

EVALUATION MEMORANDUM
Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposals #21-052
Construction Manager at Risk Services
For New City Public Safety Building

General

The City of Sandy Springs (“City”) conducted a two-step solicitation process to select a construction firm with the capacity and demonstrated experience to provide construction manager at risk services (“Services”) for a new public safety building at 620 Morgan Falls Road, Sandy Springs, Georgia 30328 (“Project”). The first step was a Request for Qualifications (“RFQC”) followed by a Request for Proposals (“RFP”). On April 7, 2021, the City issued the RFQC to seek Statements of Qualifications (“Responses”) from highly qualified and experienced firms to perform the Services described in the RFQC. Responses to the RFQC were due on May 5, 2020, no later than 2:00 PM E.S.T.

Responses Received

The City received Responses from the following twelve (12) firms (“Respondents”):

1. Ajax Building Company
2. Albion General Contractors
3. Carroll Daniel Construction
4. Choate Construction Company
5. Cooper & Company General Contractors, Inc.
6. Hogan Construction Group, LLC
7. McCarthy & Barnsley Joint Venture
8. New South Construction Company
9. Reeves Young
10. Structor Group
11. The Winter Construction Company
12. Turner Construction

The Responses were initially examined for administrative compliance with submittal instructions contained in the RFQC. No administrative compliance issues were noted.

Evaluation

The City formed a committee (“Evaluation Committee”) consisting of the following City personnel to evaluate Responses using the criteria set forth in the RFQC and to recommend a qualified firm to perform the Services:

1. Dave Wells, Deputy City Manager, City of Sandy Springs
2. Richard Collins, City Construction Manager, City of Sandy Springs
3. Keith Sanders, Fire Chief , City of Sandy Springs
4. Benjie Cain, Police Major, City of Sandy Springs
5. Cheston Roney, Court Administrator, City of Sandy Springs
6. Jim Fraker, Police Captain, City of Sandy Springs
7. Ron Durmire, Facilities Director, City of Sandy Springs
8. Craig Chandler, Deputy Police Chief, City of Sandy Springs

Evaluation Criteria

Section 4 of the RFQC identified the criteria on which the City would base evaluation of Responses. The Evaluation Committee used the following criteria to review Responses and to determine which Respondents would be invited for formal interviews and presentations.

1. Resources of the company
2. Relevant experience of the company
3. Statement of Suitability of the company for the Project

Utilizing all criteria stated, Responses were scored and ranked in accordance with the following:

CRITERIA	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION	SCORE
Description and Resources of Firm	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Company Overview <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Proposing company’s name and primary contact for the Response. b) Address of company’s headquarters and, if applicable, the address of the local branch. c) Office designated for the Project, and distance to the Project. d) Indicate number of years in business under the name stated above. Describe company ownership structure and provide a brief company history. e) Organizational chart of the company showing authority, structure, and depth of resources. f) List number of permanent employees. If a branch office will be utilized, further indicate the employee breakdown by professional discipline for that office and an organization chart for that office. g) Describe significant company changes that are anticipated to occur over the duration of the Project. h) Provide a list of current on-going projects (including preconstruction and construction). 2. Financial / Legal Information <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) List company’s total annual billings for the past five (5) years. b) Provide a copy of your company’s latest financial statement and the name/phone of company’s primary banker. c) Provide the name of company’s bonding company and name/phone of the local agent. d) Provide a letter from the surety indicating company’s current bonding capacity and the surety’s willingness to bond the work under consideration. Indicate the A.M. Best rating for company’s surety and its status to do business in Georgia. e) Has the company ever defaulted on a contract? If so, explain. f) Has the company been involved in litigation or arbitration with an owner in the last five (5) years? If so, describe each instance giving specific detail regarding the reasons for the claim and amount in dispute. Explain how the claim was resolved. 	Pass / Fail

