



Effingham County

## Purchasing

Danielle Carver, Procurement & Capital Projects Manager

804 S Laurel Street, Springfield, GA 31329

### EVALUATION TABULATION

CMAR RFP No. 25-CMAR RFP-096

Clarence E. Morgan- Phase II

RESPONSE DEADLINE: January 27, 2026 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Monday, March 23, 2026

## PHASE 1

### EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
1. Pricing	Points Based	30 (30% of Total)

#### Description:

Includes all cost components provided in **Attachment C – CMAR Pricing Proposal Form**, such as:

- Preconstruction Services Fee
- Overhead & Profit percentage
- General Conditions / General Requirements
- Bonds, Insurance, and Contingency

#### Evaluation Factors:

- Completeness of pricing form
- Reasonableness of costs compared to industry standards and project requirements
- Consistency and accuracy of calculations

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
2. Schedule	Points Based	30 (30% of Total)

Description:

Evaluation of the proposed project schedule, including:

- Overall duration and milestones for preconstruction and construction phases
- Realism of timelines considering permitting, utility coordination, and phasing requirements
- Identification of critical path and sequencing strategies to minimize risk of delays

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
3. Construction Management Plan	Points Based	15 (15% of Total)

Description:

Assessment of the proposer’s approach to managing the project, including:

- Team organization and lines of communication
- Cost control, quality assurance, and safety measures
- Risk identification and mitigation strategies
- Coordination with County, design team, and stakeholders

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
4. Project Experience & Key Staff	Points Based	15 (15% of Total)

Description:

Evaluation of:

- CMAR experience on projects of similar size, complexity, and scope
- Qualifications, availability, and experience of key staff (Project Manager, Superintendent, Preconstruction Manager)
- Past performance with the County or other public entities

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Local Participation	Points Based	10 (10% of Total)

Description:

Evaluation of proposer’s demonstrated commitment to local participation, including:

- Utilization of local subcontractors, suppliers, and workforce
- Local business outreach and participation plan
- Reporting and tracking of local participation goals

**AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY**

Vendor	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Lavender & Associates, Inc.	89	89	88.5	94	90.13
Astra Group, LLC	87	80	85	90	85.5
C. Merrill Construction	82	79	84	89	83.5
Samet Corporation	84	75	78	84	80.25
Reeves Young, LLC	83	76	85	71	78.75
TQ Constructors, INC.	77	73	82	62	73.5

**VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Vendor	1. Pricing Points Based 30 Points (30%)	2. Schedule Points Based 30 Points (30%)	3. Construction Management Plan Points Based 15 Points (15%)	4. Project Experience & Key Staff Points Based 15 Points (15%)	Local Participation Points Based 10 Points (10%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Lavender & Associates, Inc.	26.9	26.8	13.5	14.3	8.8	<b>90.13</b>
Astra Group, LLC	24.3	28.5	12.3	12.3	8.3	<b>85.5</b>
C. Merrill Construction	19.8	27.3	13.8	13.8	9	<b>83.5</b>
Samet Corporation	22.8	26	11.8	12.5	7.3	<b>80.25</b>
Reeves Young, LLC	21.8	25	13	12.5	6.5	<b>78.75</b>
TQ Constructors, INC.	25.3	18.8	10.3	12	7.3	<b>73.5</b>

**INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES**

<b>Astra Group, LLC</b>	
<b>1. Pricing   Points Based   30 Points (30%)</b>	
Evaluator 1:	24
Evaluator 2:	23
Evaluator 3:	25
Very competitive pricing. Accurate calculations. They were not lowest so they were penalized for this.	
Evaluator 4:	25
<b>2. Schedule   Points Based   30 Points (30%)</b>	

Evaluator 1: 29

Evaluator 2: 27

Evaluator 3: 28

Complete. Showed understanding of project.

Evaluator 4: 30

### 3. Construction Management Plan | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)

Evaluator 1: 13

Evaluator 2: 11

Evaluator 3: 13

Approach was thorough. Showed they knew how to control project. However, not as solid of a plan as others.

Evaluator 4: 12

### 4. Project Experience & Key Staff | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)

Evaluator 1: 11

Evaluator 2: 12

Evaluator 3: 12

Relevant experience and team members. Not as much with large multifield park projects.

Evaluator 4: 14

### Local Participation | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: 10

Evaluator 2: 7

Evaluator 3: 7

General commitment to local subcontractors. Showed limited outreach strategy

Evaluator 4: 9

### C. Merrill Construction

#### 1. Pricing | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

Evaluator 1: 25

Evaluator 2: 15

Evaluator 3: 16

Form was compliant. Minor inconsistencies that were identified during review but were corrected. Overall prices were not very competitive with others.

