

**AS REQUIRED FOR THE
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
TO DEVELOP, DESIGN, CONSTRUCT AND FINANCE
THE
NORTHWEST CORRIDOR PROJECT
THROUGH A
DESIGN BUILD FINANCE AGREEMENT
PROJECT NUMBER
CSNHS-0008-00(256), P.I. No. 0008256
INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

RFP Issued: December 7, 2012

Addendum No. 1 Issued: February 22, 2013

Addendum No. 2 Issued: April 24, 2013

Addendum No. 3 Issued: May 24, 2013

Proposals Due: June 10, 2013 at 2:00 p.m. EDT

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

RE: COMMENTS REGARDING EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RE: COMMENTS REGARDING EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

July 22, 2013

In accordance with O.C.G.A. Section 32-2-80 (3), a public comment period was held from June 20, 2013, to July 19, 2013, to offer an opportunity for the public to review and make comments on the Executive Summaries for the Northwest Corridor Project (NWC Project). The three Executive Summaries were part of the three proposals the Georgia Department of Transportation received on June 10, 2013, in response to the Request for Proposals issued on December 7, 2012. The purpose of the Executive Summary in the Proposal was to provide sufficient information for reviewers with both technical and non-technical backgrounds to familiarize themselves with the Proposer's ability to satisfy the financial and technical requirements of the project.

The NWC Project entails the design, construction, and partial private financing of managed lanes from I-285 to Hickory Grove Road along I-75 and from I-75/I-575 Interchange to Sixes Road along I-575 in Cobb and Cherokee Counties. As part of the public comment period, public hearings were held on July 9, 2013, in Cherokee County and on July 11, 2013, in Cobb County for the Northwest Corridor Project.

All comments received during the public comment period will be made a part of the project record. Below is a verbatim compilation of the comments received and the responses to those comments. The comments were transcribed as they were received; no modifications and no alterations were made.

RE: COMMENTS REGARDING EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Comment #	Topic	Comment	Response	Transmitted by
1	Comment about individuals included in Executive Summary organization chart	I have worked with part of the Northwest Express Roadbuilders, Archer Western, on a few projects, and would like to provide feedback on my experience with them. AW is very organized and professional. More specifically, David Casey and Steve Hausler are both extremely competent, forward-looking, and ethical managers. They will do an excellent job of handling a very high-profile project, such as the Northwest Corridor.	GDOT appreciates your comments on the Executive Summaries. Staff experience and qualification are certainly components of the evaluation. These areas will be thoroughly reviewed and evaluated for each of the Proposer's key staff members.	Email
2	Comment about work history and traffic management as required in Executive Summary	<p>In consideration of the bids for the Northwest Corridor Project, I hope that you consider not only the fiscal advantages of using certain companies over others, but also the work history of the companies involved. To be frank, when I saw that CW Matthews was involved in the bidding on this project, I was extremely disheartened. Every time I pass their projects in Metro Atlanta and Mid-Georgia, I pass them going 30 mph or less. It seems as if they are getting a lot of work lately with GDOT, which is great (for them), but they often do things without much concern as to what effect their actions will have on the people who live in those areas.</p> <p>For example, one weekend in March, I attempted to go to my aunt's memorial service, but instead sat in traffic for over 2 hours on 285, only going 11 miles the entire time. Eventually I found out that 285 had been reduced to only one lane while the others were being stripped and re-laid. For the life of me, I cannot understand why any construction company dealing with the amount of volume that Atlanta typically offers up on the weekends would close TWO lanes at a time in the <i>middle of the day with no notice to the citizens of Atlanta</i>. In the five years I've lived here, I've never encountered anything like it and I hope I never will again.</p> <p>This is only one of many examples in which I, personally, have been effected by the poor project planning and execution of CW Matthews, but many more have been negatively effected too. When my friends would have travel on 285 to get to weddings, barbeques, or outings on the weekends on the other side of the city, they expressed that they would</p>	GDOT appreciates your comments on the Executive Summaries. The Proposers Maintenance of Traffic plan will be thoroughly reviewed and evaluated including the degree to which the Proposer has demonstrated a strategy to minimize impacts to motorists in the corridor and any required lane and shoulder closures.	Email

