



DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING AND CONTRACTING

RFP Number: 20-500550  
 RFP Name: Construction Management (Multiyear Contract)

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Opening: 2-24-21 @ 3:00 PM  
 Agent: Willie Moon, Procurement Agent, Senior

Criteria	Vendors								
	Arcadis	Black & Veatch	CGA	EDT-Wade-Trim	Hellier	NAPM	Tetra Tech	VolKert	Wood
Firm Experience and Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The prime contractor seems to have experience with water infrastructure work - primarily plant work.</li> <li>Experience staff (plenty of staff available)</li> <li>Extensive experience with DeKalb projects.</li> <li>Downside is that experience is heavier on plant side rather than linear projects.</li> <li>Arcadis submitted information indicates that they have a lot of experience.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The prime contractor seems to have experience with water infrastructure work - no linear, CIPP, etc.</li> <li>Good Staff and approach to project</li> <li>Current on-call engineering firm for Watershed.</li> <li>The highlighted projects are ok but in some cases don't match our needs.</li> <li>Didn't see any references to Tank painting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The firm shows experience in all required areas of interest outlined in the RFP.</li> <li>Good experience on similar projects</li> <li>Gresham Smith has DeKalb, Gwinnett and Fulton construction management experience.</li> <li>Good sample of projects that are similar to DWM's expected work.</li> <li>Bidder submitted information indicates that they have a lot of experience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matrix shows the firm has experience in all of the areas.</li> <li>Good description of Job duties</li> <li>Reeves has past or present construction management role with DeKalb Watershed.</li> <li>Matrix is strong and shows extensive CM and inspections.</li> <li>The joint venture seems to be a partnership of contractors that has meet the criteria that the County is asking for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Didn't see any experience with inspections of CIPP work.</li> <li>Plenty of experience in all aspects of the contract</li> <li>Not clear what if any water and sewer related experience Hellier actually has.</li> <li>Firm experience is not strong.</li> <li>They did not list some of the requested information such as project milestones</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The firm NAPM has limited experience with construction management but is a contractor and should have experience in effectively managing a contract.</li> <li>Good Staff Not Over Educated</li> <li>Not clear how much experience NAPM has with construction management on water and sewer projects</li> <li>Firm experience is relatively strong.</li> <li>Good Team.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matrix shows the firm has experience in all areas including Tank painting</li> <li>Good experience in the type of work in this RFP</li> <li>Current CM services contract with DWM.</li> <li>The highlighted five projects are representative of expected work</li> <li>Tetra Tech has a strong team that seems to meet the criteria of the RFP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The firm has very solid experience and expertise. Didn't see any CIPP similar projects for inspectors or construction managers</li> <li>Good Company all around</li> <li>VolKert and subs all have relevant experience either locally or elsewhere.</li> <li>Some construction administration but doesn't demonstrate extensive or convincing Construction Management experience in water and wastewater.</li> <li>VolKert have experience provided design and construction admin services on th Rockbridge Road project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience matrix covered all areas throughout team members.</li> <li>Expertise mostly in pump stations but no point repair work provided.</li> <li>Wood has worked on many similar projects in DeKalb and on similar projects in nearby counties and cities.</li> <li>The highlighted five projects are representative of expected work.</li> <li>Wood has experience in a multitude of water and sewer projects for inspections and CCTV Assessments, CIPP, point repairs, pipe bursting</li> </ul>
Construction Technical Management Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly defined roles. Love the fact the CM has a contractor background.</li> <li>Good Approach to managing project</li> <li>Only one construction manager listed. Not clear what the difference is between project manager and construction manager.</li> <li>Approach is good and well thought out; although fairly standard and not innovative in any way.</li> <li>They plan to created shared understanding of the goals of the project with all stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not sure if they understand the depth of resources requirement nor the primary needs of Watershed.</li> <li>Good resources. Do not talk about communication with DeKalb doing projects</li> <li>Little discussion of communications strategy.</li> <li>Construction management approach is thorough and complete.</li> <li>Didn't mentioned services provided during pre-bid conferences, questions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan was pretty solid on planning, executing, monitoring and controlling and project closeout.</li> <li>Good approach on managing and keeping DWM informed</li> <li>Notes the need to adjust resources to meet current needs in program.</li> <li>CM approach is sound, understands the requirements of the project.</li> <li>Good Approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed but I'm not sure if the firm understands the depth of resources of what is required.</li> <li>Good Management approach for coordination and communications</li> <li>Very dependent on two people. Organization below them is unclear although staff are listed by specific functional area.</li> <li>Expertise mostly in pump stations but no point repair work provided.</li> <li>Good Team solid response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delineation of roles assigned to team members was completed but not much effort put into the RFP.</li> <li>Straight forward approach, though almost vague</li> <li>Brief and fairly generic. Good communication matrix</li> <li>Doesn't convey a wealth of experience in Construction management or inspection</li> <li>Needed more detail on experience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Built a team with a lot of construction background which is a huge plus.</li> <li>Good Management approach</li> <li>Proposing that Lee Orr and Robert McPherson be co-leaders and central points of contact.</li> <li>Approach is only ok. Doesn't identify any resources, only says they have them.