2	Michael Baker International Inc.	10/1/2019	10:35 AM	X	X
3	STV Incorporated	10/1/2019	10:27 AM	X	X
4	American Engineers, Inc.	9/27/2019	8:31 AM	X	X
5	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.	10/1/2019	9:06 AM	X	X
6	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	10/1/2019	10:39 AM	X	X

# SOQ AREA CLASS CHECKLIST

Solicitation #: RFQ-484-052819

Solicitation Title: Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services, Contract 6, P#0015151

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	1.01	1.02	3.06	3.07	3.12	3.13	3.15	5.01	5.02	5.03	5.04	5.05	5.08	6.01(a)	6.01(b)	6.03	8.01	Certificate Expires
1	American Engineers, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10/31/2022
	Altra North America, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/10/2020
	Edwards-Pilman 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	X	X	X	4/11/2020
	Settimo Consulting Services Inc.																											2/28/2022
	Long Engineering, Inc. (12/8/2020)																											12/14/2020
	hfc Squared, Inc.																											11/9/2020
7	Heath & Linaback Engineers, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	5/10/2020
	Edwards-Pilman 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	X	X	X	4/11/2020
	Wolverton & Associates																											2/8/2020
	Settimo Consulting Services Inc.																											2/28/2022
	United Consulting, LLC																											7/19/2020
	Atlanta Consulting Engineers, Inc.																											7/19/2020
14	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	X	X	X	11/9/2020
	Atlanta Consulting Engineers, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7/19/2021
	Edwards-Pilman 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	X	X	X	4/11/2020
	Long Engineering, Inc.																											12/14/2020
	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	X	X	X	11/9/2020
	Nova Engineering & Environmental, LLC																											3/14/2022
	Settimo Consulting Services Inc.																											2/28/2022
	Michael Baker International, Inc.																											2/28/2022
17	Michael Atcheyll 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	X	X	X	3/6/2021
	CCR 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	X	X	X	6/7/2020
	Hussay Gay Ball & DeYoung	X																										11/1/2021
	Long Engineering, Inc.																											12/14/2020
	Settimo Consulting Services Inc.																											2/28/2022
	WMS&K, LLC																											3/7/2020
23	STV Incorporated	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	4/30/2022
	Cardno, Inc.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	3/6/2021
	CCR Environmental, Inc.																											6/7/2020
	Palladium Geomatics, LLC																											4/30/2022
	New South Associates, Inc.	X																										6/7/2020
	Nova Engineering & Environmental, LLC																											3/14/2022
	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	X	X	X	4/30/2021
	WMS&K, LLC																											3/7/2020



RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	<b>PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS</b>	
Firm	Moffatt & Nichol		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Moffatt &amp; Nichol have local knowledge of the area. They worked with other projects along the corridor. One of the 2 firms identified the bus routes and transit agency. Moffatt walked the project corridor and photographed each intersection. As it pertains to RSA (Roadside Safety Audit), they mentioned that the project would be divided into components based upon 6 design specializations. Also, the firm recognizes that construction staging, retrofitting existing developments and scope creep are challenges. They identified an elevated need for public involvement due to religious stakeholders within the project area.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>Two of the Evaluators worked with Moffatt - the PM and environmental lead are responsive and aware of the project status and needs. One of the reference checks is from Chatham County, which is where the project is located, and provided a rating which stated that the "firm exceeded expectations". CMIS Vendor Evaluation scores for 2018: 60, Two 100s, Two 83s and 77, which is an average score of 83.83. Based on this average score, the Evaluation Team agreed on a rating of "Good".</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	<b>PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS</b>	
Firm	Michael Baker International Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Michael Baker is using Moffatt &amp; Nichol as their sub-consultant - different design squads would be used for different segments. They stated that they would solve problems at the intersection level and corridor level. Michael Baker noted public involvement as a primary concern, and recognized the need to avoid impacts due to the lack of a program ROW phase. They also stated in order to implement some of the solutions, ROW would be necessary with local funds. They anticipate a PCE (Programmatic Categorical Exclusion); however, access changes can kick the Department out of the PCE agreement - which means they may not be scoping correctly. They provided an accelerated PDP schedule. Michael Baker's entertaining the use of virtual PIOH, in addition to a physical PIOH, which is in line with the Department's objective for public engagement.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>One of the Evaluators has experience with Michael Baker, specifically, PI# 0014167. The NEPA representative from Michael Baker wasn't very responsive when asked to fill out the A3M (Avoidance Minimization Measures Meeting) schedule letter. One of the reference checks was from the Savannah Airport Commission, and provided information that "the firm met expectations". However, the overall project success was below expectations. CMIS Vendor Evaluation scores from 2018 -"77, 83, 88, 88, 95 and 100", which is an average score of 88.5. Based on this average score, the Evaluation Team agreed on a rating of</p>			



RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	<b>PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS</b>	
Firm	STV Incorporated		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>STV's initial analysis of the corridor gave the driver's perspective and pedestrian's viewpoint. They talked about the transit stops. They mentioned that the project should be in existing ROW, and noted public involvement. STV provided the main challenges of the project, which are mid-block crossings, pedestrian accidents, and traffic accidents; they also provided general solutions for each of those. They gave 3 specific examples of safety challenges with photos, which are transit riders, bus stops without shelters, mid-block crossings by pedestrians, and no accessible wheelchair ramps. However, they didn't have a specific design approach and didn't give any QC/QA approach. They talked about LiDAR and how it would minimize field crew exposure to traffic, and increase safety while collecting data. They mentioned the Hunter Army Air Field, and how 1 of their sub-consultants is familiar with required coordination.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Excellent
<p>One of the Evaluators has experience with STV. The CMIS Vendor Evaluation scores for 2018 with the PI#s 0014134 (which is 1 of the Evaluators' project), #0014901, #0013992, #0014073, #0014902, #321960 - all rated the firm "100". Based on this score, the Evaluation Team agreed on a rating of "Excellent".</p>			

RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	<b>PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS</b>	
Firm	American Engineers, Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Good
<p>American Engineers propose to use the pedestrian safety matrix (which is a list of each problem area with a ranking of "extreme, high, medium or low" with cost); this means that they recognize how to prioritize project improvements. The firm assumes only 10 of 50 intersections to be approved for pedestrian safety with traffic and crash studies performed by their sub-consultants. American Engineers took the initiative to perform an in-house RSA along the corridor to provide an independent analysis. As far as public involvement, they identified stakeholders for targeted outreach. They also outlined a 4 step process for approach - excellent communication/customer service, progress meetings, maintain schedules and project management software. The firm describes a sufficient QC/QA</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>None of the Evaluators had experience with American Engineers. The CMIS Vendor Evaluation scores for 2018 - "60, 60, five 82s, and 100" which is an average of 78.75. Based on this average score, the Evaluation Team agreed on a rating of "Adequate".</p>			



RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	<b>PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS</b>	
Firm	Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Moreland Altobelli's design approach is to review the proposed improvements, and make additional recommendations as needed. They said each location would be evaluated. The firm does have an office in Chatham County, which is where the project is located. They recognize that the procurement process will require an advanced start to prevent delays. However, Moreland doesn't have a PIOH plan, and doesn't anticipate public involvement, despite the stakeholders in the area and transit riders. They have individuals in mind for utility coordination as needed.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Marginal
<p>One of the Evaluators has experience with Moreland - the environmental lead is new to the firm and has a heavy background in Ecology, which means he's still learning NEPA and is on par with a GDOT NEPA associate level. This means he will probably require more assistance from GDOT. CMIS Vendor Evaluation scores for 2018 - "37, 60, 60, 77, 77" which means the average score is 62.2. Based on this average score, the Evaluation Team agreed on a rating of "Marginal".</p>			
RFQ	RFQ-484-052819	<b>PHASE 2 SUMMARY COMMENTS</b>	
Firm	Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.		
Technical Approach		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>Heath &amp; Lineback's design approach is to treat each intersection as a stand-alone. Using the RSA, the firm will identify and validate the problems to determine the full list of needs, and will involve the stakeholders to determine solutions using the corridor-wide evaluation. Heath &amp; Lineback plan on developing a public involvement plan, which will potentially target stakeholders in advance of a formal public meeting. They recognize that there's no ROW phase plan. Also, they did present an idea from another project to use an ADA (American Disabilities Act) scissors ramp to avoid required ROW. The firm described an 11 point scope delivery process, and talked about a quality management plan which included 8 procedures.</p>			
Past Performance		Assigned Rating	Adequate
<p>One of the Evaluator's has experience with Heath &amp; Lineback - the environmental lead is responsive and aware of the project status and needs. The projects that 1 of the Evaluators has direct communication on, it always appears that the environmental lead is knowledgeable about the statutory requirements. CMIS Vendor Evaluation scores for 2018 - "Four 60s, 82, Three 77s, and 95" which is an average of 72. Based on this average score, the Evaluation Team agreed on a rating of "Adequate".</p>			

