



Effingham County

Purchasing

Danielle Carver, Procurement & Capital Projects Manager

804 S Laurel Street, Springfield, GA 31329

EVALUATION TABULATION

CMAR RFP No. 25-CMAR RFP-109

Phase II - Effingham Regional Water Supply Facilities

RESPONSE DEADLINE: January 14, 2026 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Tuesday, February 24, 2026

PHASE 1

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
1. Firm Experience	Points Based	25 (25% of Total)

Description:

Relevant experience of the firm performing CMAR services as pertains to this scope.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
2. Personnel Experience	Points Based	20 (20% of Total)

Description:

Relevant experience of Key Personnel assigned to this project.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
3. Methodology	Points Based	15 (15% of Total)

Description:

Understanding of project delivery and proposed approach.

EVALUATION TABULATION
 CMAR RFP No. 25-CMAR RFP-109
 Phase II - Effingham Regional Water Supply Facilities

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
4. Programs and Processes	Points Based	10 (10% of Total)

Description:
 Quality control, safety, communication, and project management capabilities.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
1. Lump Sum Preconstruction Fee	Points Based	10 (10% of Total)

Description:
 Fixed fee for preconstruction and GMP development services.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
2. Construction Services Fee	Points Based	10 (10% of Total)

Description:
 Percentage fee for construction phase services, including overhead and profit.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
3. General Conditions	Points Based	10 (10% of Total)

Description:
 Evaluation of monthly general conditions estimate — clarity, completeness, and reasonableness.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Ruby-Collins, Inc.	94	95	95	89	97	94
Reeves Young, LLC	91	94	94	90	93.4	92.48
Harper General Contractors	83	87	88	83	83.3	84.86

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	1. Firm Experience Points Based 25 Points (25%)	2. Personnel Experience Points Based 20 Points (20%)	3. Methodology Points Based 15 Points (15%)	4. Programs and Processes Points Based 10 Points (10%)	1. Lump Sum Preconstruction Fee Points Based 10 Points (10%)	2. Construction Services Fee Points Based 10 Points (10%)	3. General Conditions Points Based 10 Points (10%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Ruby-Collins, Inc.	23.6	19	13	8.8	9.8	10	9.8	94
Reeves Young, LLC	24	19.6	14.4	9.8	5.8	10	8.8	92.48
Harper General Contractors	21.2	17.8	14	8.6	6.4	10	6.9	84.86

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Harper General Contractors	
1. Firm Experience Points Based 25 Points (25%)	
Evaluator 1: 21	

Evaluator 2: 21

Evaluator 3: 23

Evaluator 4: 21

Evaluator 5: 20

Very little work in SE Georgia

2. Personnel Experience | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: 18

Evaluator 2: 18

Evaluator 3: 18

Evaluator 4: 17

Evaluator 5: 18

Very little work in SE Georgia

3. Methodology | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)

Evaluator 1: 14

Evaluator 2: 14

Evaluator 3: 14

Evaluator 4: 13

Evaluator 5: 15

4. Programs and Processes | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: 8

Evaluator 2: 9

Evaluator 3: 9

Evaluator 4: 9

Evaluator 5: 8

1. Lump Sum Preconstruction Fee | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: 5

points allocated in proportion to the lowest bid

Evaluator 2: 8

Calculated differences and weighted on total cost of project (\$150,000,000).

Evaluator 3: 7

Total fee is \$250,000 (mid-range), but fee is heavily concentrated at the 90% milestone with \$0 at 30%, 60%, and 100%; proposer provided narrative explanation for this approach.

Evaluator 4: 7

Reeves Young carried two subconsultants in their preconstruction services; while the most expensive, this price provides a better value to the County; without these subs, Reeves Young's price would be closer to Harper and therefore, received the same score. Providing a lower price for preconstruction could indicate less value or less services and undesirable, i.e., you get what you pay for. The 150k to 200k range would have received 10 points.

Evaluator 5: 5

2. Construction Services Fee | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: 10

points allocated in proportion to the lowest bid

Evaluator 2: 10

Evaluator 3: 10

competitive and consistent with other proposers

Evaluator 4: 10

These are all the same score because all had the same percent fee

Evaluator 5: 10

3. General Conditions | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: 7

points allocated in proportion to the lowest bid, clarity/completeness is good

Evaluator 2: 7

Calculated differences and weighted on total cost of project (\$150,000,000).

Evaluator 3: 7

Monthly GC estimate is \$250,000 (highest of the three); submission includes summary GC table and labor/equipment rates page, but less detailed GC backup in the fee table itself compared with others.

