



DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING AND CONTRACTING

RFP Number: 20-500544
 RFP Name: On Call Engineering Services
 (Multiyear)

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Opening: 9.25.20 @ 3:00 PM
 Agent Name: Michelle Butler

Vendors	Criteria		
	Firm Experience and Qualifications	Project Organization, Personnel, and Staffing	Project Management
Freese and Nichols - Graham Joint Venture	<p>This proposal presents a nice array of projects covering typical projects we have ongoing at DWM.</p> <p>Seemed to understand our Consent Decree position. Good list of professional capabilities. Good mix of on call or task order projects.</p> <p>Nice proposal</p>	<p>The org chart shows a nice break down of the topic along with the lead, QA/QC advisor, and then the technical support.</p> <p>Solid org chart. Good coverage. Good Consent Decree Coverage.</p> <p>Strong project organization.</p>	<p>Approach addressed everything</p> <p>Good PM Approach. Liked that discussion about alternative project delivery.</p> <p>Very good</p>
WSP USA, Inc.	<p>Shows a well rounded matrix of projects and qualifications.</p> <p>Highly ranked in design, water supply and transmission. Lots of good experience with multi-term on-calls for other jurisdictions, but did not list a lot of local ones. Makes me wonder if this is experience of the company or of the people who will work on the project?</p> <p>Showing very good past experience.</p>	<p>Very strong staff with SMEs in each area and available locally.</p> <p>Good Staff coverage. Good org chart. Not a lot of the proposed team on the org chart has worked on referenced projects. Lots of Subject matter experts.</p> <p>Good qualify staff. Good project mix.</p>	<p>Fair approach to project management. A good project management system would have this readily available.</p> <p>Strong PM Approach</p> <p>Very good</p>
Tetra Tech	<p>ENR ranks impressive over multiple areas. Consent Decree Experience with DeKalb.</p> <p>Well rounded matrix of recently completed projects. Provided CM services for DeKalb County consent decree package 1 and they paid particular attention to detail. They have a very nice portfolio of CD projects they have worked on.</p>	<p>Org chart looks deep for all areas. Good area coverage. Would have liked to have more details on the project manager's experience.</p> <p>Good project organisation</p> <p>They have a lot of LSBEs on their just to get the 10 points for LSBE participation. For most of these LSBEs there is not value added to the team (rather weak selection of LSBE with the exception of a few). A lot of their staff has been around to work on referenced projects.</p>	<p>Good, but generic.</p> <p>Good project management</p> <p>Very sound project management approach. QA/QC is a very good process, which was evident on projects they have worked on for the County.</p>