RE: COMMENTS REGARDING EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Comment #	Topic	Comment	Response	Transmitted by
		<p>rather take a detour through the heart of Atlanta than deal with the “mess” on 285. Frankly, it’s a mess, and the project could have been done much better. Honestly, the only reason I know the CW Matthews name is because of the times I’ve ended up googling their name while stuck in gridlock.</p> <p>The only other construction company I know of in Atlanta is Archer Western, and it’s only because I’ve compared the traffic in their work areas to that of CW Matthews. It’s at least 10 times better! If they ever stop traffic (which they did this past weekend on I-85S) it’s brief, it still flows, and at least I get a little warning so I can change my route if I’m in a hurry.</p> <p>I don’t know about Bechtel or any of the other construction companies out there, but I have experienced the work of these two companies. CW Matthews has caused so much gridlock in the Atlanta area with their current project on 285 that I would personally be upset if they won another project in this area, paid for with taxpayer dollars, just to mess up traffic. The area that would be affected by this project is already a pretty bad area to drive through (especially during rush hour) and it could further exasperate the problem (albeit temporarily) to put CWM on the Northwestern Corridor Project.</p> <p>Anyone else but them, I beg of you. Archer Western seems to know what they are doing in the Buckhead area, but, to be honest, as long as the project doesn’t go to CW Matthews I can rest assured that my taxes are going to repair a road I’ll actually be able to use for the next 2 years.</p>		

RE: COMMENTS REGARDING EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Comment #	Topic	Comment	Response	Transmitted by
3	Executive Summary	<p>I initially came to the meeting to review the plan status of the proposed sound barrier wall behind my neighborhood.</p> <p>I believe Archer-Western and C.W. Matthews are locally based contractors. I hope that one of the two are chosen over Bechtel.</p> <p>I also noticed that C.W. Matthews included a paragraph titled 'Approach to Aesthetics'. I love the way designs are embedded in concrete walls and bridges throughout Florida and Arizona. I hope that the final project uses integral colored concrete and embed designs as well. The large green beams on raised roadways serve their purpose but bring about an industrialized look that is very unattractive. It'd be nice to see our state emblem or a GA peach embedded.</p>	<p>GDOT appreciates your attendance at the public hearing and comments on the enhanced aesthetics for the Northwest Corridor Project. While information regarding the Proposers' Aesthetics Plan was not required to be included in the Executive Summary, C.W. Matthews did provide information on their proposed Aesthetics Plan in the Executive Summary. All Proposers were required to provide enhanced aesthetic hardscape and landscape features in their Proposal.</p>	Public Hearing on 7/9/2013
4	Executive Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matthews summary does not provide confidence that they have the resources to be able to handle a project of this size & importance. According to news it is 4x larger than anything they have done. • Georgia Transportation Partners seem to brag a lot about projects all over the world. This summary is not clear on how they will integrate into the Georgia community. There is no discussion about project specifics. This seems to be a 10 page commercial for these firms. • NWER demonstrates resources, capabilities, & explains in their approach how they are saving the taxpayers money. They also have the shortest schedule. Their summary was the easiest to read & understand. 	<p>GDOT appreciates your attendance at the public hearing and the comments regarding your review of the provided Executive Summaries. The purpose of the Executive Summary is to provide sufficient information for reviewers with both technical and non-technical backgrounds to become familiar with the Proposer's ability to satisfy the financial and technical requirements of the Project. We have forwarded your comments to Executive Management for consideration.</p>	Public Hearing on 7/11/2013
5	Project concept	<p>DOT Project Design/Concept</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Another Spaghetti Junction FIASCO thought & design process thanks to the GA DOT!! Will you ever learn??? 2. Using Houston as a model?? ONE OF THE WORST TRAFFIC highway systems in the country!! 	<p>GDOT appreciates your attendance at the public hearing. Your comments have been forwarded to GDOT Management for consideration since this feedback does not directly relate to the Executive Summaries.</p>	Public Hearing on 7/9/2013

RE: COMMENTS REGARDING EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Comment #	Topic	Comment	Response	Transmitted by
6	Impacts to a specific parcel/property	I serve as a representative of Parkway Center located at intersection of I-75 and the S. Marietta Parkway. Parkway is the only Class A office space in the City of Marietta and is the city's largest taxpayer. The ultimate proximity and height of the project is going to be critical to the continued success of this office complex. We simply request that whichever team is selected that they work with us on key issues of impact and mitigation. If the new lanes, for all intents and purposes, abut Parkway and are visible or even blocking the windows of the complex, it will be devastating and tantamount to a taking. We remain confident and hopeful that there are and will be solutions acceptable to all.	GDOT appreciates your attendance at the public hearing. Your comments have been forwarded to GDOT's Office of Innovative Program Delivery, the Office of Right of Way and to Executive Management for consideration since this feedback does not directly relate to the Executive Summaries.	Public Hearing on 7/11/2013
7	Tolling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reversible lanes a great idea, Tolloed roads not! Maybe incentive to carpool but please avoid the toll. • Recently experienced the benefits of reversible lanes in Seattle... • Curious what happens at the 285 termination point. • Does this mean we've given up on MARTA / rail transit? 	GDOT appreciates your comments. Your feedback has been forwarded to the State Road and Tollway Authority, GDOT's Office of Planning and Office of Intermodal, and to Executive Management for review since the comments do not directly relate to the Executive Summaries.	Email
8	Tolling	I am opposed to construction or changes that would toll lanes to be developed along this corridor. This will do nothing but make the entire stretch of road more congested during construction. If the route needs more lanes, build them with taxpayer tax dollars that you are already collecting. My take on the North side traffic situation, as I travel from Kennesaw to Flowery Branch to see my daughter and granddaughter every week. Is to connect 75 and 85 to bypass much of the truck traffic currently have to go onto 285.	GDOT appreciates your comments. Your feedback has been forwarded to the State Road and Tollway Authority and GDOT's Executive Management for review since the comments do not directly relate to the Executive Summaries.	Email