Evaluator 4: 23

#### 2. Schedule | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

Evaluator 1: 25

Evaluator 2: 28

Evaluator 3: 29

In line with strong County experience. Permitting experience.

Evaluator 4: 27

#### 3. Construction Management Plan | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)

Evaluator 1: 11

Evaluator 2: 14

Evaluator 3: 15

Very strong delivery structure. Proven recent and current park performance with Effingham County.

Evaluator 4: 15

**4. Project Experience & Key Staff | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Evaluator 1: 12

Evaluator 2: 14

Evaluator 3: 15

Positive experience on past and current projects with entire team.

Evaluator 4: 14

**Local Participation | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)**

Evaluator 1: 9

Evaluator 2: 8

Evaluator 3: 9

Corporate offices in Statesboro allow for easy access and convenient project management.

Evaluator 4: 10

**Lavender & Associates, Inc.**

**1. Pricing | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)**

Evaluator 1: 29

Evaluator 2: 24

Evaluator 3: 24.5

Competitive but not the highest points.

Evaluator 4: 30

**2. Schedule | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)**

Evaluator 1: 23

Evaluator 2: 29

Evaluator 3: 28

Very realistic. Logical phasing.

Evaluator 4: 27

**3. Construction Management Plan | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Evaluator 1: 12

Evaluator 2: 14

Evaluator 3: 14

Cost control. Evidence of CMAR understanding. Very strong.

Evaluator 4: 14

**4. Project Experience & Key Staff | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Evaluator 1: 15

Evaluator 2: 14

Evaluator 3: 14

Very familiar with complex as they have worked on previous projects onsite.

Evaluator 4: 14

**Local Participation | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)**

	Evaluator 1: 10
	Evaluator 2: 8
	Evaluator 3: 8
Commitment to local subcontractor participation.	
	Evaluator 4: 9

Reeves Young, LLC	
1. Pricing   Points Based   30 Points (30%)	
	Evaluator 1: 26
	Evaluator 2: 20
	Evaluator 3: 21
Competitive but not lowest.	
	Evaluator 4: 20

2. Schedule   Points Based   30 Points (30%)	
	Evaluator 1: 24
	Evaluator 2: 23
	Evaluator 3: 28
Well-structured with major milestones identified. Accurate for size and complexity of the project.	
	Evaluator 4: 25

3. Construction Management Plan   Points Based   15 Points (15%)	
	Evaluator 1: 12

Evaluator 2: 14

Evaluator 3: 15

Well done. Very impressive.

Evaluator 4: 11

**4. Project Experience & Key Staff | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Evaluator 1: 13

Evaluator 2: 11

Evaluator 3: 13

Extensive experience. No direct experience with this type of work in Effingham.

Evaluator 4: 13

**Local Participation | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)**

Evaluator 1: 8

Evaluator 2: 8

Evaluator 3: 8

Regional presence a plus. Commitment to local and minority recruitment on other projects.

Evaluator 4: 2

**Samet Corporation**

**1. Pricing | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)**

Evaluator 1: 25

Evaluator 2: 19

Evaluator 3: 20

Evaluator 4: 27

**2. Schedule | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)**

Evaluator 1: 27

Evaluator 2: 24

Evaluator 3: 25

Evaluator 4: 28

**3. Construction Management Plan | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Evaluator 1: 11

Evaluator 2: 13

Evaluator 3: 13

Evaluator 4: 10

**4. Project Experience & Key Staff | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Evaluator 1: 13

Evaluator 2: 12

Evaluator 3: 13

Evaluator 4: 12

**Local Participation | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)**

Evaluator 1: 8

Evaluator 2: 7

Evaluator 3: 7

Evaluator 4: 7

**TQ Constructors, INC.**

**1. Pricing | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)**

Evaluator 1: 28

Evaluator 2: 24

Evaluator 3: 29

Evaluator 4: 20

**2. Schedule | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)**

Evaluator 1: 20

Evaluator 2: 19

Evaluator 3: 21

Evaluator 4: 15

**3. Construction Management Plan | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Evaluator 1: 8

Evaluator 2: 11

Evaluator 3: 12

Evaluator 4: 10

4. Project Experience & Key Staff   Points Based   15 Points (15%)	
Evaluator 1:	11
Evaluator 2:	12
Evaluator 3:	13
Evaluator 4:	12

  

Local Participation   Points Based   10 Points (10%)	
Evaluator 1:	10
Evaluator 2:	7
Evaluator 3:	7
Evaluator 4:	5