Vendors	Criteria		
	Firm Experience and Qualifications	Project Organization, Personnel, and Staffing	Project Management
Brown and Caldwell	<p>heir transmittal references a project which they did for DWM and as we access and use the data, the data is very errant and has to be re-verified for accuracy. Not a good decision to reference this project.</p> <p>Specialized experience- this is all they do. Consent Decree Experience. Seemed to understand our needs and had relevant oncall experience. Liked that they had local, regional and national experience to apply to our projects.</p> <p>Good in general</p>	<p>PM is listed as a VP and charges rates as a PIC which leads to high prices on tasks. Team has an array of professionals and speciality services.</p> <p>DeKalb and Dekalb- quality control, choose one. Liked the Experience Matrix- lots of coverage. Seemed to have all the areas covered. Liked that they had had lots of local experience, but also could call in others, as needed.</p> <p>Principal part of the team</p>	<p>Good project management plan based on experience working on prior projects with the County.</p> <p>Good PM Approach.</p> <p>Everything based on one person - principal</p>
CDM Smith, Inc.	<p>Impressive array of projects.</p> <p>Good project and staffing</p> <p>Lots of relevant, good design experience. Experience with similar projects, jurisdictions and consent degrees. Proposal very easy to read, concise. Relevant on-call project examples.</p> <p>Projs listed didn't discuss all the things we requested to demonstrate a well rounded firm. Good transmittal letter.</p>	<p>The PM has 18 years experience. The team has a diverse mix of SMEs.</p> <p>Strong design experience</p> <p>Good area coverage. Good org chart. Consent decree experience. Strong staff experience. Have no doubt that the staff and firm can do the work.</p> <p>Didn't see breakdown of staff roles/team as requested by RFP.</p>	<p>Very entailed PM plan. However, they never mention the development of a PMP in their approach on task orders.</p> <p>Good PM approach</p> <p>Generic explanation given, though it did say they'd work with us.</p>
Arcadis US, Inc.	<p>Good project list.</p> <p>Mentioned that they had a mix of clientele and projs and gave a matrix to go with that statement.</p> <p>Really liked how they went into detail about each area of design/inspection/CIP/Consent. Lots of staff, lots of resources. Like how they presented their references. Lots of relevant, good design experience. Experience with similar projects, jurisdictions and consent degrees. Proposal very easy to read.</p>	<p>Good staff experience in CD and CIP</p> <p>Gave org chart and resumes with personnel exp and their representative projs. Gave no human resource avail info. Provided projs and the various team members under that proj.</p> <p>Good staff coverage. Org chart strong. Similar experience. PM only 30% available? Consent decree experience. DeKalb experience. Lots of additional staff, if needed.</p>	<p>PMP good</p> <p>Gave explanation of how they intend to manage the proj but also read like a generic statement of proj mngt.</p> <p>Good PM Approach</p>

Vendors	Criteria		
	Firm Experience and Qualifications	Project Organization, Personnel, and Staffing	Project Management
HDR Engineering, Inc.	<p>Did not show ww experience and other disciplines outlined in RFP</p> <p>Very Strong national ratings top 5 in water, water supply, wastewater treatment plants, transmission & Distribution, #7 in water treatment plants. Understood the county's needs. Lots of staff available (local). Avoided litigation question. Very good example references. Lots of great experience over all areas. Easy to read.</p> <p>Shows some experience with wastewater but not sure how versed they are in wastewater. Doesn't truly stand out in this proposal.</p>	<p>No schedules or milestones for the projects</p> <p>Good staff coverage. Strong org chart. Lots of good experience from team leaders over a broad variety of areas. Very good coverage and experience with on-call contracts.</p> <p>Staff is okay.</p>	<p>Gave detailed explanation of how they intend to manage the project and who would do what.</p> <p>Good PM approach</p> <p>Project management is okay and is within industry standards. Nothing that truly stands out.</p>
EDT-Wade Trim Joint Venture	<p>This JV between EDT and Wade Trim is being led by EDT. EDT shows no experience leading a CD program. They have done some projects but this would lay heavily on Wade Trim.</p> <p>Somewhat generic- hard to read, felt like I was reading the same thing over and over. Good coverage in scope areas with good project experience.</p>	<p>Although the proposal states the JV team will be led by EDT, the team is made predominantly from staff of Wade Trim along with most SMEs.</p> <p>Detailed org chart. Concerned that the Principal in Charge is going to be a technical lead.</p>	<p>Fairly good approach to project management.</p>
DeKalb Infrastructure Group, A Joint Venture (Khafra Engineering Consultants, Inc./MiJoy Industrial Services)	<p>They don't appear to have much experience in water/wastewater.</p> <p>Consent decree experience. Lots of experience, not sure all that was present was relevant to this proposal.</p> <p>Do not have design experience pertaining to the RFP</p> <p>Gave a quick summary of various water related projects that range from engineering, inspections, rehab work, and study work. Gave more projects that focused on non-engineering work.</p>	<p>They have the staff to handle portions of task orders that are assigned under this contract. They would fit in as a smaller firm to do smaller less specialized projects under this contract.</p> <p>Liked that the team has worked together on other projects. Good experience in all areas. Good staff coverage</p> <p>Good chart</p> <p>Gave project summaries to demonstrate abilities but projects didn't include planned schedule vs completion date or the planned costs vs actual costs. Projects were also more non-engineering based considering the RFP scope and the various staff they've indicated would be available for all types of engineering services.</p>	<p>Project management approach is very much in line with how task orders are handled currently. Good approach to project management.</p> <p>Good PM approach</p> <p>Gave explanation of how they intend to manage the project. At times also explained which staff member would handle a particular portion of the project management approach.</p>