Reference Check Summary for  
 <RFQ 484-052819 Contract #6>  
 Batch #1 - 2019 Engineering Design Services

Questions answered on a 1, 3, 5 scale.  
 1 = Below Expectations, 3 = Met Expectations, 5 = Exceeded Expectations

	American Engineers	Michael Baker	Moffatt & Nichol	Moreland Althobelli Associates	STV Incorporated	Heath & Lineback (no responses)
<b>1. Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project.</b>						
Reference 1	5	3	5	5	5	
Reference 2	5		5			
Reference 3	5					
Reference 4	5					
Reference 5						
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
<b>Section Average</b>	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	
<b>2. Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project.</b>						
Reference 1	5	3	5	5	5	
Reference 2	3		5			
Reference 3	5					
Reference 4	5					
Reference 5						
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
<b>Section Average</b>	4.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	
<b>3. Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals.</b>						
Reference 1	5	3	5	5	5	
Reference 2	5		5			
Reference 3	3					
Reference 4	5					
Reference 5						
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
<b>Section Average</b>	4.50	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	
<b>4. Rate the firm's technical assistance in program/project management.</b>						
Reference 1	5	3	5	5	5	
Reference 2	5		5			
Reference 3	5					
Reference 4	5					
Reference 5						
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
<b>Section Average</b>	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	
<b>5. Rate the overall success of the project thus far.</b>						
Reference 1	5	1	5	5	5	
Reference 2	3		5			
Reference 3	5					
Reference 4	5					
Reference 5						
Reference 6						
Reference 7						
<b>Section Average</b>	4.50	1.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	
<b>Overall Average</b>	4.70	2.60	5.00	5.00	5.00	0.00

GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for American Engineers, Inc. for Project:  
EAST CHEROKEE DRIVE AT OLD HIGHWAY 5 INTERSECTION

#1

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Email Invitation 1 (Email)  
**Started:** Monday, September 16, 2019 3:03:28 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, September 16, 2019 3:06:35 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:07  
**Email:** gmorton@cherokeega.com  
**IP Address:** 166.102.55.2

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Geoff Morton, P.E.

Cherokee County

Engineer

gmorton@cherokeega.com

678-493-6077

Geoffrey E. Morton, PE

Cherokee County

Community Development Agency Director

gmorton@cherokeega.com

678-493-6077

**Q2** A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey?

No

Page 2: Consultant Reference Check Survey

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

5 - Exceeded expectations

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

5 - Exceeded expectations

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

5 - Exceeded expectations

**GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for American Engineers, Inc. for Project:  
EAST CHEROKEE DRIVE AT OLD HIGHWAY 5 INTERSECTION**

**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 awarded a 2019 ACEC Merit Award Winner.**

GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for American Engineers, Inc. for  
Project: LITTLE MILL ROAD PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS

#1

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Email Invitation 1 (Email)  
**Started:** Tuesday, September 17, 2019 8:35:02 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, September 17, 2019 8:38:21 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:18  
**Email:** tallen@forsythco.com  
**IP Address:** 66.110.201.211

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Tim Allen  
Forsyth County  
Assistant Director of Engineering  
tallen@forsythco.com  
678-898-1361

**Tim Allen**  
**Forsyth County**  
**Assistant Director of Engineering**  
**TLAllen@forsythco.com**  
**678-898-1361**

**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, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for American Engineers, Inc. for  
Project: LITTLE MILL ROAD PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS**

**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**

**Respondent skipped this question**



GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for American Engineers, Inc. for Project:  
16-INTERSECTIONS

#1

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Email Invitation 1 (Email)  
**Started:** Tuesday, September 17, 2019 8:52:53 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, September 17, 2019 8:55:31 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:02:37  
**Email:** tallen@forsythco.com  
**IP Address:** 66.110.201.211

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

**Q1 Contact Information**

Tim Allen  
Forsyth County  
Assistant Director of Engineering  
tallen@forsythco.com  
678-898-1361

Tim Allen  
Forsyth County  
Assistant Director of Engineering  
TLAllen@forsythco.com  
6788981361

**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

**GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for American Engineers, Inc. for Project:  
16-INTERSECTIONS**

**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**

GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for American Engineers, Inc. for  
Project: SUGARLOAF PARKWAY PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS

#1

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Email Invitation 1 (Email)  
**Started:** Friday, September 20, 2019 4:20:12 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, September 20, 2019 4:31:50 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:11:37  
**Email:** edgardo.aponte@gwinnettcounty.com  
**IP Address:** 12.164.201.242

