

## AGENDA NOTES

<b>Solicitation Name and Number</b>	Professional Services for Classification and Compensation Study Service RFP No. 2025-100078
<b>Procurement Agent</b>	Jordan M. Rodges
<b>Date solicitation prices expire</b>	December 8, 2025
<b>Solicitation Name, Number and Contract Number of expiring/expired Contract</b>	Professional Services for Compensation and Classification Study RFP 13-500272 CPA 13-902747
<b>Previous Contract Number, Contractor Name and Award Amount</b>	\$474,680.00 CPA 13-902747, The Archer Company
<b>Previous Amount Spent on Expiring/Expired Contract</b>	\$454,320.00
<b>Prime Contractor Information and LSBE-Subcontractor</b>	<p><b><u>Evergreen Solutions, LLC (Prime)</u></b>  President: Jeff Ling  Years in Business: 20  Years Doing Business with DeKalb: 0</p> <p><b><u>ARK Global Partners, LLC-LSBE MSA; 20%</u></b>  800 Battery Ave Suite 100, Atlanta Georgia 30339  Principal: Anthony Kitchens  Years in Business: At least 2  Years doing Business with DeKalb: 0  Services to be Provided: Conducting orientation sessions, focus groups and salary survey data collection.</p> <p>All references were favorable.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. UD Recommendation</li> <li>2. Cumulative Score Report</li> <li>3. Evaluation Summary</li> </ol>

**User Department's Recommendation****Recommended Bidder(s):** Evergreen Solutions, LLC meets our approval.**Amount Spent on Previous Contract:** \$474,000.00**Name of Fund:** 100**Project Amount: Year 1:** \$404,500.00**Year 2:** **Year 3:** **Total:** \$404,500.00**Written Justification:**

As the highest ranking vendor, Evergreen Solutions is recommended to be awarded this contract. HR's assessment is they have the technical approach, project management, personnel, organizational qualifications, and financial stability to perform the scope of work required for DeKalb County's classification and compensation study.

Jimmy Woo, HR Generalist Principal, July 3, 2025

Name, Title

Date

JPHaynes for BCR 7/3/2025

Department Director

Date

			Vendor	Vendor	Vendor	Vendor	Vendor
Criteria	Description	Max Points	CBIZ Benefits & Insurance	Ernst & Young LLP	Evergreen Solutions, LLC	Management Advisory Group International, Inc.	Mercer
Technical Approach		20	14.57	10.57	15.71	11.14	15.43
Project Management		20	12.29	11.43	14.86	10.86	14.86
Personnel		10	6.14	6.71	8	6.57	6.14
Organizational Qualifications		20	13.71	12.29	16.86	14	14.86
Financial Responsibility		5	3.43	2.79	3.43	0.79	3.79
References		5	3.14	3.21	3.29	3	3.07
Cost		10	6	3	5.00	10.00	4.00
Total Points Prior to LSBE Participation		90	59.28	50.00	67.15	56.36	62.15
LOCAL SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION	Utilizes LSBE DeKalb	10		10		10	
	Utilizes LSBE MSA	5	5		5		5
	GFE	2					
Interview		10	7.70		7.7	8.3	6.4
Total Points After Interview		100/110	72.0	60.0	79.9	74.7	73.6

Number of Notifications Sent: 1252

Number of Responses Received: 9

**Recommend award to the highest scoring proposer:**

Evergreen Solutions, Inc., 2528 Barrington Circle, Unit 201, Tallahassee, FL 32308

Non-Responsive

1. The Archer Company — Failed to submit required documents, specifically Attachment G, “DeKalb First LSBE Information &amp; Exhibits,”

2. Gallagher Benefits — Failed to attend the mandatory Local Small Business Enterprise (LSBE) meeting, failed to meet the LSBE benchmark or provide a demonstration of Good Faith Efforts as required on pages 28-33 of the RFP, and to failed to submit required documents, including Attachment G, DeKalb First LSBE Information, Exhibit 1

3. Salary.com — Failed to completely submit Attachment K, Proposal Cover Sheet, and failed to submit required documents, including Attachment G, DeKalb First LSBE Information, Exhibit 1