Relevant Experience	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Distinguish the company by describing its local office's current, and relevant experience with project components described within this RFQC, similar renovation projects, police, courts, etc., and the year each project was completed. Identify each project as to whether it was constructed by this office or performed by other out-of-state offices. 2. Provide a description of the company's (local office's) five (5) most relevant projects currently underway or completed within the last five (5) years. Include name of project, location, construction value, schedule, completion date, owner (with name and current phone number of contact), architect (with name and phone number of contact), and the names of project team members involved. Identify each project as to whether it was constructed by this office or performed by other out-of-state offices. 3. Describe the company's approach to utilizing technology in construction and what technologies you intend to incorporate into the Project. 4. Describe the company's understanding of the open book contracting approach. 5. Provide resumes of your proposed main Project team members, including: proximity to the Project, similar project experience, years with the firm, years in this position, project references, projects constructed together. (Do not provide resumes of individuals that will not be involved day to day in the Project or those who will not be on-site). 	Pass / Fail
Statement of Suitability for Project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a statement or specific information that may serve to differentiate the firm from other firms in suitability for the Project. Suitability may include, but is not limited to, the firm's fit to the Project and/or needs of the City, any special or unique qualifications for the Project, current and projected workloads, the proximity of office to Project location, and any techniques or methodologies offered by the firm that may be particularly suitable for unique aspects of the Project. 	Pass / Fail

Evaluation

Following individual review and scoring, Evaluation Committee members met to discuss the Responses. The Evaluation Committee reached consensus and selected eight (8) qualified Respondents that passed all criteria and clearly demonstrated a superior understanding of the Project, with past experience very relevant to the Project. The following Respondents were invited to submit proposals in the second step in the solicitation process pursuant to the requirements of the RFP:

COMPANY	CONSENSUS SCORE
Ajax Building Company	Pass
Carroll Daniel Construction	Pass
Hogan Construction Group, LLC	Pass

McCarthy & Barnsley Joint Venture	Pass
New South Construction Company	Pass
Reeves Young	Pass
The Winter Construction company	Pass
Turner Construction	Pass

On June 10, 2021, the City issued the RFP to seek proposals (“Proposals”) from the eight (8) firms above to perform the Services described in the RFP. Proposals were due on July 20, 2021, no later than 2:00 PM E.S.T.

Proposals Received

The City received Proposals from the following seven (7) firms (“Offerors”):

1. Ajax Building company
2. Carroll Daniel Construction
3. Hogan Construction Group, LLC
4. McCarthy & Barnsley Joint Venture
5. New South Construction Company
6. Reeves Young
7. The Winter Construction Company

Turner Construction did not submit a Proposal.

Proposals were initially examined for administrative compliance with RFP submittal instructions. No administrative compliance issues were noted.

Evaluation Criteria

Section 4 of the RFP identified the criteria on which the City would base evaluation of Proposals. Proposals were divided into two (2) components: Technical Proposal and Fee/Cost Proposal. The Evaluation Committee used the following criteria to review Proposals and to determine which Offerors would be invited for formal interviews and presentations.

Technical Proposal criteria were as follows:

1. Project Understanding and Approach
2. Schedule / Statement of Work
3. Project manager and Project Team
4. Pre-Construction Services
5. Quality Assurance-Quality Control / Safety / Cost Control-Project Accounting

Fee/Cost Proposal criteria were as follows:

1. Lump sum pre-construction fee for the Project
2. Lump sum general conditions fee for the Project
3. Lumps sum bond fee for the Project
4. Project construction fee stated as a percentage of direct costs and general conditions costs

Utilizing all criteria stated, Proposals were scored and ranked in accordance with the following:

