



CITY OF
FORESTPARK

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ricky L. Clark, Jr., City Manager
Executive Office

FROM: Talisa R. Adams, CPPO, Procurement Manager
Department of Finance – Procurement

CC: John Wiggins, Director of Finance
Committee Members: James Shelby, Pauline Warrior, Nigel Wattley,
Glenn Athearn, (Expert/Observer), and Yazmin Huerta (Note-taker)

SUBJECT: Committee Recommendation for RFP No. 8162024 –
CMAR Services for New City Center

DATE: October 31, 2024

Procurement would like to thank each committee member for serving on this committee. Your time, effort, analysis, and participation have led us to a logical recommendation. Again, thank you for your willingness to serve the City beyond your daily job duties, and help in our RFP process.

The Selection Committee has completed their work and is hereby recommending the highest scoring proposer that they believe is most qualified to be awarded the contract for the services advertised under this RFP. **That firm is Carroll Daniel Construction.** The committee received four (4) proposals. After scoring all four (4) proposals, one (1) firm was disqualified due to inaccuracies within their submitted cost proposal. The remaining three (3) responsive firms were invited to interviews/presentations and were interviewed by the committee on Friday, October 25, 2024. Afterwards, the committee added points for the interview/presentation section for each firm.

The final scores and cost proposals for each firm are displayed below and relevant attachments are enclosed with this correspondence. Should the department choose to move forward with this recommendation, it will need to appear in a near future Council agenda for contract award.



**CITY OF
FORESTPARK**

SCORES AND COST PROPOSALS OF RESPONSIVE FIRMS

INTERVIEWED FIRMS	AVERAGE SCORE BEFORE INTERVIEW / PRESENTATION	AVERAGE SCORE AFTER INTERVIEW / PRESENTATION	LSBE PARTICIPATION	SUBMITTED COST
1. Carroll Daniel Construction	96.3	110.3	Yes	\$25,000 – Preconstruction \$3,454,496 – General Conditions 1.9% Construction Fee
2. Hogan Construction	94.33	109.16	Yes	\$45,000 – Preconstruction \$3,708,400 – General Conditions 2.75% Construction Fee
3. Reeves Young	93.54	106.37	Yes	\$75,000 – Preconstruction \$3,536,816 – General Conditions 2.25% Construction Fee

Sincerely,

**Talisa R. Adams, CPPO
Procurement Manager/Chairperson**

Attachments:

Chairperson and OpenGov Score Sheets
Minutes from all Meetings

Chairperson Evaluation Criteria Score Sheet




Department of Finance Procurement Division		RFP No. 8162024 CMAR Services for New City Center				
Criteria	Description	Maximum Points	RESPONDERS			
			Carroll Daniel Construction	Hogan Construction Group LLC	McCarthy+Barnsley, A Joint Venture	Reeve Young
EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS	<p>a. Responders are required to provide cover letter of interest expressing the firm's interest in being considered for the project and summarizing the qualifications and experience relevant to the scope.</p> <p>b. Include statement regarding the consultant's in constructing similar facilities for public entities to include the availability to dedicate time, personnel, and resources to this effort. The letter of interest must include a commitment to the availability of all key staff, and any subconsultants to provide specified services.</p>	30	30	29	27.7	27.7
PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN	<p>a. Describe how the firm plans to perform tasks and execute the work.</p> <p>b. Designate person must be designated as the principal contact for the tasks associated with the scope. Provide information on the experience of the principal contact person on similar projects and at least three references with contact information.</p> <p>c. Submit an executive level plan describing the successful experience with the CMAR process and management process the proponent will implement to ensure all work and services performed are of the highest quality. The approach should include a description of the proponent's process as it pertains to equipment, methods, techniques, and procedures used to ensure accurate and comprehensive services.</p> <p>d. Describe its means and methods of reporting levels of service, etc. Describe the proponent's corrective action plan. Describe how the proponent's organizational structure supports this plan and clearly identify responsible and accountable parties. Describe what information you would expect the city to supply or be responsible for.</p>	15	13.3	14	14.3	14.3

