

RFP Evaluation Summary for RFP 22-500612 Architectural & Engineering Services for the New Brookhaven Library (Five (5) Year Multiyear Contract)

PROPOSERS:	Cas Architecture, P.C.	Moody Nolan, Inc.	Houser Walker Architecture, LLC	Cooper Carry, Inc.	CPL Architects, Engineers, Landscape Architect and Surveyor, D.P.C (P.C.)	Syntony Design Collaborative, LLC	Studio SOGO, LLC
Criteria							
Technical Approach	Very detailed about services they will be provide. They presented a good understanding of the project, having designed similar libraries.	Adequate scope; clearly stated responsibilities. Outlined how they would work with the community and stakeholders. Focused on future of libraries and their needs.	Has had good experience with library design. Good and well-explained technical approach. Previously worked with DeKalb County Library.	Their Technical approach was decent. They have the experience. Committee members wished they provided more detail in this area.	Provided good details about what their approach will be toward the project.	Very detailed about services they will be provide. They presented a good understanding of the project, having designed similar libraries.	Provided little information on how they would approach the project that wasn't already in the scope of work in the RFP. Provided no schedule.
Project Management	Provided very detailed project management description. Uses various project management software to manage the process and reporting.	They provided good details in their proposal and it addresses what was requested in project management.	Provided direct and to the point project management approach as required in the RFP	Provided information as requested. Provided good details on software that will keep the project on track and work with the County.	Provided adequate information on timeline of completion, and gives details on diverse staff and working with partners.	Very detailed project management description.	Did not provide very detailed description of Project Management process. They did not outline a progress reporting procedure and did not identify how their sub-contractor would participate in the project.
Personnel	Displayed excellent staff and subs; many have worked with similar type of construction build for libraries.	Their team has a good experience for building libraries for other municipalities.	They displayed qualified staff that have experience library design.	Provided details of a good team that have experience with design of libraries and government school systems.	Qualified staff that has has experience working with DeKalb County Library.	Qualified staff that has has experience working with DeKalb County Library.	Management and staff didn't display on similar projects. Staff list showed little experience.
Oranizational Qualifications	Relevance of previous projects to Brookhaven. Provided good project examples. Designed 15 Libraries in the last 5 years (5 New & 10 Renovated)	Displayed extensie experience on relevant projects. Have a lot of experience with design of libraries.	Provided great experience working on similar projects. Team has won architecture awards for.	Provided good details of similar projects, working with various counties and municipalities, including the city of Decatur.	Provided good details of similar projects, working with DeKalb County Library in the past.	Provided good details of similar projects, working with DeKalb County Library in the past.	Did not display enough experience as a Prime on similar projects.
Financial Responsibility	According to the DeKalb County Finance Department, they are a small firm, but well established company with good financials.	Accorging to the DeKalb County Finance Department, they) have equity in excess of \$10 million dollars and have been in operation for a "long" time.	Firm did not provide financial statements. Evaluation Committee voted to give them a score of 5.	According to the DeKalb County Finance Department, they) have equity in excess of \$10 million dollars and have been in operation for a "long" time.	Firm did not provide financial statements. Evaluation Committee voted to give them a score of 5.	Firm did not provide enough financial statements. Evaluation Committee voted to give them a score of 5.	According to the DeKalb County Finance Department SOGO is the youngest company represented and, appear to have a very small equity, less than one million. Evaluation Committee voted to give them a score of 5.
References	Earned the maximum score of 5. References were favorable.	Earned the maximum score of 5. References were favorable.	Earned the maximum score of 5. References were favorable.	Earned the maximum score of 5. References were favorable.	Earned the maximum score of 5. References were favorable.	Earned the maximum score of 5. References were favorable.	Earned the maximum score of 5. References were favorable.
LOCAL SMALL BUSINESS/ GFE	Earned the score of 2. GFE approved due to they would have had LSBE participation if the County had timely reviewed LSBE sub application.	Earned the score of 2. Did not obtain LSBE Participation, but demonstrated GFE.	Earned the score of 5. Obtained LSBE MSA Participation.	Earned the score of 2. Did not obtain LSBE Participation, but demonstrated GFE.	Earned the score of 2. Did not obtain LSBE Participation, but demonstrated GFE.	Earned the score of 2. Did not obtain LSBE Participation, but demonstrated GFE.	Earned the score of 5. Obtained LSBE MSA Participation.