

**DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING AND CONTRACTING
EVALUATION SUMMARY**

Criteria				
Proposers	Technical Approach	Personnel	Organizational Qualifications	DeKalb First Ordinance Participation
Arcadis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This could have been written for the entire project rather than writing this for each section. Waste of time. o The design alternatives provided for each Section seem reasonable and practical - good approach. o Good response, alternatives o The staff is local and subs are local. If there is an emergency, they can handle quickly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o PM not a registered Georgia P.E. and is not local o PM and Assistant PM commitment is very low for a project of this magnitude. o Arcadis shows component project team with strong experice on relevant projects and skill set o Out of state. Low PM percentage o Engineer-in-Training - Taylor Tittle 65% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Overall Arcadis is capable of doing a project of this magnitude. o Arcadis provides clear information on the firm information includes all required information o Good experience. o Has key personnel o Arcadis holds the only active license for this BEM technology in North America 	<p>Contractor had a mix of LSBE Points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o LSBE DeKalb: 15% o LSBE MSA: 15% o Total LSBE Points: 10
Atkins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The technical approach is actually very good. o Technical approach workflow is concise and clear for each phase with different alternatives. o Design consideration graph, alternatives for phases 1,2,3. project challenges illustrated, solutions were clear. o Great Technical approach and detail about what they are going to do o Completed 10 BDRs mentions 3 alternatives but did not choose one 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A bit skeptical with R2T from their performance on past projects and the lack of QA/QC of their product. o Atkins provides competent team members with vast variety of experience required for the project o Relevant project experience. Atlanta office is the largest, same members on all teams. o Met qualifications and work experience o Good personnel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A narrative providing the firm's experience on providing large diameter sewer design is not provided. o The executive summary is clear and concise. o Some negative references for subs o The contractor did follow the instructions and provided the percentage of time that each key member will dedicate to the project o Didn't see a lot of experience with the large diameter sewer 	<p>Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10</p>
Black and Veatch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o To be the firm that created the bridging documents, this technical approach is very mundane. o Overall technical approach is lacking details. o Response is good. List of assumptions may limit meetings, change orders o Technical approach was just ok. o Identified problem area pictures. But no advantages or disadvantages on alternates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The PM is not local nor is the project design phase lead. This is not preferred. o Design Engineer has less year of experience e.g.. 5 which may limit the design experience due to complexity of this project o A lot of out of state personnel. Will work with DeKalb for alternatives. o Nice project goals and objectives. o Engineer have only a few years of experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o All requested information is provided. o B&V's team has benefit of the knowledge of this project through early work. o Did not show litigation o The PM is located in a different state. How often will he be involved in the projects. o Engineer have only a few years of experience o Transmittal letter was ok2 	<p>Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10</p>

**DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING AND CONTRACTING
EVALUATION SUMMARY**

Criteria				
Proposers	Technical Approach	Personnel	Organizational Qualifications	DeKalb First Ordinance Participation
Brown and Caldwell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o BC has taken the time to review the alignment and provide alternatives that may be used during construction such as means of reducing by pass pumping. o BC's risk management plan associated with risk register and mitigation plan with some potential risks identified are clear and concise. o Key technical aspects, very clearly explained, alternatives shown, reference projects clearly illustrated o Nice project goals and objectives. o Completed 22 projects under the ON Call 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Good mix of staff and personnel. o BC key personnel have sufficient qualification with relevant experience with appropriate time commitment provided for overall project but did not break down into each phase o Strong team, some out of state, PM and Engineer 70% and 60%, different team members for each phase. o Local staff. Meet qualifications o BC has worked with partners Accura, ACR, RK Reeve 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o BC has shown on similar projects they have the knowledge and expertise to handle this type project. o BC has several past and on-going projects with DWM o Well presented o Good Mix of Experience. 	Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10
CDM Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o They talk about the different alternatives but never make a recommendation. o Technical approach focus on seamless project management and technical excellence o Comprehensive, VE, includes alternatives with pros and cons, addressed disruption. o Great Technical Approach o Standardization of materials can greatly reduce future maintenance burden 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A large majority of the prime team is not local in the Atlanta area. o CDM Smith is partnering with Barge Design and Tetra Tech to bring local experience. o Strong personnel, public support person, good commitment of key personnel, 90/75/75 for engineers. o No local PM o Significant sewer design and rehab. experience throughout GA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The transmittal letter fails to provide a straightforward narrative of the consultants ability to satisfy the requirements of the RFP. o CDM Smith, Barge, Tetra tech has combined experienced in similar projects with Shoal creek to include trunk sewer relief o Good transmittal letter, relying on Barge Design Solutions and Tetra Tech for strength o Good Client Mix 	Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10

**DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING AND CONTRACTING
EVALUATION SUMMARY**

Criteria				
Proposers	Technical Approach	Personnel	Organizational Qualifications	DeKalb First Ordinance Participation
HDR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal talks about different scenarios for each of the three sections but never comes forward and identifies a preferred alternative. o HDR provided generic project management approach for each phase. o Each section described, general character, easement concerns, road crossings. o I like their technical approach but would have liked to see more on the community engagement. o Parallel trench construction has a benefit of reducing dependance on bypass pumping during construction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o PM not licensed. This is not a strong staff for a project of this magnitude. o The team members seem to be competent but not as stand out. o Not very clearly addressed. A few key personnel out of state 6 /14, commitment in the appendix. o Staff out of town and no work composable o Contractor met the minimum qualification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Nor does this firm/agency section provide a precise statement describing the firm's experience on large gravity sewer design. o Overall company profile seem fine and meet requirement. o Good references o Has some concerns about staffs ability to do the job. o Transmittal letter I didn't see a clear and concise response to why the County should select this firm 	Identified 20% LSBE MSA earning the maximum MSA score of 5
Wood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The project approach does not provide any of the requested information from the RFP. o Wood only provides generic project technical approach and did not mention they have walked the site o No alternatives, No schedules, no public outreach, several assumptions (cultural resources) Very poorly written. o Did not see detail approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There is no detailed breakdown of the roles of the individuals that will be working on this project. o Wood provides competent team members. o No org charts, no phases, no percentage commitment, poor presentation. o Need more details o Contractor did not following instructions for RFP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The proposal talks more on the history of the company than about their capabilities. o Past project experience are fine but most of them are not directly similar to Shoal Creek so made it harder to reference. o Project experience seemed not deep. o There is not enough professional experience o Contractor provided the Minimum experience required for the solicitation 	Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10
Woolpert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Value engineering covered. o Woolpert has reviewed project site specific and identify each critical area. o No org charts, no phases, no percentage commitment, poor presentation. o I like their technical plan. I would like to see more discussions on their 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Large part of their key personnel are not in Georgia. QA/QC presents a question. o Key team members have competent background experience o Solid team with experience, good transmittal, addressed most points, good references o Met qualifications o Decent mix of experiece 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No special strengths highlighted or detailed. o The past relevant experience provided is sufficient, though some are more on the construction management and sewer rehab rather than sewer design. o Met qualifications o Contractor have more construction experience than engineering experience. 	Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10