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

**Q1 Contact Information**

Edgardo Aponte  
Gwinnett County  
Pre-construction Engineer  
edgardo.aponte@gwinnettcounty.com  
770-822-7433

Edgardo Aponte  
Gwinnett County Department of Transportation  
Preconstruction Division Director  
edgardo.aponte@gwinnettcounty.com  
770-822-7433

**Q2 A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey?**

No

Page 2: Consultant Reference Check Survey

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

**5 - Exceeded expectations**

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

**5 - Exceeded expectations**

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

**5 - Exceeded expectations**

**GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for American Engineers, Inc. for  
Project: SUGARLOAF PARKWAY PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS**

**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**

The Gwinnett County Department of Transportation contracted with American Engineers, Inc. (AEI) to provide engineering services to prepare construction and right of way plans for the addition of sidewalks on Sugarloaf Parkway from US 29/Lawrenceville Highway to SR 124/Scenic Highway. AEI was responsive throughout the development of the construction plans and we are very pleased with their work. AEI is currently providing engineering services for other projects that we have in our roadway program.

GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for Michael Baker International, Inc. for  
Project: AIRWAYS AVENUE AT I-95 INTERIM IMPROVEMENTS

#1

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Email Invitation 1 (Email)  
**Started:** Tuesday, September 17, 2019 8:15:28 AM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, September 17, 2019 8:16:41 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:01:12  
**Email:** gfidler@savannahairport.com  
**IP Address:** 64.203.242.122

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

George Fidler, Jr.  
Savannah Airport Commission  
Director of Engineering  
gfidler@savannahairport.com  
912-964-0514

Mark Denmark  
Savannah Airport Commission  
Asst. Director of Engineering  
mdenmark@flysav.com  
912-964-0512

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

3 - Met expectations

**GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for Michael Baker International, Inc. for  
Project: AIRWAYS AVENUE AT I-95 INTERIM IMPROVEMENTS**

**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**

**Respondent skipped this question**



GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for Moffatt & Nichol, Inc. for Project: SR 81 WIDENING (PI#0015089)

#1

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Email Invitation 1 (Email)  
**Started:** Wednesday, September 18, 2019 11:00:12 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, September 19, 2019 5:40:13 PM  
**Time Spent:** 18:40:00  
**Email:** rromero@co.henry.ga.us  
**IP Address:** 174.218.146.92

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Roque Romero	Roque Romero
Henry County	Henry County
Project Manager	Transportation Projects Director
rromero@co.henry.ga.us	rromero@co.henry.ga.us
770-288-7325	7702887325

**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

<b>Q3</b> Rate the firm's quality of leadership in program/project management for your project	5 - Exceeded expectations
<b>Q4</b> Rate the overall services of the firm's staff for the duration of the project	5 - Exceeded expectations
<b>Q5</b> Rate the firm's ability to meet the established project goals	5 - Exceeded expectations

**GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for Moffatt & Nichol, Inc. for Project: SR 81 WIDENING (PI#0015089)**

**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**

M&N staff is very knowledgeable regarding GDOT PDP and FHWA process. Project Manager is always available. PM has been able to get the project moving and get thru the NELT and logical terminal issues. County has work with PM in the pass and design projects are completed in time and more important not many issues during construction.

GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for Moffatt & Nichol, Inc. for  
Project: QUACCO ROAD WIDENING

#1

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Email Invitation 1 (Email)  
**Started:** Friday, September 27, 2019 4:03:26 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, September 27, 2019 4:04:20 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:00:53  
**Email:** NPanther@chathamcounty.org  
**IP Address:** 12.48.151.106

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

Nathaniel Panther  
Chatham County  
Project Manager  
npanther@chathamcounty.org  
912-652-7800

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

**Q2 A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey?**

**No**

Page 2: Consultant Reference Check Survey

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

**5 - Exceeded expectations**

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

**5 - Exceeded expectations**

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

**5 - Exceeded expectations**

**GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for Moffatt & Nichol, Inc. for  
Project: QUACCO ROAD 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**

**5 - Exceeded  
expectations**

**Q8 Please provide comments to substantiate your  
ratings**

**Respondent skipped this question**

GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for Moreland Altobelli Associates for  
Project: Bethelview Road, Forsyth County, (PI#141888)

#1

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Email Invitation 1 (Email)  
**Started:** Friday, September 20, 2019 4:02:55 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, September 20, 2019 4:09:23 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:28  
**Email:** jvcunard@forsythco.com  
**IP Address:** 66.110.201.211

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

**Q1 Contact Information**

John Cunard, P.E.