Chairperson Evaluation Criteria Score Sheet

Criteria	Description	Maximum Points	Carroll Daniel Construction	Hogan Construction Group LLC	McCarthy+Barnsley, A Joint Venture	Reeve Young
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE / PROJECT TEAM	a. Provide an organizational chart that lists key team and their titles and describes the roles and qualifications of proposed project team.	25	23	22.7	23.7	24
	b. Describe its back-up personnel, identify the individual(s) and role(s) in the event there is a need to replace key team members during the term of any contract awarded					
	c. Provide detailed resumes not exceeding 2 pages of each team member and subcontractor who will be directly working on the project organized as follows: Name and title, Professional background, Current and past relevant employment, Education Certifications, Three (3) relevant projects, including client name, project description, project value, role of the individual, project completion date, reference contact name, phone number and e-mail address.					
REFERENCES	a. Describe Responder's experience, capabilities and other qualifications for this project. How many years has Responder operated under current company name?	10	Responsive: In business for 80 years with over 400 CMAR projects for other municipalities from county and city levels - Provided financial statements - References were favorable - all projects are still underway but each municipality stated that they were pleased with the progression thus far	Responsive: In business for 26 years with over 100 CMAR projects within the last 5 years for other municipalities from county and city levels - Provided financial statements - Requested 2 additional references that were not associated with the City of Forest Park - References were favorable - all indicated that they projects were ahead of schedule and under budget	Responsive: In business for 20 years with over 30 CMAR projects for other municipalities from county and city levels - Provided financial statements - References were favorable - all indicated that they projects were ahead of schedule and under budget. City of Brookhaven City Center is currently under construction	Responsive: In business for 72 years with the last 10 yrs under the current company name with over 350 CMAR projects with 150 for other municipalities from county and city levels - Provided financial statements - References were favorable - one reference stated subjective to some of the questions asked. The City of Conyers gave rave reviews for the new construction of their City Hall Complex.
	b. Has Responder ever been debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded by any Federal department or agency from doing business with the Federal Government?					
	c. Include a financial statement for the last three (3) years.					
	d. Identify projects which were delivered as CMAR to include at least one project which was contracted directly with a local government entity for three (3) references for projects similar in size and scope to the project specified herein using the Reference and Release Form attached hereto in the RFP.					
COST	Methodology: lowest cost/next cost X 20 points	20	20	18.63	Disqualified	19.54
Total Points Prior to Bonus Points		100	96.3	94.33		93.54
BONUS POINTS FOR: LOCAL SMALL BUSINESS DIVERSITY PARTICIPATION &	Utilizes a LSBID subcontractor (5 pts.)	5	5	5	5	5

Chairperson Evaluation Criteria Score Sheet

Criteria	Description	Maximum Points	Carroll Daniel Construction	Hogan Construction Group LLC	McCarthy+Barnsley, A Joint Venture	Reeve Young
INTERVIEWS						
	Interview (10 pts.), if needed	10	9	9.83		7.83
GRAND TOTAL POINTS		115	110.3	109.16		106.37
<p>COMMENTS/SCORING JUSTIFICATION: McCarthy + Barnsley, A Joint Venture was disqualified due to calculation inaccuracies in their submitted cost proposal. The remaining three (3) firms will be invited to interviews/presentations.</p> <p>Recommended highest scoring proposer Carroll Daniel Construction.</p>						
Approved:			Listed 10 Clayton County LSBDD vendors	Listed 5 Clayton County LSBDD vendors	Listed 18 Clayton County LSBDD vendors	Listed 6 Clayton County LSBDD vendors
 Chairperson: Talisa R. Adams, CPPO						
Procurement Manager						
Department of Finance - Procurement						