</li> <li>Good management approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very good approach and coordination plan provided.</li> <li>Good approach to project management</li> <li>Well organized description of project approach showing the proposed roles of each sub</li> <li>Construction Management approach is very good. Addresses each of the requirements.</li> <li>Good Team. The learning curve should be shortsince some of the contractors is already working with the County</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach was well defined by utilizing local resources and expertise.</li> <li>Good staff and experience especially in field personnel</li> <li>Detailed but fairly generic description of approach.</li> <li>Construction Management approach is good.</li> <li>Good Team solid response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The construction management approach was ok - pretty standard.</li> <li>Good management approach but did not say exactly meeting schedule</li> <li>Concise description of their construction management approach.</li> <li>Construction Management approach is very good.</li> <li>I like thier approach and Org chart.</li> </ul>
Experience and Qualifications of Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cannot tell which team members outside of Graham who have the required certifications.</li> <li>Lots of staff. Engineer not registered</li> <li>All major participants have extensive relevant experience.</li> <li>5 of the 9 inspector's experience is primarily with material testing, not water or wastewater work. None of the nine have any CIPP experience</li> <li>Submitted information indicates that they have the required experience and has assembled a successful team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full resumes provided. Overall staff was pretty weak.</li> <li>Lack of stating certifications</li> <li>Contract manager and two of four construction managers show no experience on any of the reference projects listed in the staff experience matrix.</li> <li>The proposed staff's experience in similar work performing CM and inspection is very weak.</li> <li>Didn't see MACP, PACP certifications for inspectors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The team is staffed with experienced leaders currently working with DeKalb DWM</li> <li>Good experience with technical staff</li> <li>Project manager - has 27 years experience. Oversees current DeKalb construction management</li> <li>The Sewer CM has no water or sewer experience showing; appears to be strictly DOT experience.</li> <li>Proposer has good experience and management plan. Inspectors have PACP and MACP certifications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction managers had little relevant experience. No water or sewer pipeline work (per the staff matrix).</li> <li>Good staff plenty of education</li> <li>Dorsey El Amin is construction manager and has DeKalb experience.</li> <li>Good to see focus on the change management plan.</li> <li>Over average proposal submitted.No mention of tans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good qualified inspectors and managers, but not much experience, not alot of higher education</li> <li>Project Manager Fran Limieux doesn't have watershed related experience</li> <li>PM has no water or ww experience</li> <li>No wastewater experience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The team has a extensive background in construction</li> <li>Resumes short but to the point, plent of experienced personnel</li> <li>No specific past projects listed for Lee Orr, program manager.</li> <li>CM (Steele) shows CM and inspection for Dekalb but doesnt show specific project types, footages, water sewer etc.</li> <li>Over all good team cover all of ther requirements in the solicitation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good qualified staff both at management level and field level</li> <li>Good chart showing certifications of key staff.</li> <li>Inspector resumes are strong in all aspects of water and ww inspection</li> <li>Expertise mostly in pump stations but no point repair work provided.</li> <li>Overall good team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good experience with DWM projects</li> <li>Many proposed staff with relevant experience.</li> <li>Construction Management approach is good.</li> <li>As a whole, the staff is not strong in water and ww construction inspection.</li> <li>Over proposals didn't seem to as experience in construction than they did in roads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good experienced staff not over educated</li> <li>Expertise mostly in pump stations but no point repair work provided.</li> <li>Project manager and most key staff have relevant DeKalb DWM.</li> <li>Staff experience is relatively strong. Construction managers are not strong.</li> <li>Although the proposal mentions that thier multiple certifications focused on NPDES, I only saw one inspector that had NASCO, PACP, MACP certifications.</li> </ul>
Financial Responsibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very strong balance sheets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very strong balance sheets.</li> <li>Did not submit cash flow statements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corporate Environmental Risk Mgmt., LLC; Gresham Smith &amp; Atkins North America submitted a proposal as a joint venture.</li> <li>Corporate Environmental, although "small", looks okay. Positive they were organized in 1995.</li> <li>Gresham's balance sheet looks okay. They did not submit income or cash flow statements.</li> <li>Atkins North America has strong financials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good set of financials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not submit Financials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financials are okay</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very Strong Financials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong financials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very strong financials</li> </ul>
DeKalb First Ordinance Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contractor had a mix of LSBE Points</li> <li>LSBE DeKalb</li> <li>LSBE MSA</li> <li>Total LSBE Points: 7.5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contractor had a mix of LSBE Points</li> <li>LSBE DeKalb</li> <li>LSBE MSA</li> <li>Total LSBE Points: 7.5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contractor had a mix of LSBE Points</li> <li>LSBE DeKalb</li> <li>LSBE MSA</li> <li>Total LSBE Points: 7.12</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contractor had a mix of LSBE Points</li> <li>LSBE DeKalb</li> <li>LSBE MSA</li> <li>Total LSBE Points: 7.13</li> </ul>