Forsyth County

Engineer

jvcunard@forsythco.com

770-781-2165

**John Cunard**

**Forsyth County**

**Director of Engineering**

**jvcunard@forsythco.com**

**770-781-2165**

**Q2 A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey?**

**No**

Page 2: Consultant Reference Check Survey

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

**5 - Exceeded expectations**

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

**5 - Exceeded expectations**

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

**5 - Exceeded expectations**

**GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for Moreland Altobelli Associates for  
Project: Bethelview Road, Forsyth County, (PI#141888)**

**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**

**Program Manager for us for over 20 years.**



GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for STV Incorporated for Project: DeKalb County McAfee Road Sidewalk Project

#1

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Email Invitation 1 (Email)  
**Started:** Wednesday, September 18, 2019 5:22:30 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, September 18, 2019 5:28:21 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:03:51  
**Email:** dwpelton@dekalbcountyga.gov  
**IP Address:** 50.237.147.4

Page 1: Contact Information and Conflict of Interest

Q1 Contact Information

David Pelton P.E.  
DeKalb County  
Engineer  
dpelton@dekalbcountyga.gov  
770-492-5223

David Pelton P.E.  
DeKalb County  
Deputy Public Works Director  
dpelton@dekalbcountyga.gov  
770-492-5223

Q2 A conflict of interest may exist when an individual engages in activities which may financially or otherwise benefit themselves, their relatives or other individuals with whom they are personally or financially involved as a result of knowledge, information or action taken in an official capacity. A conflict of interest may exist where there is no actual benefit to the individual. The mere presence of the opportunity may create the conflict. Based on the above definition of conflict of interest, is there any circumstance whereby a conflict of interest (real or perceived) exists and therefore would cause you to recuse yourself from completing this survey?

No

Page 2: Consultant Reference Check Survey

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

5 - Exceeded expectations

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

5 - Exceeded expectations

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

5 - Exceeded expectations

**GDOT RFQ-484-052819, Contract 6, Consultant Reference Check Survey for STV Incorporated for Project: DeKalb County McAfee Road Sidewalk Project**

**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 : MOFFATT & NICHOL\***  
**Record Status: Active**

**ENTITY** MOFFATT & NICHOL Status: Active

DUNS: 783792190 +4: CAGE Code: 531T8 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 08/28/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 1025 Greenwood Blvd Ste 371

City: Lake Mary

State/Province: FLORIDA

ZIP Code: 32746-5424

Country: UNITED STATES

**ENTITY** MOFFATT & NICHOL Status: Active

DUNS: 859600228 +4: CAGE Code: 1YNY7 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 09/02/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 4225 E Conant St Ste 201

City: Long Beach

State/Province: CALIFORNIA

ZIP Code: 90808-1867

Country: UNITED STATES

**ENTITY** MOFFATT & NICHOL Status: Active

DUNS: 079836171 +4: CAGE Code: 7PB00 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 09/02/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 2937 SW 27TH AVE STE 101

City: MIAMI

State/Province: FLORIDA

ZIP Code: 33133-3772

Country: UNITED STATES

**ENTITY** MOFFATT & NICHOL Status: Active

DUNS: 015350572 +4: CAGE Code: 1PLX5 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 09/02/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 529 5th Ave Fl 14

City: New York

State/Province: NEW YORK

ZIP Code: 10017-4676

Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 142671689	+4:	CAGE Code: 3QWS5 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 09/02/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 101 W Main St Ste 800		
City: Norfolk	State/Province: VIRGINIA	
ZIP Code: 23510-1670	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 033996026	+4:	CAGE Code: 1NW66 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 09/02/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 4700 Falls of Neuse Rd Ste 300		
City: Raleigh	State/Province: NORTH CAROLINA	
ZIP Code: 27609-6275	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 116752112	+4:	CAGE Code: 87L98 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 09/02/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 730 Bayfront Pkwy Ste 5B		
City: Pensacola	State/Province: FLORIDA	
ZIP Code: 32502-6250	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 012173725	+4:	CAGE Code: 1PLX1 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 09/02/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1100 Boulders Pkwy Ste 500		
City: Richmond	State/Province: VIRGINIA	
ZIP Code: 23225-4060	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 080244824	+4:	CAGE Code: 7P3W3 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 09/03/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 272 N Front St Ste 204		
City: Wilmington	State/Province: NORTH CAROLINA	
ZIP Code: 28401-3977	Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY [REDACTED] Moffatt & Nichol Status: Active