Cost Methodology Report
RFP 8162024 CMAR Services

Company	Price	Score
Carroll Daniel Construction	\$ 3,454,496.00	20
Hogan Construction Group	\$ 3,708,400.00	18.6306547
McCarthy + Barnsley, A Joint Venture		Disqualified Cost Proposal calculation inaccuracies
Reeves Young	\$ 3,536,816.00	19.5344966



City of Forest Park
Procurement

745 Forest Parkway, Forest Park, GA 30297

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 8162024

CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT-RISK (CMAR) SERVICES FOR THE CITY OF FOREST PARK CITY CENTER PROJECT

RESPONSE DEADLINE: September 23, 2024 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Tuesday, October 29, 2024

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

Question Title	Carroll Daniel Construction	Hogan Construction Group, LLC.	Reeves Young
Proposal Submittal Letter Form	Pass	Pass	Pass
Proponent's Technical Proposal	Pass	Pass	Pass
Cost Proposal			
Illegal Immigration Reform and Enforcement Act	Pass	Pass	Pass
Contractor's Statement of Legal Status and Financial Capability	Pass	Pass	Pass
Acknowledgement of Insurance and Bonding Requirements	Pass	Pass	Pass
List of Clients	Pass	Pass	Pass
Non-Collusion Affidavit	Pass	Pass	Pass
Certificate Regarding Debarment, Suspension and other Matters	Pass	Pass	Pass
Local, Small Business, Diversity Program (Forms 1-4)	Pass	Pass	Pass
Georgia General Contractor's License(s)	Pass	Pass	Pass

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. 8162024

CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT-RISK (CMAR) SERVICES FOR THE CITY OF FOREST PARK CITY CENTER PROJECT

Question Title	Carroll Daniel Construction	Hogan Construction Group, LLC.	Reeves Young
State of Georgia Certificate of Existence	Pass	Pass	Pass
W-9	Pass	Pass	Pass

PHASE 1

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Experience and Qualifications	Points Based	30 (26.1% of Total)

Description:
Successful experience in constructing similar facilities for public entities

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Management Plan	Points Based	15 (13% of Total)

Description:
Successful experience with the CMAR process

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Organizational Structure / Project Team	Points Based	25 (21.7% of Total)

Description:
Roles and qualifications of proposed project team

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. 8162024
CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT-RISK (CMAR) SERVICES FOR THE CITY OF FOREST PARK CITY CENTER PROJECT

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
References	Points Based	10 (8.7% of Total)

Description:
Identify projects which were delivered as CMAR to include at least one project which was contracted directly with a local government entity. References for each project must be included with confirmed contact person name, email address and phone number.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Cost Proposal	Points Based	20 (17.4% of Total)

Description:
DO NOT include any cost in the technical proposal. The cost proposal must be attached separately.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Local, Small Business, and Diversity Program (Outreach Plan) (5 bonus points)	Points Based	5 (4.3% of Total)

Description:
The City promotes and encourages Proponents to utilize local, veteran-owned, minority, women, and disadvantaged business enterprises whenever possible.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Interviews (Optional) (10 bonus points)	Points Based	10 (8.7% of Total)

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. 8162024
CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT-RISK (CMAR) SERVICES FOR THE CITY OF FOREST PARK CITY CENTER PROJECT

Description:
The City reserves the right to conduct interviews with all Responders or a short-listed group of Responders.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Total Score (Max Score 115)
Carroll Daniel Construction	114	106	111	110.33
Hogan Construction Group, LLC.	113.6	109.1	104.6	109.13
Reeves Young	107	110.5	101.5	106.37