4. Virtuosity — Failed to submit required documents (Attachment B, Cost Proposal Form; Attachment K, Proposal Cover Sheet; and Attachment G, DeKalb First LSBE Information), failed to attend the mandatory Local Small Business Enterprise (LSBE) meeting, and failed to meet the LSBE benchmark or provide a demonstration of Good Faith Efforts

<b>DeKalb County Department of Purchasing and Contracting</b> RFP 2025-100078 Professional Services for Classification and Compensation Study					
PROPOSER	CRIZ BENEFITS & INSURANCE	ERNST & YOUNG, LLP	EVERGREEN SOLUTIONS, LLC	MANAGEMENT ADVISORY GROUP INTERNATIONAL, INC.	MERCER
CRITERIA					
Technical Approach	The proposer’s technical approach met the basic scope requirements but was deemed adequate rather than strong. While some relevant activities—such as a peer jurisdiction compensation survey and post-implementation training—were noted, the proposal lacked depth and specificity in key areas. Concerns included limited supporting materials and inconsistent terminology, which indicated misalignment with public sector standards. Though certain elements were appreciated, they did not substantially enhance the proposal’s competitiveness. Overall, the approach was sufficient but not compelling compared to higher-ranked submissions.	The vendor presented a generally thorough and well-structured approach, with a proposed 27-week project duration. Evaluators noted strengths such as clear planning, incorporation of industry best practices, risk mitigation, and flexibility. However, concerns were raised about the classification of key components—such as salary structure revisions and FLSA reviews—as optional services, rather than core deliverables. This raised questions about the completeness of the base proposal. Scores varied significantly, reflecting differing perceptions of the proposal’s clarity and comprehensiveness.	The proposer submitted a well-structured and comprehensive technical approach, with most evaluators highlighting the detailed and thoughtful nature of their plan. The approach demonstrated a strong understanding of public sector needs, including regulatory demands and stakeholder considerations. While several evaluators praised the clarity and completeness of the methodology, one noted limited detail regarding certain tools and processes (e.g., job evaluation system, JobForce Manager, and appeal costs), as well as a desire for supporting samples. Overall, the technical approach was viewed as robust and well-aligned with project objectives, though a few areas would benefit from additional specificity.	The proposal presents a logical and complete approach, covering all key areas with clear bullet points. However, the level of detail is limited, providing only surface-level explanations without much insight into the methodology, timeline, or how challenges will be managed. Additional examples, such as class specifications, job evaluations, and salary survey samples, would strengthen the submission. Overall, the approach meets basic requirements but lacks depth and clarity.	The vendor presented an adequate and thorough technical approach with detailed methodology and a clear, step-by-step plan for managing the project. Their inclusion of proprietary tools and staff training demonstrates preparedness and structure. However, some evaluators would like to see additional samples of class specifications, job evaluations, and salary surveys for a more complete assessment.
Project Management	The proposer submitted a workable plan; however, evaluators found the project management approach lacking in depth and clarity. While it included basics like a point of contact and a high-level timeline, it lacked sufficient detail to inspire confidence. Concerns included over-reliance on the County for defining oversight, heavy delegation to LSBE partners, and the absence of clear phases, milestones, or risk mitigation strategies. Overall, the approach was viewed as vague and incomplete, contributing to a lower ranking in this category.	The vendor submitted a structured project plan with a clear timeline, outlining milestones and deliverables across a 27-week period. Evaluators noted the inclusion of a calendar and sequencing that reflects a logical flow, beginning with a thorough evaluation of current processes. While some evaluators appreciated the clarity and organization of the plan, others found the project management details lacking in depth—particularly regarding oversight responsibilities and resource allocation. Overall, the approach appeared sound but could benefit from more specificity around execution and accountability.	The proposer’s project management plan was generally well-received, with evaluators noting it as well-organized, clearly presented, and supported by a realistic timeline. Several evaluators appreciated the structure and flow of the description and the proposer’s ability to meet key deadlines, including project completion within the calendar year. While some evaluators expressed a desire for more detailed information within the project management section itself, the clarity and thoroughness of other proposal areas helped reinforce confidence in the firm’s ability to manage the work effectively. Overall, the plan demonstrated strong organizational skills and a clear strategy for successful	The proposal outlines a logical approach and includes a timeline, but overall lacks sufficient detail. The timeline is vague and provides only a broad overview, making it difficult to assess how the team will manage specific phases, tasks, and dependencies. Key milestones and deadlines are not clearly defined. The proposed project duration is approximately six months.	The vendor presented a well-structured and comprehensive project management approach. Their detailed proposal clearly outlines each phase from planning to implementation and evaluation, demonstrating transparency and a strong grasp of project requirements. The use of a progress reporting template was highlighted positively, showing effective monitoring and adjustment strategies. The timeline aims to complete the project within one year.
Personnel	The proposed team showed a baseline level of experience, with some individual qualifications noted. However, unclear and inconsistent resumes and role descriptions made it difficult to assess alignment with the project scope. Evaluators also raised concerns about the team’s geographic concentration in St. Louis, which may impact on-site collaboration, and the lack of academic and professional diversity. Overall, the personnel section did not convincingly demonstrate the team’s strength or fit for the project.	The proposed team appears generally qualified, with several evaluators noting strong credentials and relevant experience aligned with the project scope. One evaluator highlighted the team’s expertise as a strength, contributing to confidence in successful execution. However, there were concerns about the clarity of the team composition—specifically, uncertainty regarding the number of members and their locations. While the personnel section was viewed positively overall, clearer presentation of roles, structure, and location would have strengthened the proposal.	