

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY - PHASE 2

Date Submitted:	February 26, 2024	Procurement Process:	Request for Qualifications - Phase 2															
Submitted by:	Brian Davis	Length of Advertising:	Per GA Code for Professional Srvs															
Supplier Name:	Pond and Company	Source Selection Method:	Highest Score															
Description:	Safety Action Plan (SS4A)	Fair Price Determination:	Cost Analysis															
Agreement Type:	PSA - Standard	Not Low Bid Award:	Negotiated Price															
Contract Number:	045-2023-00	County Business:	No County Businesses Responded															
Contract Category:	Planning Services	Submissions Received:	3	Vendors Contacted: 3														
Contract Term:	2 Years	<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>60%</td><td>Phase 1 - A.SIMILAR PROJECT EXPERIENCE AND KEY STAFF CAPABILITIES</td></tr><tr><td>40%</td><td>Phase 1 - B.PROJECT MANAGER, KEY STAFF AND FIRM'S WORKLOAD CAPACITY</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></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	60%	Phase 1 - A.SIMILAR PROJECT EXPERIENCE AND KEY STAFF CAPABILITIES	40%	Phase 1 - B.PROJECT MANAGER, KEY STAFF AND FIRM'S WORKLOAD CAPACITY						
RFP/RFQ Selection Criteria Used in Selection Process																		
Weight	Evaluation Criteria																	
60%	Phase 1 - A.SIMILAR PROJECT EXPERIENCE AND KEY STAFF CAPABILITIES																	
40%	Phase 1 - B.PROJECT MANAGER, KEY STAFF AND FIRM'S WORKLOAD CAPACITY																	
Contract Value:	\$ 562,180.18																	
Contract Options/Renewals:	None																	
Source of Funds:	Grant - Federal																	
Debarred/Suspended:	No (screen-print on file)																	
SAM Requirement:	Meets SAM Requirement																	
BOC Meeting Prepared for:	March 5, 2024																	

Bidder/Proposing Business	Place of Business	Scores
Pond and Company	Peachtree Corners, GA.	89.79
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	Atlanta, GA.	86.02
Keck & Wood, Inc.	Duluth, GA.	75.47

*Important Price Evaluation Notes
The Phase 1 evaluation scores for the eight engineering firms who submitted their SOQ's resulted in three finalists. Each of the finalists provided their technical proposals which were reviewed and scored by the evaluation team. The team consisted of reviewers from Cherokee County's Community Development Agency and the following city government partners; City of Woodstock, City of Holly Springs, City of Canton, and the City of Ball ground. The overall results are shown above. At the County's option, the evaluation team deemed it not necessary to conduct interviews. The highest scoring firm provided their cost proposal for review. Pricing was determined to be fair and reasonable when compared to the recent County Wide Trails Plan. Based on this, Pond and Company, the evaluated responsive highest scoring firm is recommended for award.
Other Important Considerations

Phase 2 Evaluation Summary

Percent of Category	Points	Area of Evaluation	Keck & Wood	Pond & Company	VHB
Possible Points:	80	TECHNICAL APPROACH, SCHEDULE AND SCOPE OF WORK			
100%	80.00		56.80	71.13	66.02
Possible Points:	20	PAST PERFORMANCE			
100%	20.00		18.67	18.67	20.00
Total			75.47	89.79	86.02
Ranking:			3	1	2
Company Name:			Keck & Wood	Pond & Company	VHB

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY - PHASE 1

Date Submitted:	November 21, 2023	Procurement Process:	Request for Qualifications (RFQ)															
Submitted by:	Brian Davis	Length of Advertising:	Per GA Code for Professional Srvs															
Supplier Name:	Top 3	Source Selection Method:	Other*															
Description:	Safety Action Plan (SS4A)	Fair Price Determination:																
Agreement Type:	PSA - Standard	Not Low Bid Award:																
Contract Number:	045-2023-00	County Business:	No County Businesses Responded															
Contract Category:	Planning Services	Submissions Received:	8	Vendors Contacted: 91														
Contract Term:	2 Years	<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>60%</td><td>Phase 1 - A.SIMILAR PROJECT EXPERIENCE AND KEY STAFF CAPABILITIES</td></tr><tr><td>40%</td><td>Phase 1 - B.PROJECT MANAGER, KEY STAFF AND FIRM'S WORKLOAD CAPACITY</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></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	60%	Phase 1 - A.SIMILAR PROJECT EXPERIENCE AND KEY STAFF CAPABILITIES	40%	Phase 1 - B.PROJECT MANAGER, KEY STAFF AND FIRM'S WORKLOAD CAPACITY						
RFP/RFQ Selection Criteria Used in Selection Process																		
Weight	Evaluation Criteria																	
60%	Phase 1 - A.SIMILAR PROJECT EXPERIENCE AND KEY STAFF CAPABILITIES																	
40%	Phase 1 - B.PROJECT MANAGER, KEY STAFF AND FIRM'S WORKLOAD CAPACITY																	
Contract Value:	N/A																	
Contract Options/Renewals:	None																	
Source of Funds:	Grant - Federal																	
Debarred/Suspended:	No (screen-print on file)																	
SAM Requirement:																		
BOC Meeting Prepared for:																		

Bidder/Proposing Business	Place of Business	Phase 1
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	Atlanta, GA.	92.16
Keck & Wood, Inc.	Duluth, GA.	81.06
Pond and Company	Peachtree Corners, GA.	78.54
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP	Sandy Springs, GA.	76.20
BCC Engineering, LLC d/b/a Heath & Lineback	Marietta, GA.	76.16
Croy Engineering, LLC	Marietta, GA.	73.76
Atlas Technical Consultants LLC	Duluth, GA.	71.75
Cincar Consulting Group (C2G), LLC	Atlanta, GA.	59.66

*Important Price Evaluation Notes
The Procurement department issued RFQ/P 2023-045 on behalf of the Community Development Agency and the following city government partners; City of Woodstock, City of Holly Springs, City of Canton, and the City of Ball ground. This solicitation utilizes a two phased process. Phase 1 will evaluate the firms that submit their statement of qualifications with the goal of selecting a list of finalists to continue into the next phase. The finalist will then submit their technical proposals for further evaluation. Members of the evaluation team from each partner location scored each Phase 1 submittal. Eight submittals were received from engineering firms and the top three evaluated responsive firms (finalists) were VHB, Keck & Wood and Pond & Company are therefore recommended to proceed forward to Phase 2.
Other Important Considerations

Phase 1 Evaluation Summary

Percent of Category	Points	Area of Evaluation	Atlas Technical Consultants	Heath & Lineback	Cincar Consulting	Croy	Keck & Wood	Pond & Company	RK&K	VHB
Possible Points:	60	Similar Project Experience and Key Staff Capabilities								
100%	60.00		42.53	46.84	33.83	44.32	46.09	47.59	46.57	55.51
Possible Points:	40	Project Manager, Key Staff and Firm's Workload Capacity								
100%	40.00		29.22	29.32	25.83	29.44	34.96	30.94	29.62	36.65
100%	100.00	Total Technical - Phase I	71.75	76.16	59.66	73.76	81.06	78.54	76.20	92.16
Companies in order of scoring:			7	5	8	6	2	3	4	1
Company Name:			Atlas Technical Consultants	Heath & Lineback	Cincar Consulting	Croy	Keck & Wood	Pond & Company	RK&K	VHB