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Experience and Qualifications Points Based 30 Points (26.1%)	Project Management Plan Points Based 15 Points (13%)	Organizational Structure / Project Team Points Based 25 Points (21.7%)	References Points Based 10 Points (8.7%)	Cost Proposal Points Based 20 Points (17.4%)	Local, Small Business, and Diversity Program (Outreach Plan) (5 bonus points) Points Based 5 Points (4.3%)	Interviews (Optional) (10 bonus points) Points Based 10 Points (8.7%)	Total Score (Max Score 115)
Carroll Daniel Construction	30	13.3	23	10	20	5	9	110.33
Hogan Construction Group, LLC.	29	14	22.7	10	18.6	5	9.8	109.13
Reeves Young	27.7	14.3	24	8	19.5	5	7.8	106.37

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Carroll Daniel Construction	
Experience and Qualifications Points Based 30 Points (26.1%)	
Evaluator 1: 30	
Evaluator 2: 30	
Evaluator 3: 30	
Project Management Plan Points Based 15 Points (13%)	
Evaluator 1: 15	
Evaluator 2: 10	
Corrective Action Plan? City responsibility?	
Evaluator 3: 15	
Organizational Structure / Project Team Points Based 25 Points (21.7%)	
Evaluator 1: 25	
Evaluator 2: 22	
Back up / risk mgmt plan?	
Evaluator 3: 22	
References Points Based 10 Points (8.7%)	
Evaluator 1: 10	
Evaluator 2: 10	
Evaluator 3: 10	

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. 8162024

CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT-RISK (CMAR) SERVICES FOR THE CITY OF FOREST PARK CITY CENTER PROJECT

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)

Evaluator 1: 20

Evaluator 2: 20

Evaluator 3: 20

Local, Small Business, and Diversity Program (Outreach Plan) (5 bonus points) | Points Based | 5 Points (4.3%)

Evaluator 1: 5

Evaluator 2: 5

Evaluator 3: 5

Interviews (Optional) (10 bonus points) | Points Based | 10 Points (8.7%)

Evaluator 1: 9

Evaluator 2: 9

Demonstration of high level of competence and potential for success; only slight reservations based on the CCPS (CMAR) project award that the project executive mentioned was cancelled.

Evaluator 3: 9

Hogan Construction Group, LLC.

Experience and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (26.1%)

Evaluator 1: 30

Evaluator 2: 30

Evaluator 3: 27

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request For Proposal - CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT-RISK (CMAR) SERVICES FOR THE CITY OF FOREST PARK CITY CENTER PROJECT

EVALUATION TABULATION
 RFP No. 8162024
 CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT-RISK (CMAR) SERVICES FOR THE CITY OF FOREST PARK CITY CENTER PROJECT

Project Management Plan Points Based 15 Points (13%)	
Evaluator 1:	15
Evaluator 2:	13
Corrective action plan?	
Evaluator 3:	14
Organizational Structure / Project Team Points Based 25 Points (21.7%)	
Evaluator 1:	25
Evaluator 2:	23
Only 1 bio listed references (Hightower)	
Evaluator 3:	20
References Points Based 10 Points (8.7%)	
Evaluator 1:	10
Evaluator 2:	10
Evaluator 3:	10
Cost Proposal Points Based 20 Points (17.4%)	
Evaluator 1:	18.6
Evaluator 2:	18.6
Evaluator 3:	18.6
Local, Small Business, and Diversity Program (Outreach Plan) (5 bonus points) Points Based 5 Points (4.3%)	

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. 8162024
CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT-RISK (CMAR) SERVICES FOR THE CITY OF FOREST PARK CITY CENTER PROJECT

Evaluator 1: 5
Evaluator 2: 5
Evaluator 3: 5

Interviews (Optional) (10 bonus points) | Points Based | 10 Points (8.7%)

Evaluator 1: 10
Evaluator 2: 9.5

High level of competence based on myriad projects already performed of similar type. Could refine presentation approach.

