Procurement Summary

Date Submitted	17-Jul-1	8				Proposed Contract Type								
Submitted by:				anda Lam				Standard Professional Services Agreement						
Contract Numb	er:		A-2018-061					Standard Construction Services Agreement						
Value of Contra	30,000.00				Y	X PSA with Exceptions Approved by Counse								
Period of Perfor	ths from	NTP	30,000.0	<u> </u>		1	-	proved by Counsel						
Supplier Name: Planners &								• • • •		, and the second				
								1	urchase Orde	r				
			neering at I	New North	n Canton Station			Other - See	Below					
Source of Funds	S :	SPLOST												
Formal Advertised	d Procuren	ment:	Yes	No	N/A	-	/Suspende creen Prin	, ,	Yes Yes	No N/A No N/A				
E-Verify Required/Obtained:		d:	Yes	No	N/A		Emerg	ency Procu	curement: Yes No					
Number of Bidder	rs Contacto	ed / Numl	er of Bi	ds Recei	ved: 38	4	_							
			г	Τ .				Weight		luation Criteria				
Supplier Selection	n Based on	1:		Only One				50%	Price					
				Single/So				25%		anding & scope of work				
			•		valuated Bidder			25%		experience & qualifications				
			Х		Proposal Scoring			100%	Total					
				Other*										
Cherokee County I	Based Prefe	erence Res	sults:		Cherokee County Ve	endor Selecte	d							
(>\$25K, IFB Only, Re					,	articipation or bid/proposal non-responsive or not-responsible*								
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		,		Х			n 5% of Low Bid (for consideration) luated Score Inadequate (for consideration)							
					CC Vendor Total Ev	aluated Score								
					CC Vendor Not Low	Bid, or No P	id, or No Preference Per Grant or >\$100K Construction (GA Law)							
				* if CC bid/	proposal was non-responsi	ve or not respon	sible explanation	n provided in "C	Other Notes" belo	w.				
Summary of Anal	ysis / Scor	ing												
<u>Total Score</u>	· —	<u>ice</u>		<u>B</u>	<u>idder</u>	Bidder's Place of Business								
74.50	\$		Gaskins				Canton, Georgia							
75.78	\$	34,325.00		BM&K Construction & Engineering			Braselton, Georgia							
78.45 49.03	\$ 1			lanners & Engineers Collaborative IcFarland-Dyer Associates, Inc.			Peachtree Corners, Georgia							
49.03	ر ب	104,000.00	MCFallal	nu-Dyer A	Associates, Inc.	Suwanee,	Suwanee, Georgia							
			<u>I</u>											
Fair Price Determi	ination:	Method			Price Analysis T	<u>'vpe</u>		1						
		Х	Adequate	Price Con	npetition (Lowest Eva		er)	1						
			Market A	nalysis or	Market Pricing									
			Cost Ana	lysis										
				tract Pricii	0									
			Other, see	price ana	lysis below]						
Drice Explications	The a1	tion to	الا الا المسا		aal aaaaudi (- 0	mirania (d	find in the DT	D Tk - 1-1-1	ant name : C	uma susaa alaa H				
The evaluation: lowest priced for this part			m considered each proposal according to the criteria identified in the RFP. The highest scoring firm was also the											
			os over av	erage: \$20,206,25										
	Juvings Ove	111 <u>6</u> 11, ψ/ 1 ,	Joo, Javin	60 0 ver av	C1αβC. Ψ20,200.20									
Not Low Bid: (If Applicable)														
Od. N.														
Other Notes:	See attache	d evaluation	n summary	7.										