DUNS: 175375765 +4: CAGE Code: 1NU75 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 09/03/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 2185 N California Blvd Ste 500  
City: Walnut Creek State/Province: CALIFORNIA  
ZIP Code: 94596-3543 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY [REDACTED] Moffatt & Nichol Status: Active

DUNS: 005392001 +4: CAGE Code: 1PLX4 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 09/03/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 1660 Hotel Cir N Ste 500  
City: San Diego State/Province: CALIFORNIA  
ZIP Code: 92108-2805 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY [REDACTED] MOFFATT & NICHOL Status: Active

DUNS: 079570493 +4: CAGE Code: 79A19 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 09/03/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 250 Mill St Ste 307  
City: Rochester State/Province: NEW YORK  
ZIP Code: 14614-1026 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY [REDACTED] Moffatt & Nichol Status: Active

DUNS: 142671440 +4: CAGE Code: 3QWU4 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 09/03/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 2 E Bryan St Ste 501  
City: Savannah State/Province: GEORGIA  
ZIP Code: 31401-2639 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY [REDACTED] Moffatt & Nichol Status: Active

DUNS: 081362195 +4: CAGE Code: 1PLW8 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 08/28/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 555 ANTON BLVD STE 400  
City: COSTA MESA State/Province: CALIFORNIA  
ZIP Code: 92626-7811 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 078577000	+4:	CAGE Code: 6Y5D5 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/28/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 880 H St Ste 208		
City: Anchorage	State/Province: ALASKA	
ZIP Code: 99501-3450	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 005356758	+4:	CAGE Code: 1PLW7 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/06/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1300 Clay St Ste 350		
City: Oakland	State/Province: CALIFORNIA	
ZIP Code: 94612-1452	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 080244819	+4:	CAGE Code: 7MEE4 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/06/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 11 N Water St Ste 20220		
City: Mobile	State/Province: ALABAMA	
ZIP Code: 36602-3809	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 789933538	+4:	CAGE Code: 1PLX0 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/13/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 2780 Lighthouse Point E Ste D		
City: Baltimore	State/Province: MARYLAND	
ZIP Code: 21224-5055	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 859621463	+4:	CAGE Code: 3C072 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/13/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1780 Hughes Landing Blvd Ste 575		
City: The Woodlands	State/Province: TEXAS	
ZIP Code: 77380-4011	Country: UNITED STATES	



ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 080077745	+4:	CAGE Code: 7K9H5 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/13/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 180 Wells Ave Ste 302		
City: Newton		State/Province: MASSACHUSETTS
ZIP Code: 02459-3328		Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 080244829	+4:	CAGE Code: 7PAZ9 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/13/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1695 Metropolitan Cir Ste 4		
City: Tallahassee		State/Province: FLORIDA
ZIP Code: 32308-8722		Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 027283303	+4:	CAGE Code: 1PLX2 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/13/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 501 E Kennedy Blvd Ste 1910		
City: Tampa		State/Province: FLORIDA
ZIP Code: 33602-5254		Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 054860010	+4:	CAGE Code: 4D593 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 07/14/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 4225 E Conant St Ste 101		
City: Long Beach		State/Province: CALIFORNIA
ZIP Code: 90808-1867		Country: UNITED STATES
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol	Status: Active
DUNS: 801451365	+4:	CAGE Code: 538V5 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/28/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1132 Bishop St Ste 1595		
City: Honolulu		State/Province: HAWAII
ZIP Code: 96813-2814		Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 079835523	+4:	CAGE Code: 7E0A3 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 09/02/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 601 Poydras St Ste 1860		
City: New Orleans	State/Province: LOUISIANA	
ZIP Code: 70130-6066	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	MOFFATT AND NICHOL ENGINEERS	Status: Active
DUNS: 148334949	+4:	CAGE Code: 1PLX3 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 09/03/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 600 UNIVERSITY ST STE 610		
City: SEATTLE	State/Province: WASHINGTON	
ZIP Code: 98101-4117	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 142671564	+4:	CAGE Code: 3QWU9 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/28/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 301 Main St Ste 800		
City: Baton Rouge	State/Province: LOUISIANA	
ZIP Code: 70801-0009	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 080244831	+4:	CAGE Code: 7PA10 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 08/28/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1201 Peachtree St NE Ste 1106		
City: Atlanta	State/Province: GEORGIA	
ZIP Code: 30361-3512	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol - AECOM JV	Status: Active
DUNS: 080869479	+4:	CAGE Code: 7YCK7 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 07/11/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1255 Broad St. Ste 201		
City: Clifton	State/Province: NEW JERSEY	
ZIP Code: 07013-3398	Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol - Burns & McDonnell Hawaii	Status: Active
DUNS: 117225063	+4:	CAGE Code: 8ERA7 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 10/10/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 1132 Bishop St Ste 1595		
City: Honolulu	State/Province: HAWAII	
ZIP Code: 96813-2814	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	Moffatt & Nichol Engineers / URS Group Joint Venture	Status: Active
DUNS: 114746287	+4:	CAGE Code: 3DTG4 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 01/22/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 104 W 40TH ST FLR 14		
City: NEW YORK	State/Province: NEW YORK	
ZIP Code: 10018-3660	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	STV-MOFFATT NICHOL DHS JOINT VENTURE	Status: Active
DUNS: 080550277	+4:	CAGE Code: 7TX33 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 03/13/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 225 Park Ave S FI 5		
City: New York	State/Province: NEW YORK	
ZIP Code: 10003-1604	Country: UNITED STATES	
ENTITY	WRA-Moffatt Nichol A Joint Venture LLC	Status: Active
DUNS: 080780394	+4:	CAGE Code: 7XTZ9 DoDAAC:
Expiration Date: 07/09/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
Address: 801 S Caroline Street		
City: Baltimore	State/Province: MARYLAND	
ZIP Code: 21231-3311	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 : ECOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS INC\***  
**Record Status: Active**