Evaluator 3: 10

Reeves Young

Experience and Qualifications | Points Based | 30 Points (26.1%)

Evaluator 1: 26
Evaluator 2: 30
Evaluator 3: 27

Project Management Plan | Points Based | 15 Points (13%)

Evaluator 1: 15
Evaluator 2: 15
Evaluator 3: 13

Organizational Structure / Project Team | Points Based | 25 Points (21.7%)

Evaluator 1: 25

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. 8162024
CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT-RISK (CMAR) SERVICES FOR THE CITY OF FOREST PARK CITY CENTER PROJECT

Love the structure!
Evaluator 2: 25
Evaluator 3: 22

References | Points Based | 10 Points (8.7%)
Evaluator 1: 8
Evaluator 2: 8
Evaluator 3: 8

Cost Proposal | Points Based | 20 Points (17.4%)
Evaluator 1: 19.5
Evaluator 2: 19.5
Evaluator 3: 19.5

Local, Small Business, and Diversity Program (Outreach Plan) (5 bonus points) | Points Based | 5 Points (4.3%)
Evaluator 1: 5
Evaluator 2: 5
Evaluator 3: 5

Interviews (Optional) (10 bonus points) | Points Based | 10 Points (8.7%)
Evaluator 1: 8.5
Evaluator 2: 8

References not clear with interview response.

Good presentation; response provided regarding inclusion of LSBDD utilization lacked substance.

EVALUATION TABULATION
RFP No. 8162024
CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT-RISK (CMAR) SERVICES FOR THE CITY OF FOREST PARK CITY CENTER PROJECT

Evaluator 3: 7

1. Lack of scheduling software. 2. Unsatisfactory response to reference. 3. Did not delivery comprehensive Minority Participation involvement.



Evaluation Committee Minutes

RFP #8162024: CMAR Services for New City Center

Date: Wednesday, September 25, 2024

Time: 2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Location: Microsoft Teams

Attendees:

Talisa Adams – Procurement Manager & Chairperson

Yazmin Huerta – Financial Service Tech & Notetaker

Nigel Wattley – Deputy Director of Public Works, Committee Member

Pauline Warrior – Chief of Staff, Committee Member

James Shelby – Project Manager, Committee Member

Glenn Athearn – Falcon Design/Consultant & Expert Observer

Absent:

Purpose: Go over and discuss the different proposals that were received for RFP 8162024 for construction manager at risk services. Four (4) proposals were received from Carol Daniel Construction, Hogan Construction Group, McCarthy Plus Barnsley, and Reeves Young. Complete Conflict of Interest / Confidentiality forms and explain committee members responsibilities and RFP evaluation process.

Discussion/Comments:

1. Meeting was called to order at 2:01 p.m. by Chairperson Talisa Adams, Procurement Manager.
2. Mrs. Adams then proceeded with outlining the proceedings of the meeting and notified the committee that 4 Proposals were received.
3. Mrs. Adams asked if there were any existing or potential conflicts of interest among the evaluation committee members. (Responses - No). Mrs. Adams makes the committee aware to complete and email back the conflict-of-interest form. Once the forms are received then Ms. Adams will release proposals to the evaluation committee members via OpenGov.



Evaluation Committee Minutes

4. Mrs. Adams explained the process for reviewing and scoring the technical proposals through OpenGov. As well as let the committee know that the reference and local small business diversity criteria scores will be provided by Mrs. Adams, the chairperson.
5. Mrs. Adams went over the request for proposal, evaluation process, and committee responsibilities. Page 4 of the RFP Committee Instructions explain the Chairperson's responsibilities, such as scheduling meetings, finalizing the meeting minutes and presenting them at the next meeting for the committee to approve. The Chairperson will handle the reference checks, verify local small business diversity program (Goof Faith Efforts and/or participation), and schedule interviews/presentations with short listed firms, if applicable. Page 5 explains the process of scoring the technical proposals. Mrs. Adams informed the committee members that if they come across any issues with OpenGov they can always reach out to her for assistance. Page 8 explains the evaluation committee members' responsibilities and the importance of keeping the proposal packages confidential.
6. Towards the end of the meeting Mrs. Adams shows the committee members how OpenGov looks and where they will individually score the proposals and so on.
7. Lastly the committee discussed what day the 2nd meeting will take place. Mrs. Adams reminds the committee that the meeting will be in person to finalize scoring. The committee decided on Wednesday October 16, 2024, at 2:00 p.m.
8. Ms. Adams asked if anyone had questions (Response-No). The meeting was adjourned.