Vendors	Criteria		
	Firm Experience and Qualifications	Project Organization, Personnel, and Staffing	Project Management
Volkert, Inc.	<p>Although Volkert is deemed the Prime, the projects in this proposal are mostly work that has been done by Constantine. This team has 13 subs as well which will make it a very difficult team to manage and some services being provided are questionable.</p> <p>Weird that the Program Manager nor Project Manager was not listed for contact. Liked that they mentioned PDP should any projects need coordination. Looks like good experience in scope areas. Lot of subs.</p> <p>Does not look like a prime</p>	<p>Most of the staffing is done through subs. Don't really see where Volkert is highly engaged.</p> <p>Detailed org chart with lots of backups. Good coverage of scope items in staff experience/skills matrix. Not much mention on experience with Consent Decree Programs.</p> <p>Most staffing is subs</p>	<p>Best part of this proposal.</p> <p>Good PM Approach</p>
Black & Veatch	<p>B&V has a wide array of water/wastewater experience as shown in this section.</p> <p>Three decades of consent decree experience. References are long term- reselected. Lots of experience, DeKalb Experience. Lots of relevant, good design experience. Experience with similar projects, jurisdictions and consent degrees. Proposal very easy to read.</p> <p>Good project list</p>	<p>The PM currently used is based in Canada and is listed in this RFP as a project manager.</p> <p>Strong org chart. Consent decree experience. DeKalb experience. Liked their statements on costs and schedules. PM is in Canada.</p> <p>Gave org chart and resumes with personnel exp and their representative projs. Gave human resource avail info. Provided projs and what the various team member roles were under that proj. Included milestones and planned schdl vs completion dates and planned costs vs actual costs.</p>	<p>Being a current on-call, they should describe how they have been managing projects on their current contract. The fail to do that in this proposal.</p> <p>Good PM approach- little generic</p>
Atkins-CERM Joint Venture	<p>Relevant information that was asked has been provided. This proposal shows the basic tasks to be done under this contract but fails to address additional specialty services in the water/wastewater area.</p> <p>Liked that the team has worked together on other projects. Lots of experience. Lots of relevant, good design experience. Experience with similar projects, jurisdictions and consent degrees. Proposal very easy to read, concise. Liked the graphics. Lack of example of waste water experience. Proposal had more water experience listed.</p> <p>Gave a good mix of clients and projects. Didn't give an explanation of the various types of engineering services that can be provided. Provided table with a mix of projects and what they did on those projects as it relates to the sow tasks listed in RFP.</p>	<p>As a JV with CERM, all water/wastewater services would be done under Atkins as CERM does not show a capability to do design in wastewater/water in this proposal. However, the QA/QC will be led by CERM (Rhodney Givens) who has no background in water/wastewater (so how do you QA/QC) water/wastewater plans?</p> <p>Good staff coverage. Some concern about availability of staff based on text (not chart on pg 22), Strong org chart. Consent decree experience. DeKalb experience. Concerned that CERM is doing QAQC for design.</p> <p>Gave org chart and resumes with personnel exp and their representative projs. Gave human resource avail info. Gave proj summaries to demonstrate abilities but not all projs included planned schdl vs completion date or the planned costs vs actual costs.</p>	<p>Atkins is currently an on-call engineering firm so they have a working knowledge of how task orders are managed.</p> <p>Good PM Approach</p>