The personnel proposed for the project are highly experienced, particularly working with similar organizations and for achieving comparable outcomes. Several evaluators highlighted the extensive experience and strong qualifications of the team members. However, one evaluator noted some uncertainty regarding the absence of a tentatively assigned project manager, which would have provided clearer insight into the team’s overall approach. Overall, the personnel demonstrate strong public sector experience and appear well-equipped to support successful project execution.	The team is composed of very qualified personnel with experience in regional organizations similar to ours. All staff assigned have relevant public sector backgrounds, indicating familiarity with government project complexities. However, there is some uncertainty regarding how many team members are local versus out-of-state. The team consists of seven members, reportedly based in Fairfax, VA.	The personnel presented are generally qualified and mostly local. However, their qualifications are somewhat less strong and compelling compared to other proposals. While the team has relevant experience, their backgrounds lack the depth and specialization demonstrated by competitors. The team appears relatively small, with only four members noted from the Mercer Atlanta office.
Organizational Qualifications	The proposer demonstrates over 20 years of experience and a high client volume, which some evaluators viewed positively. However, examples provided lacked clarity and consistency, with only two clearly aligning with full classification and compensation studies. This raised concerns about the firm’s direct experience with similar projects. Overall, while the firm appears adequately qualified, the proposal did not strongly distinguish itself in this area.	The organization demonstrated adequate qualifications and capacity, with strengths in infrastructure and staffing. However, the brief organizational description and limited focus on public sector experience raised concerns. One evaluator also noted mention of existing lawsuits, though this was seen as less significant due to the firm’s size. Overall, the qualifications were sufficient but could be better aligned with DeKalb’s public sector needs.	The organization demonstrates extensive experience producing studies similar to the current project, particularly within Georgia and the Southeastern region. They have completed over 1,450 comparable studies for local governments and public sector clients nationwide, including more than 65 in Georgia alone. This strong track record with a large public sector client base highlights their capability and suitability to manage the scope and complexities of this engagement.	The organization is very qualified, with extensive experience in regional comparisons and five similar projects relevant to DeKalb County. Their exclusive focus on public sector clients ensures expertise tailored to the unique needs of government agencies. The firm maintains a large client base, including several in Georgia, reinforcing their strong public sector credentials.	The organization demonstrates solid past experience with similar clients, including projects comparable to DeKalb County. Recent project examples effectively showcase their capability to successfully deliver on the proposed work. However, there are relatively few clients based in Georgia, which may impact local familiarity. Overall, the qualifications reflect a competent and experienced organization.
Financial Responsibility	The proposer’s financial responsibility seemed adequate overall. Some evaluators cited strong cash flow and financial position, while others noted that supporting documentation was limited or only referenced as available. The lack of detailed financial disclosures resulted in lower scores from a few evaluators, though no significant red flags were identified.	The proposer’s financial responsibility was generally viewed as adequate. Evaluators noted no major concerns, and while financial documents were available, some pointed out that the firm does not publicly distribute financials due to its private LLP status. One evaluator mentioned improved stability following the implementation of an SEC order, suggesting the firm has taken corrective action. Overall, the firm appears financially stable, but the lack of transparent, detailed	The vendor appears financially stable with no significant concerns raised. Complete financial documentation was submitted, supporting their ability to manage the project’s financial requirements effectively. Overall, the responses indicate confidence in the vendor’s financial responsibility.	The financial information provided was insufficient. Most evaluators noted a lack of detailed financial statements, with only minimal confirmation of financial stability. Overall, the submission did not include adequate documentation to fully assess the vendor’s financial responsibility.	The financial information provided appears adequate and indicates the organization is financially stable. Documentation shows consistent revenue, and no concerns were raised regarding their financial capacity to support the project. Overall, their financial responsibility is satisfactory.
References	The proposer’s references were adequate but lacked depth and detail. While some references demonstrated relevant experience and capability, others provided minimal information beyond the reference forms. The limited number and detail of references contributed to moderate scores, indicating only a partial assurance of past performance aligned with the project’s requirements.	The proposer’s references were relevant and showed experience with similar projects, including work with large organizations. However, evaluators noted a lack of local references and limited variety. While one evaluator highlighted strong relevance and outcomes, overall the references were considered adequate but not especially distinguished in terms of diversity or depth.	The vendor provided an adequate number of references, including several from similar organizations, demonstrating relevant experience. While the references meet baseline expectations, some evaluators noted a preference for more examples closely aligned with the project’s specific scope and objectives. Overall, the references support the vendor’s capability but leave room for additional relevant detail.	The references were adequately presented with a reasonable number provided. While the listing was generally good, some evaluators noted a limited number of examples specific to neighboring counties or cities in the Metro Atlanta area, which was a missed opportunity to showcase more directly relevant experience. Overall, the references support a baseline level of relevant	The references provided adequately meet the qualification requirements, listing an appropriate number of contacts. They demonstrate a baseline level of relevant experience and generally support the organization’s past performance. Overall, the references are sufficient but not exceptional.
LSBE Participation	LSBE-MSA (5 points)	LSBE-DeKalb (10 points)	LSBE-MSA (5 points)	LSBE-DeKalb (10 points)	LSBE-MSA (5 points)