Evaluation Committee Minutes

RFP #8162024: CMAR Services for New City Center

2nd Evaluation Committee Meeting for Final Scoring Proposals

Date: Wednesday, October 16, 2024

Time: 2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Location: City Hall, Executive Office Conference Room

Attendees:

Talisa Adams – Procurement Manager & Chairperson
Yazmin Huerta – Financial Service Tech & Notetaker
Nigel Wattley – Deputy Director of Public Works, Committee Member
Pauline Warrior – Chief of Staff, Committee Member
James Shelby – Project Manager, Committee Member
Glenn Athearn – Falcon Design/Consultant & Expert Observer

Absent:

Purpose: The Evaluation Committee to review, discuss, and provide individual scores, obtain references and LSBF points from Chairperson, open cost proposals, and finalize cumulative scores for CMAR Services for New City Center from the following 4 Proposers: Carroll Daniel Construction, Hogan Construction Group LLC, McCarthy & Barnsley, A Joint Venture, and Reeves Young

Discussion/Comments:

1. Meeting was called to order at 2:04 p.m. by chairperson Talisa Adams, Procurement Manager.
2. Mrs. Adams then proceeded with outlining the proceedings of the meeting and notified the committee that 4 proposals were received and remained responsive.
3. The committee members proceeded to provide individual scores for each proposer and Mrs. Adams noted the scores on the Excel spreadsheet. Mrs. Adams provided the references scores as well as the LSBF scores for the 4 proposers.
4. Once all scores were collected and all proposers remained responsive and responsible, Mrs. Adams explained the cost methodology that would be used to allocate the points for the cost proposals.



Evaluation Committee Minutes

5. Mrs. Adams opened the cost proposals in OpenGov and read the total amount of each proposal's cost for insertion in the Excel spreadsheet. After completion of opening all cost proposals, each committee member added the cost points to their OpenGov score sheet for each proposal.
6. As the committee was looking over the cost proposals the committee noticed that McCarthy & Barnsley Cost Proposal Form calculations on Exhibit A – Maximum Allowable General Conditions contained calculation inaccuracies. Mrs. Adams asked the committee should they be disqualified, and the committee's consensus was **YES**. Ms. Adams stated that McCarthy & Barnsley will be disqualified for inaccuracies found in their submitted cost proposal. Ms. Pauline asked what the follow-up is for excluding McCarthy & Barnsley. Mrs. Adams stated that she will send a disqualifying notification through OpenGov.
7. McCarthy & Barnsley was excluded from the scoring process and the final scores were entered for the three (3) remaining proposers. The committee decided to interview all three (3) proposers.
8. Mrs. Adams explained how the interview process will take place. The interviews will take place in person. The committee will get to ask questions. Mrs. Adams asked each committee member to submit a minimum of 2 questions, to include any questions offered by Mr. Glenn. All questions should be submitted to Mrs. Adams no later than Monday October 21, 2024.
9. Mrs. Adams asked the committee if they had any questions or comments before adjourning the meeting. There were none, so the meeting was adjourned at 3:54 p.m.



Evaluation Committee Minutes

Evaluation Committee Technical Scores

Carroll Daniel Construction: REF: (10) been in business for 80 yrs; over 70% of projects are for CMAR services; completed over 400 projects and provided financial statements. All references were favorable, each municipality stated they were pleased with the projects thus far and each reference ranked 10 out of 10 for the firm's level of professionalism. LSBD: (5) – listed 10 local Clayton County small businesses to subcontract with during the construction phase.

