

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

RFP# 2023-037

Date Submitted:	November 7, 2023	Procurement Process:	Request for Proposals (RFP)															
Submitted by:	Brian Davis	Length of Advertising:	Standard (15+) days															
Supplier Name:	Gresham Smith	Source Selection Method:	Highest Proposal Scoring															
Description:	Professional Planning Services	Fair Price Determination:	Adequate Price Competition															
Agreement Type:	PSA w/ Approved Exceptions	Not Low Bid Award:	See Proposal Scoring Totals															
Contract Number:	037-2023-00	County Business:	No County Businesses Responded															
Contract Category:	Architectural Services	Submissions Received:	3	Vendors Contacted: 72														
Contract Term:	1 Year from NTP	<table><tr><th colspan="2">RFP/RFQ Selection Criteria Used in Selection Process</th></tr><tr><th>Weight</th><th>Evaluation Criteria</th></tr><tr><td>50%</td><td>Previous County Wide Parks Experience including Overall Trails, Hard Surface Linear Trails Systems & Greenways</td></tr><tr><td>10%</td><td>Work Plan and Schedule</td></tr><tr><td>40%</td><td>Price</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td></tr></table>			RFP/RFQ Selection Criteria Used in Selection Process		Weight	Evaluation Criteria	50%	Previous County Wide Parks Experience including Overall Trails, Hard Surface Linear Trails Systems & Greenways	10%	Work Plan and Schedule	40%	Price				
RFP/RFQ Selection Criteria Used in Selection Process																		
Weight	Evaluation Criteria																	
50%	Previous County Wide Parks Experience including Overall Trails, Hard Surface Linear Trails Systems & Greenways																	
10%	Work Plan and Schedule																	
40%	Price																	
Contract Value:	\$ 148,302.00																	
Contract Options/Renewals:	None																	
Source of Funds:	General Funds																	
Debarred/Suspended:	No (screen-print on file)																	
SAM Requirement:	Self Certification via Appendix F																	
BOC Meeting Prepared for:	November 7, 2023																	

Bidder/Proposing Business	Place of Business	Evaluated Price	Score
Gresham Smith	Alpharetta, GA.	\$ 148,302.00	86.34
Toole Design Group	Silver Spring, MD.	\$ 225,000.00	72.68
Design Workshop	Raleigh, NC.	\$ 285,000.00	65.08

*Important Price Evaluation Notes
Cherokee County Procurement published RFP 2023-037 to 72 Firms of which 3 submissions were received. Each submittal was reviewed by evaluators from the Community Services and the Community Development Agencies. The two highest scoring Firms were invited to interview with the Evaluation Team. The number 1 & 2 Firm's interviews were excellent and yet did not provide any further differentiation between the two that would affect the scoring totals or rank. The County requested a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) from both Firms. In consideration of all the process steps mentioned above including the BAFO's received, It is the recommendation evaluation committee to award the project to Gresham Smith.

Other Important Considerations

Percent of Category	Points	Area of Evaluation	Combined Average Scores		
			Design Workshop	Gresham Smith	Toole Design Group

Possible Points:	50	Previous Countywide Parks Development project experience & knowledge, and overall trail experience in Hard Surface Linear Trails Systems and Greenways			
30%	15.00	Respondent provided five examples of related expansion projects of similar scope that include extensive experience in: - Hard Surface Linear Trail Systems and, - Greenways	12.56	9.00	14.06
5%	2.50	All five expansion project examples included customer contact names, titles, and contact information	1.88	2.09	2.09
5%	2.50	Each of the five project examples addressed safety features of the design(s) and, any unique features of the project(s) that are relevant to this project.	1.38	1.84	1.50
5%	2.50	Respondent provided the original budget and final cost as well as the original schedule and actual completion timing for each project example.	1.84	1.84	2.09
5%	2.50	Respondent described their experience facilitating workshops as defined in the statement of work, and included how the workshop information is validated and used to identify requirements.	1.75	2.22	1.72
10%	5.00	Respondent identified potential constraints and concerns which will need to be addressed in developing this type of master plan and how future needs will be considered to maximize potential.	3.00	4.19	3.94
15%	7.50	Respondent provided their business' background; years in business, type of business (incorporated, partnership, etc.), size of business (number of employees, locations, etc.), recent financial condition (gross sales, general profitability), listing of principles, design awards won for similar projects, provide CV's for key functional roles managed internally and describe firms unique value proposition as it relates to this project.	5.53	6.28	5.44
25%	12.50	Respondent provided the proposed project team with project roles, responsibilities, relevant experience, and professional references and contact information for the project lead and key principle responsible for the project. Also provided the percentage of time for each that will be dedicated to this project.	9.38	10.47	8.59
100%	50.00		37.31	37.94	39.44

Possible Points:	10	Work Plan and Schedule			
20%	2.00	Respondent provided a work-plan and schedule of events supporting the requirements defined in the work description.	1.88	1.80	1.80
20%	2.00	Each task in their workplan defined the objective, the input required and the output product.	1.63	1.60	1.30
20%	2.00	Each task in their workplan showed the assigned proposed responsibility for performing the work, who's input is necessary and who will approve the work.	1.08	1.60	1.10
20%	2.00	Each task in their workplan contains dates for the initiation of the tasks and their planned completion.	1.18	1.80	1.38
20%	2.00	The Respondent provided and identified the critical path and all assumptions were identified.	1.20	1.60	1.30
100%	10.00		6.95	8.40	6.88

60%	60.00	Total Technical	44.26	46.34	46.31
40%	40.00	Price Score	20.81	40.00	26.36
100%	100	Price + Technical	65.08	86.34	72.68

Companies in order of scoring:			3	1	2
Company Name:			Design Workshop	Gresham Smith	Toole Design Group

PRICING ANALYSIS AND SCORING

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	Design Workshop	Gresham Smith	Toole Design Group				
40	\$ 285,000.00	\$ 148,302.00	\$ 225,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Low Bid: \$ 148,302		Under Average					
Percentage of Points Earned	52%	100%	66%				
Number of Points Earned	21	40	26				

Low Bid	High Bid	Average	Range	# of Bids	# Under Average	Standand Dev.	Process Savings
\$ 148,302	\$ 285,000	\$ 219,434	\$ 136,698	3	1	94,473	\$ 71,132