Interview	<p>The interview scores reflect a range of impressions from the evaluation team. While the presentation was generally adequate, several evaluators expressed concerns about the firm's reliance on Excel for job evaluation, suggesting the use of outdated technology. Additionally, the team's inability to clearly articulate their process and identify key personnel raised questions about overall preparedness and clarity. Despite these concerns, the firm was seen by some as capable and meeting baseline expectations.</p>	<p>This candidate was not shortlisted for an interview.</p>	<p>The interview demonstrated strong knowledge of the metro area and the project, with multiple evaluators praising the quality of the presentation. The team showed familiarity with the proposal and relevant background research. However, some concerns were noted about key personnel involvement, particularly the limited participation of the designated project manager. Overall, the presentation was solid with good public sector experience but left questions regarding team roles and direct engagement.</p>	<p>The interview was well-received overall, with strong presentations noted and positive feedback on the presenter's knowledge and involvement, especially from the presenter who is expected to be actively engaged in the project. Several evaluators appreciated the team's experience with small jurisdictions and public sector work. Some concerns were raised about whether the appeals process was included in the cost and if there would be sufficient staffing to complete the project.</p>	<p>The interview presentation was generally knowledgeable and reflected local expertise. However, there was a lack of clarity regarding the designated project manager, which raised some concerns about team structure and leadership. While the presenters were capable and met criteria, more concrete examples of comprehensive studies and a clearer project team were expected but not provided.</p>
-----------	--	---	---	--	--