Evaluator 4: 6

The delta between RC and RY is \$20k, and the delta between RY and H is \$50k and reflective of the points allotted

Evaluator 5: 7.3

Reeves Young, LLC

1. Firm Experience | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: 25

Evaluator 2: 24

Evaluator 3: 25

Evaluator 4: 21

Evaluator 5: 25

2. Personnel Experience | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: 20

Evaluator 2: 20

Evaluator 3: 19

Evaluator 4: 19

Evaluator 5: 20

3. Methodology | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)

Evaluator 1: 14

Evaluator 2: 14

Evaluator 3: 15

Evaluator 4: 14

Evaluator 5: 15

4. Programs and Processes | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: 9

Evaluator 2: 10

Evaluator 3: 10

Evaluator 4: 10

Evaluator 5: 10

1. Lump Sum Preconstruction Fee | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: 4

points allocated in proportion to the lowest bid

Evaluator 2: 7

Calculated differences and weighted on total cost of project (\$150,000,000).

Evaluator 3: 7

Reeves-Young submitted the highest preconstruction fee (\$300,000), but the fee is clearly distributed across all required milestones (30%, 60%, 90%, and 100%). A score of 7/10 reflects the phased fee structure while still recognizing lower price competitiveness.

Evaluator 4: 7

Reeves Young carried two subconsultants in their preconstruction services; while the most expensive, this price provides a better value to the County; without these subs, Reeves Young's price would be closer to Harper and therefore, received the same score. Providing a lower price for preconstruction could indicate less value or less services and undesirable, i.e., you get what you pay for. The 150k to 200k range would have received 10 points.

Evaluator 5: 4.2

2. Construction Services Fee | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: 10

points allocated in proportion to the lowest bid

Evaluator 2: 10

Evaluator 3: 10

Competitive and consistent with other proposers

Evaluator 4: 10

These are all the same score because all had the same percent fee

Evaluator 5: 10

3. General Conditions | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: 9 points allocated in proportion to the lowest bid, clarity/completeness is good
Evaluator 2: 9 Calculated differences and weighted on total cost of project (\$150,000,000).
Evaluator 3: 8 Submission includes substantial supporting labor/equipment documentation and notes, supporting clarity/completeness.
Evaluator 4: 9 The delta between RC and RY is \$20k, and the delta between RY and H is \$50k and reflective of the points allotted
Evaluator 5: 9.2

Ruby-Collins, Inc.

1. Firm Experience | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

Evaluator 1: 24
Evaluator 2: 24
Evaluator 3: 24
Evaluator 4: 21
Evaluator 5: 25

2. Personnel Experience | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

Evaluator 1: 19
Evaluator 2: 19
Evaluator 3: 19
Evaluator 4: 18

Evaluator 5: 20

3. Methodology | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)

Evaluator 1: 13

Evaluator 2: 13

Evaluator 3: 14

Evaluator 4: 12

Evaluator 5: 13

4. Programs and Processes | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: 8

Evaluator 2: 9

Evaluator 3: 9

Evaluator 4: 9

Evaluator 5: 9

1. Lump Sum Preconstruction Fee | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: 10

points allocated in proportion to the lowest bid

Evaluator 2: 10

Calculated differences and weighted on total cost of project (\$150,000,000).

Evaluator 3: 10

Total fee is \$125,000 (lowest of the three) and is distributed across all required milestones, supporting phased deliverables and reasonableness.

Evaluator 4: 9

Reeves Young carried two subconsultants in their preconstruction services; while the most expensive, this price provides a better value to the County; without these subs, Reeves Young's price would be closer to Harper and therefore, received the same score. Providing a lower price for preconstruction could indicate less value or less services and undesirable, i.e., you get what you pay for. The 150k to 200k range would have received 10 points.

Evaluator 5: 10

2. Construction Services Fee | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: 10

points allocated in proportion to the lowest bid

Evaluator 2: 10

Evaluator 3: 10

Competitive and consistent with other proposers.

Evaluator 4: 10

These are all the same score because all had the same percent fee

Evaluator 5: 10

3. General Conditions | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)

Evaluator 1: 10

points allocated in proportion to the lowest bid, clarity/completeness is good

Evaluator 2: 10

Calculated differences and weighted on total cost of project (\$150,000,000).

Evaluator 3: 9

Lowest of the three; proposer also submitted supporting labor/equipment rates and OPC form as part of the fee package.

Evaluator 4: 10

The delta between RC and RY is \$20k, and the delta between RY and H is \$50k and reflective of the points allotted

Evaluator 5: 10