Vendors	Criteria		
	Firm Experience and Qualifications	Project Organization, Personnel, and Staffing	Project Management
Prime Engineering, Inc.	<p>No terms of contract and no descriptions of the projects done under these contracts. Very basic descriptions provided. Doesn't provide enough information to detail the level of expertise Prime has in the water/wastewater sector.</p> <p>I liked how they got to the point without fluff. Easy to read. Has appropriate experience with Consent decree also.</p> <p>Generic proposal</p>	<p>With 64 total staff, it may be difficult to handle some of the projects assigned under this task order. I don't see how they will have the checks and balances (QA/QC) work without enough SME. Team features a lot of subs but most don't bring the added value to handle projects under this contract.</p> <p>Org chart must only show team leaders- looks slim in staffing. Light on recent pump station design experience (based on chart).</p>	<p>Liked the management philosophy statement. Nice touch. Strong PM approach in total.</p> <p>Not much about scheduling</p>
Gresham Smith	<p>Proposal provided relevant information that was requested in the RFP but nothing that truly stands out above average.</p> <p>Liked that they outlined the various design services provided in detail. Really like how they showed their experience on page 4 with CIP and Consent Decree work with specific names/roles. Lots of relevant, good design experience. Experience with similar projects, jurisdictions and consent decrees.</p> <p>Gave a brief stmt of how they are very aware of County needs; provided a chart with all the engineering svcs they have provided for DeKalb as well as other municipalities; provided reference info and a brief proj explanation of 3 projs.</p>	<p>Some proposed staff are currently in use on Gresham's current contract and their performance has not been par.</p> <p>Good experience. Solid org chart- liked how they detailed the design disciplines with staff. Good coverage.</p> <p>Provided resumes, Org Chart with roles, and summary of services to be provided by key personnel. Provided total relevant human resource availability throughout agmt term and staff can work onsite. Provided on call projs and what the various team member roles were under that proj.</p> <p>Included milestones and planned schdl vs completion dates and planned costs vs actual costs.</p>	<p>Fairly detailed explanation of how projects will be managed and they are familiar with DWM's PMIS system, SharePoint, since they are currently doing CM services.</p> <p>Solid, detailed</p> <p>Gave explanation of the systems and processes they'd use to keep projs on track and what they currently use with their current DWM work.</p>
R2T, Inc.	<p>More about Hazen than R2T. R2T has a small staff and doesn't offer the flexibility to cover all topics covered under this task order. They would rely heavily on Hazen to handle tasks under this RFP.</p> <p>Found proposal very hard to read. Did not give dates on experience (how long ago were these contracts). Just seemed like something was missing, but I think they could do the work.</p> <p>Had problems with previous projects</p>	<p>Very small staff could handle smaller linear projects assigned under this RFP</p> <p>Did like the availability and location of staff. Org chart good. Like that they indicated who was Atlanta based. This is a strength that they emphasized throughout. Concerned about subject matter experts in all areas. Hazen emphasized, R2T.</p> <p>Did not show what actually R2T can do.</p>	<p>Fair approach to project management.</p> <p>OK PM approach.</p>

