PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

Date Submitted:	ed: 5-Jun-19						Proposed Contract Type							
Submitted by:	Terri Seay							X Standard Professional Services Agreement						
Contract Number	9-043						Standard C	onstruction S	Services Agre	ement				
Value of Contrac			5	9,763.00	Standard Construction Services Agreement									
	-	\$ One Yea	r fra NIT	.D		3,703.00		PSA with Exceptions Approved by Counsel Supplier Agreement Approved by Counsel						
Period of Perform	nance:								1 ''		-	unsei		
Supplier Name:		Freese & N	Nichols, In	C.					Standard P	urchase Ord	er			
General Descript	ion:	Union Hill R	d at Lower	Union Hill	Rd Improve	ments Design			Other - See	Below				
Source of Funds:		SPLOST												
Formal Advertised F	rocureme	nt:	Yes	No	N/A		Debarre	d/Suspen	ded (EPL):	Yes	No	N/A		
						_		Screen Pr	int in File:	Yes	No	N/A		
										•				
E-Verify Required/C	Obtained:		Yes	No	N/A			Eme	rgency Prod	curement:	Yes	No		
						_								
Number of Bidders	Contacted	/ Number	of Bids R	eceived:		59	12	_						
							•		Weight	Eva	aluation Crit	<u>eria</u>		
Supplier Selection B	ased on:			Only On	e Bidder				35%	Understand	ing, Schedule	e & SOW		
					ole Source				35%	· ·	& Staff Capa	bilities		
					Evaluated I		,		30%	Price				
			Х		Proposal S	coring	,		100%	Total				
				Other*										
Chanaliaa Carreti B	d D., . f	D	la		01 1	. 0	0	1						
Cherokee County Ba			its:	Х		e County Ver			anal nan raa	nonciuo or n	ot-responsible	o*		
(>\$25K, IFB Only, Re	er. Ordinance	2-3-3.01)				lor not within				ponsive or n	ot-responsible	5		
						lor Total Eva		•		deration)				
					_				•		struction (GA	Law)		
				* if CC bid/		non-responsive					,			
Summary of Analysi	is / Scoring	Į.					·	·						
Total Score	_	rice		В	idder		Bidder	's Place of	Business					
85.12	\$	59,736.00	Freese 8	k Nichols,	Inc.		Atlanta, G	Α						
77.58	\$	60,000.00	Vaughn	& Melton	Consulting	3	Knoxville, TN							
74.90	\$	64,000.00	EXP US S	Services, I	nc.		Atlanta, G	Α						
83.38	\$	73,500.00	Keck & \	Nood, Inc			Duluth, G							
71.07	\$	78,500.00	· · · · · ·		ring & Asso	ciates	Atlanta, G							
50.99	\$	85,000.00		gineering			Athens, G							
62.00	\$	92,000.00		_	itions, Inc.			Corners, C	iΑ					
78.80 73.39	\$	93,000.00			ineering, Ir		Marietta, (
70.09		118,000.00		ath & Lineback Engineers, Inc. preland Altobelli Associates, LLC			Duluth, G							
40.10				Engineering & Associates, Inc.			Kennesav							
66.27		156,500.00			, a / 1000010	100, 1110.	Atlanta, G							
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					, -							
Fair Price Determina	ation:	Method			Price A	nalysis Typ	<u>e</u>							
		X	Adequate	e Price Co	mpetition (Lowest Eval	uated Bidde	er)						
			Market A	nalysis or	Market Pri	icing								
			Cost Ana	ılysis										
	State Co	ntract Pric	cing											
			Other, se	e price ar	nalysis belo)W								
Price Evaluation:			proposed	the lowes	t price equ	aling \$ 35,36	34 less than	the averag	e price and	\$96,737 less	than the high	nest		
	proposed p	orice.												
Not Low Bid:														
(If Applicable)														
(
	-													
Other Notes:	An evaluat	ion committ	ee review	ad and so	ored each	oronosale ha	sed on the	criteria dofi	ned in the D	FD Freese 9	Nichole Inc	earned		
Other Notes:						•		criteria defi	ned in the R	FP. Freese 8	Nichols, Inc.	earned		
Other Notes:						proposals ba		criteria defi	ned in the R	FP. Freese 8	Nichols, Inc.	earned		
Other Notes:						•		criteria defi	ned in the RI	FP. Freese &	Nichols, Inc.	earned		
Other Notes:						•		criteria defi	ned in the R	FP. Freese 8	Nichols, Inc.	earned		

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.

Poi	ints Availat	ole	Fre	eese	Vaughn	EXP	Keck & Wood	Kennedy	W & A	Barge Design	Southeast	Heath	Moreland	Arete	Kimley
	30		\$	59,763	\$ 60,000	\$ 64,000	\$ 73,500	\$ 78,500	\$ 85,000	\$ 92,000	\$ 93,000	\$ 118,280	\$ 128,000	\$ 132,982	\$ 156,500
Low Bid:	\$	59,763	Under	Average	Under Average										
Percentage	e of Points	Earned		100%	100%	93%	81%	76%	70%	65%	64%	51%	47%	45%	38%
Number of	Points Ear	ned		30.0	29.9	28.0	24.4	22.8	21.1	19.5	19.3	15.2	14.0	13.5	11.5

Low Bid High Bid Average Range \$ 59,763 \$ 156,500 \$ 95,127 \$ 96,737

SCORING SUMMARY

	Project Understanding, Schedule & SOW	Experience & Staff Capabilities	Price	Total Score
Max Points	35.00	35.00	30.00	100.00
Freese & Nichols, Inc.	28.26	26.86	30.00	85.12
Vaughn & Melton Consulting	23.28	24.40	29.90	77.58
EXP US Services, Inc.	22.68	24.22	28.00	74.90
Keck & Wood, Inc.	27.65	31.33	24.40	83.38
Kennedy Engineering & Associates	24.15	24.12	22.80	71.07
W&A Engineering	11.27	18.62	21.10	50.99
Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	18.00	24.50	19.50	62.00
Southeastern Engineering, Inc.	29.75	29.75	19.30	78.80
Heath & Lineback Engineers, Inc.	28.44	29.75	15.20	73.39
Moreland Altobelli Associates, LLC	27.13	28.96	14.00	70.09
Arete Engineering & Associates, Inc.	17.15	9.45	13.50	40.10
Kimley - Horn	25.81	28.96	11.50	66.27