Scoring Evaluation Summary

Criteria Category - Project Understanding & Scope of Work	Possible Points		Gas	kins			BN	I&K			Plan	ners			McFa	rland	
Individual Criteria		Eval 1	Eval 2	Eval 3	Average	Eval 1	Eval 2	Eval 3	Average	Eval 1	Eval 2	Eval 3	Average	Eval 1	Eval 2	Eval 3	Average
Provided evidence as to the level of qualify of services with similar project																	
(scope and technical content).	5	0.80	2.00	1.25	1.35	1.80	4.00	2.81	2.87	2.45	5.00	2.81	3.42	3.20	5.00	4.05	4.08
Provided evidence as to the firm's experience and ability to manage the																	
established time requirements.	5	2.81	2.00	2.81	2.54	1.80	4.00	1.25	2.35	1.25	5.00	1.25	2.50	3.20	5.00	4.05	4.08
Provided evidence of understanding the size and scope of the project.	5	4.05	5.00	4.05	4.37	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1.25	5.00	1.25	2.50	1.25	5.00	1.25	2.50
Provided potential areas of concerns, alternative approaches and approach																	
to avoiding un-necessary change orders.	5	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1.25	5.00	1.25	2.50	0.00	5.00	0.00	1.67	3.20	5.00	4.05	4.08
Provided project schedule and extent to which schedule meets the needs of																	
the County.	5	3.20	5.00	4.05	4.08	1.25	5.00	0.31	2.19	0.00	5.00	0.31	1.77	0.00	5.00	0.00	1.67
Total	25	15.86	19.00	17.16	17.34	11.10	23.00	10.63	14.91	4.95	25.00	5.63	11.86	10.85	25.00	13.40	16.42
Criteria Category - Similar Project Experience	Possible																
Criteria Category - Similar Project Experience	Points																
Individual Criteria					•												•
Provided examples of previous experience developing/managing complete																	
site civil engendering and design for projects of similar size and nature.	6.25	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.33	1.56	5.00	1.56	2.71	6.25	5.00	5.06	5.44	6.25	6.25	5.06	5.85
Level of experience and qualifications of principal design professionals and																	
lead staff.	6.25	0.25	3.00	1.56	1.60	4.00	5.00	6.25	5.08	4.00	5.00	6.25	5.08	1.56	6.25	1.56	3.13
Provided information that served to differentiate the firm and highlighted																	
its suitability for this project.	6.25	4.00	5.00	5.06	4.69	4.00	5.00	5.06	4.69	1.56	5.00	1.56	2.71	1.56	6.25	3.52	3.78
Provided examples/information on firm's experience with civil engineering including bidding, award and construction administration and any other relevant functions as stated in the RFP.	6.25	4.00	2.00	4.00	3.33	4.00	5.00	5.06	4.69	3.52	5.00	1.56	3.36	5.06	6.25	5.06	5.46
Total	25	9.25	12.00	11.63	10.96	13.56	20.00	17.94	17.17	15.33	20.00	14.44	16.59	14.44	25.00	15.20	18.21
Total Technical Scoring	50				28.30				32.08				28.45				34.63
Pricing	50				46.2				43.7				50				14.4
Total	100				74.50				75.78				78.45				49.03

PRICING ANALYSIS AND SCORING

The highest three scores are in GREEN for easy identification.

PROPORTIONAL DIFFERENCE TO LOW BID

When purchasing solutions or services where there are a number of possible ways to create acceptable results, there is an expectation that there will be a wide variety of acceptable prices as well. In this situation price scoring still needs to provide proportional outputs but on a less aggressive scale. Here the appropriate method utilizes the lowest acceptable bid as the basis for each other price to be compared and then multiplied by the points available.

Points Available			Gaskins BM&K			BM&K	Pla	anners	McFarland		
	50		\$	32,500	\$	34,325	\$	30,000	\$	104,000	
Low Bid:	\$	30,000	Und	ler Average	Uno	der Average	Unde	er Average			
Percentage of	Points Ea	rned		92%		87%		100%		29%	
Number of Po	ints Earn	ed		46.2		43.7		50.0		14.4	

Low Bid	High Bid	Average	Range
\$ 30,000	\$ 104,000	\$ 50,206	\$ 74,000
# of Bids	# Under Average	Standard Dev.	Process Savings
4	3	\$ 35,906	\$ 20,206

CHEROKEE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Bid Opening Tab

RFB/RFP No.:

RFB/RFP NAME:

RFB/RFP NAME:

North Canton Station

BID DUE DATE/TIME:

July 9, 2018 at 10:00 AM

bib bot bare, i	July 9, 2010 at 10:00 F	****	_
roposals Received (no particular order)			
NAME	<u>CITY/STATE</u>	Required Forms*	<u>Cost</u>
Gaskins Surveying Co., Inc.	Canton, Georgia	Yes	\$ 32,500.00
BM&K Construction & Engineering	Braselton, Georgia	Yes	\$ 34,325.00
Planners & Engineers Collaborative	Peachtree Corners, Georgia	A	\$ 30,000.00
		Yes	
McFarland-Dyer & Associates, Inc.	Suwanee, Georgia	ies	\$ 104,000.00
quired Forms: X App A - Info/Add Form	X App F - Sus/Debar Form		
X App B - Non-Coll Affidavit	App G -Contractor License Cer	t.	
X App C - E-Verify Affidavit	App H - Bid Bond		
X App D - References	App I - Contractor's Qual. State	ement	
X App E - Contract Acceptance Form			
A. Noted exceptions to PSA			
vening/Reading Attendance			
COMPANY		NA	AME
Cherokee County Procurement		Amano	da Lam
	<u> </u>		
revised 050117			