CRITERIA	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION	POINTS
Project Understanding/ Approach	Include a description of the Offeror’s understanding of the proposed Project as outlined in the RFP, the magnitude of the scope of services, and the desired outcomes for the Project. The overall approach should include any tools or methodologies that are needed to complete the proposed Project on time and within scope and budget	15% 15 points possible
Schedule/Statement of Services	Include a description of how the Offeror proposes to complete the Project, sufficiently detailed to highlight the effectiveness of the Proposal. It should spell out how this work can be performed in a cost-effective manner. Describe the Offeror’s approach to schedule adherence and the specific methods and techniques that are utilized. Address specifically the approaches used to bring the Project back on overall schedule should the short term schedule fall behind. Give specific examples and details where the team proposed for this Project has used these approaches successfully.	10% 10 points possible
Project Manager and Project Team	Submit the name of the proposed Project Manager and team members for this Project. Provide related individual experience and organizational chart	25% 25 points possible
Pre-Construction Services	Describe how the Offeror provides pre-construction services and who will be responsible for the day-to-day estimating effort. Provide a detailed description of the process that this individual will follow to develop a GMP while holding subcontractors accountable for a complete scope of services based upon incomplete documents. Explain how the Offeror will provide meaningful design, construction, cost, logistics, and value engineering input during pre-construction and the extent to which subcontractors will be utilized. Provide examples where the Offeror has identified value engineering ideas, what those ideas were, what the cost/schedule impact was, and the end result. For pricing purposes in this RFP, Offerors shall include a conceptual budget, schematic pricing, design development pricing and GMP proposals. An exercise to determine budgets for central chiller vs. standalone systems and various other cost implications to the project.	25% 25 points possible
Quality Assurance- Quality Control / Safety / Cost Control-Project Accounting	Describe the Offeror’s quality assurance and quality control program and indicate the parties responsible for quality assurance and quality control. Does the Offeror have a formal quality control program? How will the Offeror coordinate any special inspections as required by applicable code(s)?	10% 10 points possible

	Describe the Offeror’s safety program and indicate the parties responsible for safety. Provide the Offeror’s safety record and experience ratings for the past five (5) years. Indicate the proposed superintendents’ individual safety record for the past five (5) years. Indicate the Offeror’s policy on drugs, alcohol, and smoking for both employees and subcontractors working on the Project. Describe the company’s cost control methods and process in detail. Describe project accounting systems, as they would apply to this Project. Describe how you intend to work with The City on an open book policy.	
Fee/Cost Proposal	The Cost Proposal will be evaluated for technically qualified Offerors after Technical Proposals are evaluated. The cost criterion is rated by giving the Proposal with the lowest total cost the maximum number of cost points available (15 points).	15% 15 points possible
	TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE	100%

Formal Interviews and Presentations

After initial scoring of Proposals, the three (3) highest-ranking Offerors were invited to make presentations to the Evaluation Committee on August 17, 2021. The top-ranked Offerors were:

FIRM	TECHNICAL SCORE	COST SCORE	TOTAL SCORE	PRICE
Carroll Daniel	73.00	13.83	86.83	\$1,575,300.00
McCarthy & Barnsley Joint Venture	76.00	8.37	84.37	\$2,601,719.00
Reeves Young	76.87	15.00	91.87	\$1,453,026.00

NOTE: The Project construction fee was stated by Offerors as a percentage of the cost of work (estimated at \$18M for the purposes of scoring). The actual final fee will vary depending on the cost of work at the time the guaranteed maximum price is determined under the contract to be entered into between the City and the selected firm.

In the presentations, each Offeror provided a brief overview of the proposing firm and prior relevant experience examples. Each Offeror also responded to Evaluation Committee questions for clarification of aspects of its Proposal.

Results

Following presentations, the Evaluation Committee discussed each presenting Offeror to determine a final ranking. After taking into account information and clarification gained in the presentations, the Evaluation Committee determined that Reeves Young received the highest rankings. Several factors were important to the Evaluation Committee in making this selection, including the following:

- Reeves Young provided examples of projects (including public safety projects) of similar size and scope as the Project. This firm has completed:

- 20 public safety building projects in Georgia
- 250+ construction manager at risk projects
- 27+ renovation projects
- The proposed Project team is a seasoned and experienced team capable of building the Project
- Reeves Young's project superintendent has extensive experience and has just completed a public safety facility for the City of Chamblee
- References from past municipal projects in other jurisdictions provided positive reviews
- The proposed Project team is familiar with all specialty aspects of the Project
- A senior member of the firm will be on the Project team
- Reeves Young provided the lowest responsible Proposal on the Project
- Reeves Young is financially capable of building the Project and will provide payment and performance bonds

Recommendation

Based upon evaluation of Proposals in accordance with the criteria and process described herein, in the RFQC and in the RFP, the Evaluation Committee believes that the Proposal submitted by Reeves Young represents the best value for the City and therefore recommends it for contract award.

Name: Richard Collins, City Construction Manager
Title: Evaluation Committee Chair