Vendors	Criteria		
	Firm Experience and Qualifications	Project Organization, Personnel, and Staffing	Project Management
WK Dickson & Co., Inc.	<p>Most of what was listed was for construction related work and not for design work.</p> <p>Did not show design capabilities.</p> <p>Easy to read proposal. Missing some scope areas.</p>	<p>Didn't see breakdown of staff roles/team as requested by RFP.</p> <p>More rehab work than design.</p> <p>Not showing design work, more const management, rehab work. Weird statement on org chart- happy to work with vendors that DWM recommends??? Some concern about location of staff in GA, but did give examples about response to other jurisdictions.</p> <p>This team still lacks in showing that they have done major designs and under this RFP we have small designs and major designs. This firm would be a fit for smaller projects assigned under this contract.</p>	<p>Generic explanation given, though it did say they'd work with us.</p> <p>Basic</p> <p>OK Project management approach- generic. Liked that they thought of other stakeholders other than Watershed.</p> <p>Basic approach to project management.</p>
Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions, Inc.	<p>Most of this proposal shows construction management services and not the design aspect we're looking for under this contract.</p> <p>Liked that they mentioned design and permitting- as well as geotech and testing. Lots of staff-would like to hear more about design services and specialty areas. Ok Proposal. Confident that they could provide the requested services, but not sure they presented this in the proposal. Mentioned consent degree.</p> <p>Not showing design capabilities.</p> <p>Gave generic stmt of svcs that can be provided but not support that they can actually provide these svcs. Gave transp projs rather than water projs and gave info that focused on what work their subs did rather than what the firm did. Gave mostly DeKalb projs to demonstrate their firm abilities (not much of a mix of clients).</p>	<p>Lots of staff, Familiar with the Consent decree, Familiar with annual contracts and DeKalb County. Most notable design services through the sub contractor, not the prime. Needed stronger expression of design experience. Recommend project examples from another jurisdictions. Missing dates. Lots of info on Construction Management, not design. Lots of general statements, no specifics. This section did not support the items in the intro letter.</p> <p>No schedules, milestones. Do not show strong design capabilities.</p> <p>Stated they were capable of working on multiple task orders simultaneously and to timely respond to all project needs that DWM may have (human capital avail) but doesn't really answer the question on percentage of staff that will be on K for the life of it. Didn't give planned vs acutal costs. Didn't give milestones reached for the projs provided. Mentions that they can provide the services needed but didn't really give a lot of info on how they will do that with their team members.</p>	<p>Fairly good PM process but based on CM and not engineering design</p> <p>Gave an explanation of how they intend to provide their various svcs. Gave general stmts that they would make work breakdown schedules and prepare schdls.</p>

Vendors	Criteria		
	Firm Experience and Qualifications	Project Organization, Personnel, and Staffing	Project Management
Alfred Benesch & Company	<p>Project submitted appear to be quite old. No modern day projects in water/sewer.</p> <p>19 employees in GA (2 offices Atl and Augusta). Several of their highlighted reference projects were over 10 years old. Lots of Michigan projects? Same Staff? Concerned about team- not much discussion of subs except resumes and org chart. In general- proposal not really tailored to DeKalb Issues.</p>	<p>Most staff listed are not in Georgia. Very small staff in Geogia that does water/wastewater. This appears to be a firm attempting to enter the water/wastewater industry.</p> <p>Good org chart. Liked Staffing level chart with availability, licensing, work on site status, etc. Looks like all 19 staff in GA are available to work on site? Resumes looked good, but not highlighted in proposal. Enough Staff for a project this size?</p> <p>Did not show wastewater, CIP or Consent Decree experience.</p>	<p>Very simple project management plan.</p> <p>Generic explanation given</p>
Nova Engineering and Environmental, LLC	<p>This proposal is geared toward specialty services, Material Testing.</p> <p>Lots of projects listed- not sure they were relevant design projects, Lots of Geotech testing, Need to QAQC Doc (pg 9 calls us the CoA and Dekalb), lots of both public and private clients- would like to see a year when the work was commissioned (older projects? or current?). They may be able to do the work, but did not present it well in the proposal. References provided were not design, but testing/field investigation/inspection. Did not address consent decree. No design services- would be a great subject matter expert sub contractor. In general- this proposal did not meet the technical requirements of the RFP.</p> <p>Do not have capabilities in design of water and wastewater projects.</p> <p>Gave general statement that they can provide a variety of engineering services but only gave info and projs related to geotech, environmental, and materials testing. Gave a summary of various GA projects and a table with a listing of what appears to be comparable water/wastewater projects and the types of svcs provided to those entities but they focused on geotech, environmental, and materials testing.</p>	<p>Org chart needed more detail.</p> <p>No staff with water and wastewater design experience. Have good surveying capabilities. Projects do not show schedule.</p> <p>Didn't provide total relevant human resource availability throughout agreement term (anticipated to be at least three years), particularly for the project manager and key personnel. Gave requested projects but didn't see the milestones. Gave date of services rather than the planned schdl vs completion dates. Cost of planned vs actual was the same amount. Is this supposed to mean that they were on target with costs?</p>	<p>Seemed average</p> <p>Not very clear explained project management</p> <p>Gave explanation on the systems they have but didn't really discuss how they'd actually proj mng this entire contract and all the svcs that are to be offered. Focuses only on the services they've mentioned most in their proposal.</p>