<b>ENTITY</b> <span style="background-color: #c8e6c9;"> </span> ECOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS INC	Status: Active
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------

DUNS: 110230385    +4:	CAGE Code: 4GL03	DoDAAC:
------------------------	------------------	---------

Expiration Date: 01/02/2020	Has Active Exclusion?: No	Debt Subject to Offset?: No
-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

Address: 630 COLONIAL PARK DR STE 200

City: ROSWELL

ZIP Code: 30075-3761

State/Province: GEORGIA

Country: UNITED STATES

**SAM Search Results**  
**List of records matching your search for :**

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

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



**SAM Search Results**  
**List of records matching your search for :**

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

<b>ENTITY</b> Michael Baker Engineering, Inc.	Status: Active
DUNS: 079103100 +4: CAGE Code: 6Z3C3 DoDAAC:	
Expiration Date: 02/05/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 22 Computer Dr W City: Albany State/Province: NEW YORK ZIP Code: 12205-1695 Country: UNITED STATES	
<b>ENTITY</b> MICHAEL BAKER ENGINEERING, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 801409306 +4: CAGE Code: 6AFK6 DoDAAC:	
Expiration Date: 04/24/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 200 CENTREPORT DR STE 350 City: GREENSBORO State/Province: NORTH CAROLINA ZIP Code: 27409-9784 Country: UNITED STATES	
<b>ENTITY</b> MICHAEL BAKER ENGINEERING, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 784087756 +4: CAGE Code: 4HM32 DoDAAC:	
Expiration Date: 10/15/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 15801 BRIXHAM HILL AVE STE 430 City: Charlotte State/Province: NORTH CAROLINA ZIP Code: 28277-0753 Country: UNITED STATES	
<b>ENTITY</b> MICHAEL BAKER ENGINEERING, INC.	Status: Active
DUNS: 619158178 +4: CAGE Code: 4HL30 DoDAAC:	
Expiration Date: 04/10/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No	
Address: 797 HAYWOOD RD STE 201 City: ASHEVILLE State/Province: NORTH CAROLINA ZIP Code: 28806-3102 Country: UNITED STATES	

ENTITY MICHAEL BAKER ENGINEERING, INC. Status: Active

DUNS: 783669398 +4: CAGE Code: 4HDM1 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 11/10/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 8000 REGENCY PKWY, STE 200  
City: CARY State/Province: NORTH CAROLINA  
ZIP Code: 27518-8514 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY MICHAEL BAKER ENGINEERING, INC. Status: Active

DUNS: 073298374 +4: CAGE Code: 0KE07 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 11/18/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 11 MARTIN AVE STE 675  
City: WHITE PLAINS State/Province: NEW YORK  
ZIP Code: 10606-4015 Country: UNITED STATES

ENTITY MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL, INC. Status: Active

DUNS: 942848714 +4: CAGE Code: 79CB1 DoDAAC:

Expiration Date: 05/12/2020 Has Active Exclusion?: No Debt Subject to Offset?: No