RE: COMMENTS REGARDING EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Comment #	Topic	Comment	Response	Transmitted by
9	Tolling	<p>Nobody at my office nor anyone I discussed this project with that live in Cobb want toll lanes on 75 north. What a waste of money. Why do you think we all voted down the Tsplost?</p> <p>WE DO NOT WANT TOLL LANES!</p>	<p>GDOT appreciates your comments. Your feedback has been forwarded to the State Road and Tollway Authority and GDOT's Executive Management for review since the comments do not directly relate to the Executive Summaries.</p>	Email
10	Project concept	<p>After listening to the morning news on WSBTV this past week regarding the reverse lanes for 75 and 575, I was prompted to contact the project manager regarding our concerns that involves our community along highway 575. Since 1991, my husband and I have been residents of Cherokee County. During these years, we have watched our community grow along highway 575 with neighborhoods, schools, churches and businesses for our community to become a greater place to live.</p> <p>With our community changing and growing, we understand the infrastructure needs to be upgraded to accommodate growth. For years, the main proposal was to build another perimeter/ARC outside 285 to connect the growing counties that skirted 285. However the project never was established due to controversy over land especially around route 20. Since then, other ideas may have been talked about by never came to public that was seriously considered to be implemented. Unfortunately, we are just understanding that the Northwest Corridor Project in the last few years has been defining a decision for the reverse lanes to be added to our 575 community. We are very concern that this project has been planned & researched primarily by GDOT and Sycamore Consulting Company with minimal attention to the public, especially for the 575 community. In reviewing the Northwest Corridor Project, only a few meetings were scheduled over the last few years to include the public. There were x2 meetings in 2011, no meetings in 2012, and x2 schedule meetings in 2013 after the May 14, 2013 approval date/record of decision for these reverse lanes to be implemented in our 575 community per Christine of the</p>	<p>GDOT appreciates your comments. Your feedback has been forwarded to GDOT's Office of Planning as well as Executive Management for review since the comments do not directly relate to the Executive Summaries.</p>	Email

RE: COMMENTS REGARDING EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Comment #	Topic	Comment	Response	Transmitted by
		<p>Sycamore Consulting Co. Of these x2 meetings in 2013, only x1 meeting was located in our 575 community on July 9th). We are unsure what information was given at these few meetings or if our community was able to give any input. We have very deep concerns regarding the Northwest Corridor Project that involves 575. Our concerns are of the following: The existing highway 575 is a 4 lane highway in need to be expanded to a 6 lane highway to accommodate our growing community for our immediate neighborhood needs before we are ready to implement reverse lanes or HOT/Toll lanes. The reverse lanes and the HOT/Toll lanes do not reflect or assist our community in itself. We understand the 3rd lane running south and north on 575 was in the proposal a few years ago but was dropped. Why? The 575 community would benefit clearly to have 6 lanes for families to be able to travel to and from our schools, churches, business and etc. Our understanding from my phone conversation, the reverse lanes is a separate entity from the existing 4 lane highway that will be occupied specifically to assist commuters to connect to route 75 reverse lanes with no real purpose for our own community. In comparison, 400 is a 6 to 8 lane highway that does not have reverse lanes or HOT/Toll lanes. We feel that 575 community should have the same respect as the 400 community to have at least a 6 lane highway before reverse lanes are even considered to come to 575. We can understand to add reverse lanes to 75 since 75 already has 10 to 12 lanes. We feel our community who travels daily on the secondary streets that connect to 575 should be able to voice our concerns or what needs will be best for our community. Clearly, these reverse lanes will definitely have a negative impact on our community on a daily basis. How does GDOT conclude that a small 4 lane highway needs reverse lanes over adding a 3rd lane? Is the reason due to finances?</p> <p>In conclusion, we disagree going forward with these reverse lanes and HOT/Toll lanes for the 575 community. Our community now needs a 6 lane highway before implementing</p>		

RE: COMMENTS REGARDING EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Comment #	Topic	Comment	Response	Transmitted by
		<p>reverse lanes. Adding the 3rd lane will ease the growing pains of our community and give our neighbors a choice with a 6 lane highway. However, placement of reverse lanes to our existing 4 lane highway will give our neighbors no choice but to be forced to use the HOT/Toll lanes as being decided by the Northwest Corridor Project. We hope our voices will be heard loudly and for the GDOT to make the right decision to build the 6 lane highway before the reverse lanes.</p>		