



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)**  
**RFP 18-153**  
**North Druid Hills Road Corridor Study**  
**ADDENDUM #1**

1. Section 3.0 Proposal Submission and Evaluation refers to the “body of the submittal”. Which of the following sections, if any, count toward the 15-page “body of the submittal” maximum?

- Table of contents
- Transmittal/Cover letter
- GDOT Notice of Professional Consultant Qualifications (for BOTH Prime and subconsultants)
- Georgia Security & Immigration Compliance Act Affidavit
- Proposal form (Page 1 of the RFP)
- Proposal letter (Page 2 of the RFP)
- State’s Certificate of Incorporation
- O.C.G.A. 50-36-1(e)(2) Affidavit Verifying Status Public Benefit (SAVE)
- Resumes
- Front and back cover pages

Section 3.0 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION and its subsections have been removed and replaced with Addendum #2. Proposals shall be limited to twenty-five (25) single sided 8 ½” x 11” (One 11” x 17” Organizational Chart or Schedule will be allowed as part of the 25 pages). Required forms will not be counted as part of the page limit.

2. Would the City allow us to provide additional team member resumes (beyond Principal Design Engineer and Utility Coordinator) in an appendix that would not be counted toward the 15-page maximum?

Section 3.0 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION and its subsections have been removed and replaced with Addendum #2.

3. Aside from the prime firm, do you require the Georgia Security & Immigration Compliance Act Affidavit form to be completed by subconsultant(s) as well?

No.

4. On page 10 of the RFP, under section 2.5 Information to be provided in proposal/Technical Proposal Contents item # 5, we are required to complete the O.C.G.A. 50-36-1(e)(2) Affidavit Verifying Status Public Benefit (SAVE) form. However, the form was not included in the RFP package. Will you be providing this through an addendum?

Affidavit Verifying Status for City Public Benefit Application is attached in Addendum #2 and does not count toward number of pages in the proposal.

5. In addition to the prime firm, do you require the O.C.G.A. 50-36-1(e)(2) Affidavit Verifying Status Public Benefit (SAVE) form completed by subconsultant(s) as well?

No.

6. Should the Original Technical Proposal be submitted with the electronic copy enclosed in a separate envelope inside the original package?

The electronic media must be in a separate envelope per Section 1.2.

7. On page 11, Section 3.3 of the RFP lists four (4) questions and states that “Proposals must meet certain mandatory criteria in order to qualify for further evaluation.” Would you like proposals to explicitly state answers to those questions? If so, where would you like us to provide answers – which section?

The answers to mandatory criteria can be appended to end of proposal and do not count to page limit.

8. Additionally, the evaluation questions #2 and #3 on page 11 request explanations of disciplinary action and barring from work on federal, State or City projects. To help us provide information needed for the City to evaluate proposals based on this information, please clarify the following:

- o Would providing a litigation history sufficiently address these criteria? **Yes**
- o If so, where in the submittal package would you like such a history to be placed?

The answers to mandatory criteria can be appended to end of proposal and do not count to page limit.

- o And would a litigation history count toward the 15-page limit?

Responding to mandatory criteria does not count to page limit.

9. On page 11, Section 3.3 of the RFP states “Proposals will be reviewed using the following technical criteria. Proposals should address each question”. Our team’s assumption and interpretation is that the City requests submittals to address these questions / requirements (i through vi, pages 11-12) throughout the body of the proposal rather than providing written responses to each individual question. Please confirm if our interpretation is correct in addressing these questions/criteria throughout the proposal and not answering them directly through written responses.

The technical criteria should be considered throughout the proposal to obtain best possible score from the Evaluation Committee based on the weighting of the evaluation criteria.

10. It appears from the RFP that most of the scope relates to traffic analysis, corridor visioning, developing typical sections and recommendations, and public engagement; however, in the Bid Evaluation Scoring (p. 12), the Principal Design Engineer Resume is worth 35% of the total score. Is it your intent that the Principal Design Engineer resume reflect experience with the scope tasks as written (i.e., traffic analysis, corridor visioning, and public engagement) OR should that resume reflect more intersection/roadway design experience (such as concept reports and layouts)?

Section 3.0 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION and its subsections have been removed and replaced with Addendum #2.

11. Is it your intent for the Principal Design Engineer to be a person with traffic analysis background or a person with intersection/roadway design experience?

Company submittal will be evaluated based on their experience to analyze the circumstances of North Druid Hills and its surrounding environment and articulate feasible projects. Section 3.0 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION and its subsections have been removed and replaced with Addendum #2.

12. Given the potential impact the answers to some of these questions may have on our approach to proposals, would the City be willing to provide responses in advance of the deadline for questions?

Addendums will be provided as soon as practical for the benefit of both parties.

1. Can the City verify which sections count toward the 15-page body of the submittal?

Section 3.0 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION and its subsections have been removed and replaced with Addendum #2. The body consists of Proposal Sections I-V. Proposals shall be limited to twenty-five (25) single sided 8 ½" x 11" (One 11" x 17" Organizational Chart or Schedule will be allowed as part of the 25 pages). Required forms will not be counted as part of the page limit.

2. Pg. 10 of the RFP states that firms must complete the "O.C.G.A. § 50-36-1(e)(2) Affidavit Verifying Status Public Benefit (SAVE)." The form doesn't look to be included in the RFP, will the City provide?

Affidavit Verifying Status for City Public Benefit Application attached and does not count toward number of pages in the proposal.

1. Under Team, the RFP requests resumes for the principal Design Engineer and the Utility Coordinator. Are these indeed the resumes you are looking for? If they are not, can you please clarify which specific resumes you are wanting?

Section 3.0 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION and its subsections have been removed and replaced with Addendum #2. Resumes shall be provided for key project personnel.

2. Under References the RFP requests a list of five (5) intersection improvement design projects; is this correct?

Section 3.0 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION and its subsections have been removed and replaced with Addendum #2. A minimum of three (3) projects similar to the scope of work in the last five (5) years requested.

3. I did not see a SAVE Affidavit in the original RFP. Does this form need to be completed and provided with the technical proposal?

Affidavit Verifying Status for City Public Benefit Application is at end of Addendum #2 and does not count toward number of pages in the proposal.