

Committee Evaluation Summary
RFP: 22-500632 Air Quality and Noise Assessment Study at Dekalb Peachtree Airport

Criteria (points)	HMMH, Inc.	RoVolus, LLC	WSP
Technical Approach (20 points)	Responder has detailed plan for reaching the goals of the project. The timeline was concerning as they did not meet the 6-month window.	Responder has detailed plan for reaching the goals of the project. They did not meet the 6-month timeline	Responder has plan for reaching the goals of the project. Plan is a little hard to follow in its presentation. They met the 6-month timeline.
Project Management (25 point)	Responder has detailed description of how project will be managed, includes subcontractors/LSBE partner, and describes the resources they will use.	Responder didn't detail the project management. Concern is that they have a small team.	Responder did not explain the role of the personal.
Organization Qualifications (25 points)	Responder went into detail of the qualifications and organization.	The company is qualified to do the work downside that it is a small & young company.	Responder has extensive experience.
Financial Responsibility (5 Points)	Responder did not submit Balance Sheet; Income Statement of Cash Flow Statement was provided for any years.	Responder is a very small company; however, financials are okay. A big plus that they have been around since 2015.	Responder has a strong balance sheet.
References (5 points)	Excellent rating by all references.	Excellent rating by all references.	Excellent rating by all references.
LSBE Participation (Max. 10)	Full participation with LSBE DeKalb vendor.	Full participation with LSBE DeKalb vendor.	Full participation with LSBE DeKalb vendor.
Cost (5 points)	1 point	1.5 points	2.0 points

Committee Evaluation Summary

RFP: 22-500632 Air Quality and Noise Assessment Study at Dekalb Peachtree Airport

The method applied regarding the RFP 22-500632 Air Quality and Noise Study Scoring Sheet:

The References & Financials are grouped together under one criterion and the maximum points allowed are 5. In order to score each category, each were weighted at 2.5 points.

Since scores are based on a scale of 1-5 points, we had to administer the scoring based on the below table.

References & Financial Statement	<p>a. Responder shall provide three (3) references for projects similar in size and scope to the project specified herein using the Reference and Release Form attached hereto as Attachment C.</p> <p>b. Provide three (3) references for each subcontractor proposed as a part of the project team. The references shall be for the same or similar types of services to be performed by the subcontractor (including LSBE-DeKalb and LSBE-MSA firms) on projects similar in size and scope to the project outlined in this RFP. Use Attachment D, Subcontractor Reference and Release Form. Make additional copies as needed.</p> <p>c. Responder must provide financial statements for the last three (3) years that evidences the responder’s financial capabilities to perform the scope of work. (Audited statements are preferable but a minimum of balance sheet, income statement and cash flow statement may be accepted.) Provide year of incorporation (if applicable).</p>	5
--	--	---

Conversion Table

Points 5	Weighted 2.5
1	0.5
2	1.0
3	1.5

Committee Evaluation Summary
RFP: 22-500632 Air Quality and Noise Assessment Study at Dekalb Peachtree Airport