Address: 500 YGNACIO VALLEY RD STE 300  
City: WALNUT CREEK State/Province: CALIFORNIA  
ZIP Code: 94596-3846 Country: UNITED STATES

**SAM Search Results**  
**List of records matching your search for :**

**Search Term : Nova Engineering And Environmental, LLC\***  
**Record Status: Active**

<b>ENTITY</b>	Nova Engineering And Environmental, LLC	Status: Active
---------------	-----------------------------------------	----------------

DUNS: 801438164	+4:	CAGE Code: 52AE1	DoDAAC:
-----------------	-----	------------------	---------

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

Address: 3900 KENNESAW 75 PKWY NW  
STE 100

City: KENNESAW

State/Province: GEORGIA

ZIP Code: 30144-6409

Country: UNITED STATES

**SAM Search Results**  
**List of records matching your search for :**

**Search Term : SETTIMIO CONSULTING SERVICES INCORPORATED\***  
**Record Status: Active**

**No Search Results**

**STATE OF GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**  
**NOTICE OF PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANT QUALIFICATION**  
 You are qualified to provide Consulting Services to the Department of Transportation for the  
 area-classes of work checked below. Notice of qualification is not a notice of selection.

NAME AND ADDRESS		DISPOSITION DATE	EXPIRATION DATE
MOFFATT & NICHOL 219 WEST BRYAN ST., SUITE 202, SAVANNAH, GA 31401		January 10, 2019	January 31, 2022
<b>SIGNATURE</b>			
<i>Nicholas</i>			
<b>1. Transportation Planning</b>		<b>3. Highway Design Roadway (continued)</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.01	State Wide Systems Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.09	Traffic Control System Analysis, Design and Implementation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.02	Urban Area and Regional Transportation Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.10	Utility Coordination
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.03	Aviation Systems Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.11	Architecture
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.04	Mass and Rapid Transportation Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.12	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Roadway)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.05	Alternate System and Corridor Location Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.13	Facilities for Bicycles and Pedestrians
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.06	Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.14	Historic Rehabilitation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.06a	NEPA Documentation	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> 1.06d	Noise Studies		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.06e	Ecology	<b>4. Highway Structures</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.06f	Archaeology	<input checked="" 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	Bat Surveys	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.02	Major Bridges Design
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.07	Attitude, Opinion and Community Value Studies	<input type="checkbox"/> 4.03	Movable Span Bridges Design
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.08	Airport Master Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.04	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Bridges)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.09	Location Studies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4.05	Bridge Inspection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1.10	Traffic Studies	<b>5. Topography</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.11	Traffic and Toll Revenue Studies	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.01	Land Surveying
<input 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
		<input type="checkbox"/> 5.04	Aerial Photography
		<input type="checkbox"/> 5.05	Aerial Photogrammetry
<b>2. Mass Transit Operations</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> 5.06	Topographic Remote Sensing
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.01	Mass Transit Program (Systems) Management	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.07	Cartography
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.02	Mass Transit Feasibility and Technical Studies	<input type="checkbox"/> 5.08	Subsurface Utility Engineering
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.03	Mass Transit Vehicle and Propulsion System	<b>6. Soils, Foundation &amp; Materials Testing</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.04	Mass Transit Controls, Communications and Information Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> 6.01a	Soil Surveys
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.05	Mass Transit Architectural Engineering	<input type="checkbox"/> 6.01b	Geological and Geophysical Studies
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.06	Mass Transit Unique Structures	<input type="checkbox"/> 6.02	Bridge Foundation Studies
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.07	Mass Transit Electrical and Mechanical Systems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6.03	Hydraulic and Hydrological Studies (Soils and Foundation)
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.08	Mass Transit Operations Management and Support Services	<input type="checkbox"/> 6.04a	Laboratory Materials Testing
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2.09	Aviation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6.04b	Field Testing of Roadway Construction Materials
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.10	Mass Transit Program (Systems) Marketing	<input type="checkbox"/> 6.05	Hazard Waste Site Assessment Studies
<b>3. Highway Design Roadway</b>		<b>8. Construction</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.01	Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Rural Generally Free Access Highway Design	<input 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	<b>9. Erosion and Sedimentation Control</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.03	Two-Lane or Multi-Lane Widening and Reconstruction, with Curb and Gutter and Storm Sewers in Heavily Developed Commercial Industrial and Residential Urban Areas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.06	Traffic Operations Studies		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3.07	Traffic Operations Design		
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.08	Landscape Architecture		