

**DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING AND CONTRACTING
EVALUATION SUMMARY**

Criteria				
Proposers	Project Approach	Organizational Qualifications and Team Experience	Project Personnel	DeKalb First Ordinance Participation
Arcadis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Acadis provided the excellent summary of how to manage the project o I don't feel they answered a and b as requested. o Meets all the requirements for this criteria o Proposer didn't do a good job describing how the the project will be designed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Completed trench-type ww design and construction 10+ projects with the capacity upto 330 MGD (PS Ref ; 210, 25, 8 MGD o I don't see a direct response to the information being requested o Met every point on score card. o Missing - Firm(s) and Key Personnel that participated in project and are included in this Proposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o PM has 14+ years experience(12,18,30,38,40 MGD) without Trench-type WW experience o provided all the information requested for key personnel, availability, org chart, etc. o Met every point on score card. o Org chart not showing the reporting relationships and responsibilities of Engineer 	<p>Contractor had a mix of LSBE Points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o LSBE DeKalb: 20% o LSBE MSA: 7% o Total LSBE Points: 10
Brown and Caldwell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Not well defined with WAS approach, how to modify and/or improve the existing system, o They provided a safety approval but referred you to organization qualifications and team experience to get this information rather than show it here. o Proposed approach to decrease Community Impact so the County an evaluate is not discussed in detail. o Propopser mentioned that they will collaborate with DeKalb County but go into detail how 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Andy Thorpe, PE, Design Manager, expert in biosolids, not much in PS o Fail to describe their performance history on similar projects and the team. o Met every point on scorecard. o Good Qualitifications and Team Experience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Overall Key Personnel who will get involved in thsi project has an excellent experience. o All information requested in this section has been provided. o Met every point on scorecard. o Proprosers meet all requirements 	<p>Identified 21% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10</p>
CDM Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Executive Sumary provided the exellent one page information such as, Team Lead experieence, Recommendation, Approach, Critical Sucess Factors for improve and upgrade PS , Was, and Solids. o Met every point on scorecard. o CDM Smith meets all the requirements for this criteria. o Good project approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Shows strong project team with key personnels and subcontractors o Very generic in detailing the period of their projects. o Did not show that their personnel's expertise was directly in Wastewater (ex. Pumping Stations) o Didn't see licenses for some of the contractors and subcontractors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Technical Advisors have an excellent experience, PS o All required information provided o Met every point on scorecard. o PM plan is thorough. o Meet all qualifications 	<p>Contractor had a mix of LSBE Points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o LSBE DeKalb: 20.5% o LSBE MSA: 6% o Total LSBE Points: 10

DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING AND CONTRACTING

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Criteria				
Proposers	Project Approach	Organizational Qualifications and Team Experience	Project Personnel	DeKalb First Ordinance Participation
FGW (JV)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In Ref. Form Attachment D, the 3rd ref is less concern with PS or Solid MM o Provided an in-depth assessment of the existing IPS and suggested recommendations here in their proposal. o Need more details of minimizing the disturbance to the greatest extent possible o Project approach was well thought out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o PM and DPM don't have the experience with TWW even though on page 27 showing that PM has strong Biosolids MM (-1). o Quarter point deducted on PMs lack of experience with this type project, but he is surrounded by a cast of SMEs o Met every point on scorecard. o Good qualification and team experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o FGW_ the team member for both PS and Solids MM are excellent. o All requested criteria met. o Met every point on scorecard. o Good Personnel 	<p>Contractor had a mix of LSBE Points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o LSBE DeKalb: 24% o LSBE MSA: 5% o Total LSBE Points: 10
Gresham Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Over all project approach is so general and typical o Technical approach was very weak and could have provide a bit more insight on the diffent technoloiges available o Doesn't seem their team has too much experience in Pumping Stations. o Too bland with not enough information within the Project Approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Layout and information provided in the references are difficult to evaluate, should imporve and condense reference information o Referenced projects have no schedules provided so no idea if these were completed within the last ten years o Doesn't seem their team has too much experience in Pumping Stations o Proposer did not provide all of the information required to make a decision on whether they had enough expereince to complete the project we are advertising. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o PM has20+ years experience(00000MGD) with one Trench-type WW experience @ COA/ICWRC which is not constructed. o Don't see a lot of experience from the design team for the type project being advertised in this RFP. o Doesn't seem their team has too much experience in Pumping Stations. o Minus points for organization charts, identifying key personel, commitment of all key personell, 	<p>Contractor had a mix of LSBE Points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o LSBE DeKalb: 2.4% o LSBE MSA: 14% o LSBE earning the Good Faith Efforts (GFE) maximum score of 2 points