4	2.0
5	2.5

Evaluation Summary
Air Quality and Noise Assessment Study

Criteria	Description	HMMH, Inc.	RoVolus, LLC	WSP
Technical Approach to the Project	<p>a. Responders are required to describe the procedures and methods that will achieve the required outcome of the project as specified herein;</p> <p>b. Include a listing of the County’s responsibilities and the Responder’s responsibilities required to complete the project; and</p> <p>c. Provide a project schedule at the task level starting with the receipt of the Notice to Proceed and ending with project completion.</p>	<p>There Technical approach is sound and looks like they are using the latests technology. There responsibilities are clearly defined and project schedule is outline clearly.</p> <p>Detailed Approach to technical items</p> <p>Project Length "as a little concerning</p> <p>The firm documented a concern about the timeline that the County estimated that the project should take for completion. Perhaps it should be considered in scoring.</p>	<p>There technical approach isn't as sound as the other companies and lacking the latest technology that was shared from the other companies. They have a clearly defined project schedule.</p> <p>Cut and dry approach</p> <p>Cost effective in some areas</p> <p>The firm submitted a proposal based upon a 12-month deliverable schedule</p>	<p>There technical approach is sound and they are using the latest technology. There project schedule wasn't as clear as the other companies, I feel they left a lot of wiggle room to extend the project.</p> <p>Pretty High tech approach not extremely detailed but met all bullet points.</p> <p>The firm submitted a proposal based upon a 6-month schedule with contingencies.</p>
Project Management	<p>a. Describe how the project will be organized and managed;</p> <p>b. Describe progress reporting procedures for the project;</p> <p>c. Include the anticipated use of subcontractors or vendors, identify all subcontractors, if any, and identify the work subcontractors will be doing; and</p> <p>d. Describe the resources necessary to accomplish the purpose of the project.</p>	<p>They described the project organization and management well, described the reporting, included a subcontractor and clearly described what is needed to accomplish the project.</p> <p>Great details as to who would be managing each part of project</p> <p>Efficient</p> <p>All descriptions were included and thoroughly explained.</p>	<p>They didn't described the project organization and management as well as the other two companies. Included a subcontractor.</p> <p>Didn't really see the type of management style that would be used.</p> <p>Small team. Over reliance on CERM.</p>	<p>They described the project organization and management well, described the reporting, included a subcontractor and could have me more clear on what was need to accomplish the prj.</p> <p>Not sure about the project management great personnel. not sure about the team aspect.</p> <p>Explanation of the management could have been a bit more</p>
Personnel	<p>a. Identify the individuals who will be part of the project team;</p> <p>b. Include any outside personnel, such as subcontractors; and</p> <p>c. Provide detailed resumes of team members and subcontractors who will be directly working on the project.</p>	<p>Well rounded Personnel that covered all aspect of the project and provided detailed resumes of their team.</p> <p>Great team members with many years of experience.</p> <p>All requested information included in submittal.</p>	<p>Did not answer question on how they were going to use GIS and if they were going to use the ESRI Airport Model</p> <p>Good experience as individuals but not sure how much they mesh as a team.</p> <p>Size of the team is a concern.</p>	<p>Answered all of the GIS question and were the most knowledgeable about the ESRI Airport model.</p> <p>Questions about the number of staffing that would be available. Size of the team is a concern.</p>

Evaluation Summary
Air Quality and Noise Assessment Study

Criteria	Description	HMMH, Inc.	RoVolus, LLC	WSP
Organizational Qualifications	a. Describe Responder's experience performing research and investigatory air and noise studies, capabilities and other qualifications for this project; b. How many years has Responder operated under current company name? c. Has Responder ever been debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded by any Federal department or agency from doing business with the Federal Government?	They described experiences and qualification of proposed project, extensive years of experience in dealing with Air & noise studies. Extremely qualified Been in business since the 80's	Qualified as a company Young company Outstanding work with the FAA	They described experiences and qualification of proposed project, extensive years of experience in dealing with Air & noise studies. Young company as well -Questions about the "debarred"
References & Financial Statement	a. Responder shall provide three (3) references for projects similar in size and scope to the project specified herein using the Reference and Release Form attached hereto as Attachment C. b. Provide three (3) references for each subcontractor proposed as a part of the project team. The references shall be for the same or similar types of services to be performed by the subcontractor (including LSBE-DeKalb and LSBE-MSA firms) on projects similar in size and scope to the project outlined in this RFP. Use Attachment D, Subcontractor Reference and Release Form. Make additional copies as needed. c. Responder must provide financial statements for the last three (3) years that evidences the responder's financial capabilities to perform the scope of work. (Audited statements are preferable but a minimum of balance sheet, income statement and cash flow statement may be accepted.) Provide year of incorporation (if applicable).	Excellent References Financial Statement I'm not able to review HMMH since no Balance Sheet, Income Statement of Cash Flow Statement was provided for any years.	Excellent References Financial Statement ReVou is a very small company, however financials are okay. A big plus that they have been around since 2015.	Excellent References Financial Statement WSP is a very large company. Strong balance sheet.
LSBE	LSBE within DeKalb (LSBE-DeKalb) - Ten (10) Preference LSBE Outside DeKalb (LSBE-MSA) - Five (5) Preference Points Demonstrated GFE - Two (2) Preference Points	LSBE DEKALB Participation - 20%	LSBE DEKALB Participation - 20%	LSBE DEKALB Participation - 20%
Optional Interview		Thorough presentation. Multiple team members explained their roles.	Explained that they attempted to guess on some of the scoped items. They also recommended that the County "share risks" for some of the supplemental work.	Technical approach. Stated that the RFP did not allow them to submit a cost for work scoped in the supplemental costs.

Evaluation Summary
Air Quality and Noise Assessment Study

Criteria	Description	HMMH, Inc.	RoVolus, LLC	WSP
----------	-------------	------------	--------------	-----