

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

**DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING AND CONTRACTING  
EVALUATION SUMMARY**

<b>Criteria</b>				
<b>Proposers</b>	<b>Technical Approach</b>	<b>Personnel</b>	<b>Organizational Qualifications</b>	<b>DeKalb First Ordinance Participation</b>
Brown and Caldwell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>o BC's risk management plan associated with risk register and mitigation plan with some potential risks identified are clear and concise.</li> <li>o Key technical aspects, very clearly explained, alternatives shown, reference projects clearly illustrated</li> <li>o Nice project goals and objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Good mix of staff and personnel.</li> <li>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</li> <li>o Strong team, some out of state, PM and Engineer 70% and 60%, different team members for each phase.</li> <li>o Local staff. Meet qualifications</li> <li>o BC has worked with partners Accura, ACR, RK Reeve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o BC has shown on similar projects they have the knowledge and expertise to handle this type project.</li> <li>o BC has several past and on-going projects with DWM</li> <li>o Well presented</li> <li>o Good Mix of Experience.</li> </ul>	Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10
CDM Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o They talk about the different alternatives but never make a recommendation.</li> <li>o Technical approach focus on seamless project management and technical excellence</li> <li>o Comprehensive, VE, includes alternatives with pros and cons, addressed disruption.</li> <li>o Great Technical Approach</li> <li>o Standardization of materials can greatly reduce future maintenance burden</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o A large majority of the prime team is not local in the Atlanta area.</li> <li>o CDM Smith is partnering with Barge Design and Tetra Tech to bring local experience.</li> <li>o Strong personnel, public support person, good commitment of key personnel, 90/75/75 for engineers.</li> <li>o No local PM</li> <li>o Significant sewer design and rehab. experience throughout GA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The transmittal letter fails to provide a straightforward narrative of the consultants ability to satisfy the requirements of the RFP.</li> <li>o CDM Smith, Barge, Tetra tech has combined experienced in similar projects with Shoal creek to include trunk sewer relief</li> <li>o Good transmittal letter, relying on Barge Design Solutions and Tetra Tech for strength</li> <li>o Good Client Mix</li> </ul>	Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10
HDR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The proposal talks about different scenarios for each of the three sections but never comes forward and identifies a preferred alternative.</li> <li>o HDR provided generic project management approach for each phase.</li> <li>o Each section described, general character, easement concerns, road crossings.</li> <li>o I like their technical approach but would have liked to see more on the community engagement.</li> <li>o Parallel trench construction has a benefit of reducing dependance on bypass pumping during construction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o PM not licensed. This is not a strong staff for a project of this magnitude.</li> <li>o The team members seem to be competent but not as stand out.</li> <li>o Not very clearly addressed. A few key personnel out of state 6 /14, commitment in the appendix.</li> <li>o Staff out of town and no work composable</li> <li>o Contractor met the minimum qualification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Nor does this firm/agency section provide a precise statement describing the firm's experience on large gravity sewer design.</li> <li>o Overall company profile seem fine and meet requirement.</li> <li>o Good references</li> <li>o Has some concerns about staffs ability to do the job.</li> <li>o Transmittal letter I didn't see a clear and concise response to why the County should select this firm</li> </ul>	Identified 20% LSBE MSA earning the maximum MSA score of 5

**DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING AND CONTRACTING  
EVALUATION SUMMARY**

<b>Criteria</b>				
<b>Proposers</b>	<b>Technical Approach</b>	<b>Personnel</b>	<b>Organizational Qualifications</b>	<b>DeKalb First Ordinance Participation</b>
Wood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The project approach does not provide any of the requested information from the RFP.</li> <li>o Wood only provides generic project technical approach and did not mention they have walked the site</li> <li>o No alternatives, No schedules, no public outreach, several assumptions (cultural resources) Very poorly written.</li> <li>o Did not see detail approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o There is no detailed breakdown of the roles of the individuals that will be working on this project.</li> <li>o Wood provides competent team members.</li> <li>o No org charts, no phases, no percentage commitment, poor presentation.</li> <li>o Need more details</li> <li>o Contractor did not following instructions for RFP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The proposal talks more on the history of the company than about their capabilities.</li> <li>o Past project experience are fine but most of them are not directly similar to Shoal Creek so made it harder to reference.</li> <li>o Project experience seemed not deep.</li> <li>o There is not enough professional experience</li> <li>o Contractor provided the Minimum experience required for the solicitation</li> </ul>	Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10
Woolpert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Value engineering covered.</li> <li>o Woolpert has reviewed project site specific and identify each critical area.</li> <li>o No org charts, no phases, no percentage commitment, poor presentation.</li> <li>o I like their technical plan. I would like to see more discussions on their</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Large part of their key personnel are not in Georgia. QA/QC presents a question.</li> <li>o Key team members have competent background experience</li> <li>o Solid team with experience, good transmittal, addressed most points, good references</li> <li>o Met qualifications</li> <li>o Decent mix of experience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o No special strengths highlighted or detailed.</li> <li>o The past relevant experience provided is sufficient, though some are more on the construction management and sewer rehab rather than sewer design.</li> <li>o Met qualifications</li> <li>o Contractor have more construction experience than engineering experience.</li> </ul>	Identified 20% LSBE earning the maximum score of 10