Vendors	Criteria		
	Firm Experience and Qualifications	Project Organization, Personnel, and Staffing	Project Management
Hughes-Ray Company, Inc.	<p>Propoal lacks separation of the different sections. Qualifications presented don't show a strong background in water/wastewater design. A few pump stations projects are shown but not clear as to what was HRC's role on these projects.</p> <p>Proposal very stock- not tailored to the project. Org chart weak, enough staff? No dates on reference works. Think they could do the work, but not presented well.</p> <p>Do not see experience in CIP, water, & wastewater projects related to consent decree. Has two sewer design. No water design.</p> <p>Listed that they are only civil engnrs, land surveyors, and landscape architects. Doesn't cover all the areas of engineering scope seeks. Did appear to provide projs demonstrating engineering abilities for water projs. Prime references were favorable but weren't focused exclusively on scopes that aligned with the RFP scope.</p>	<p>There personnel shows no SME in any areas for doing water/wastewater projects. The org chart is very simple with no breakdown of roles nor staff availability to work on this contract.</p> <p>Not showing relevant projects. Do not show major milestones and summery of schedule. Do not see actual cost vs actual costs.</p> <p>Gave org chart and resumes with personnel exp and their representative projs. Projs didn't incld planned schdl vs completion date or the planned costs vs actual costs.</p> <p>No milestones given or human resource availability for life of agmt.</p> <p>Appears to be a small team for all the anticipated work expected.</p>	<p>Very basic project management setup. No discussion of PMIS system used to track projects and share information.</p> <p>Average</p> <p>Gave generic explanation of how they intend to manage the proj.</p>
International Design Services, Inc. dba IDS Global	<p>Very little water/sewer experience. This firm does transportation as evidenced by their submittal.</p> <p>The technical parts of the transmittal letter talk about road design and items not specific to the watershed project- stock letter. I would have preferred to hear about how they were going to solve the issues related to the consent degree. Limited staffing. Most design projects listed for the Prime were prior to 2013- older. Newer projects are SUE. No mention of consent degree experience. Does not give any specifics on the services on the scope of services requested.</p> <p>Most experience is in road design. No water and wastewater experience.</p> <p>Had a mix of clients and projects. Gave a brief description of the services they can proviide but no projs provided to support these stmts.</p> <p>Provided some projs demonstrating abilities providing design svcs for bridge work and low dollar water main proj as well as doing utility locates but not projs that demonstrate their ability to cover all the sow requested.</p>	<p>Does not have the technical resources to provide the services needed for this proposal.</p> <p>No staff with water and wastewater design experience. Have good surveying capabilities. Projects do not show schedule.</p> <p>Provided key personnel experience, resumes, and Org Chart but nothing given to really explain what these people will do on this proj.</p> <p>No human resource avail info provided for life of K and the area</p> <p>Didn't give planned vs actual costs.</p> <p>Didn't give milestones reached for the projs provided.</p>	<p>Stock proposal text.</p> <p>Generic project management approach.</p> <p>Gave a long narrative per sow task on what they intend to do with the County under the K. Really reads like a regurgitation of the sow where the vendor is advising he'll comply. Doesn't really explain how they intend to manage the proj in order to meet the sow.</p> <p>Did give workflow charts of how they intended to move the project through various sow phases.</p>