Mentioned in or have been involved in some litigations within the past 10 years, yet all have been dismissed except for this last one they believe will also be dismissed.

Technical Approach: 30

Pauline 30 - did not see subconsultants

Nigel 30

James 30 - they meet all requirements

Project Management Plan: 15

Pauline 10 - did not see a corrective action plan

Nigel 15

James 15 – very successful with completing a lot of these type of projects

Organizational Structure Personnel Qualifications: 25

Pauline 22

Nigel 22

Shelby 25

Mrs. Adams clarified that the subconsultants/subcontractors were included in the LSBD section.



Evaluation Committee Minutes

Hogan Construction Group LLC: REF (10) been in business for 26 yrs; over 100 projects within the last 5 yrs and provided financial statements. The City requested two (2) additional REF that were not for previous FP projects or current stakeholders. All references were favorable, each municipality stated that projects were completed on schedule. The City of Jonesboro former Mayor Ms. Joy Day stated that new City Center building took 24 months to complete, which was on schedule. LSBD (5) - listed 5 Clayton County small business to subcontract with during the construction phase.

Technical Approach: 30

Pauline 30

Nigel 27

James 30

Project Management Plan: 15

Pauline 13

Nigel 14

James 15

Organizational Structure Personnel Qualifications: 25

Pauline 23

Nigel 20

James 25

Ms. Adams instructed the committee to include notes in OpenGov regarding their scores that are below the maximum allowable score.



Evaluation Committee Minutes

McCarthy & Barnsley: REF: (10) been in business for 20 yrs; completed over 30 projects for municipalities, such as the City of Brookhaven and Rockdale County and provided financial statements. All references were favorable, each municipality stated they were pleased with the projects thus far and each reference ranked 10 out of 10 for the firm's level of professionalism. LSBD: (5) - listed 18 Clayton County small businesses to subcontract with during the construction phase.

Technical Approach: 30

Pauline 30

Nigel 27

James 26 - they've done a lot of projects but not specific city centers

Project Management Plan: 15

Pauline 15 - They provided a very detailed schedule with project completion in early NOV 2026, also liked the traffic control plan

Nigel 13

James 15

Organizational Structure Personnel Qualifications: 25

Pauline 23 - Typos on "City of Forest Park"

Nigel 23

James 25

Due to their submitted cost proposal calculation errors, the proposer was disqualified.



Evaluation Committee Minutes

Reeves Young: REF: (8) been in business for 72 yrs, with the last 10 yrs under the current firm's business name and provided financial statements. All references were favorable, expect one with the new construction of the City of Chamblee City Hall project. The references stated that there were project issues with HVAC equipment malfunctions, water leaks from second floor patio to Court Offices below, HVAC engineering -humidity. The reference answered several questions with the word "**subjective**", as it related to their satisfaction with the quality of construct/build, quality of completed project exceeded cost spent, and firm's level of professionalism. The other two (2) references: the City of Conyers gave great reviews - 12-month project completed on schedule. The City of Sandy Springs is ongoing and currently ahead of schedule. LSB: (5) listed 6 Clayton County small businesses to subcontract with during the construction phase.

Technical Approach: 30

Pauline 30

Nigel 27

James 26

Project Management Plan: 15

Pauline 15

Nigel 13

James 15

Organizational Structure Personnel Qualifications: 25

Pauline 25

Nigel 22 - did not seem as structured as they should be

James 25



Evaluation Committee Minutes

Proposers' Cost Proposal / Cost Methodology Scores

Methodology: lowest cost/next cost X 10 points

Carroll Daniel Construction: Cost score 20

- A. Preconstruction: \$25,000.00
- B. General conditions: \$3,454,496.00
- C. General conditions: 1.9%

Hogan Construction Group LLC: Cost score 18.63

- A. Preconstruction: \$45,000.00
- B. General conditions: \$3,708,400.00
- C. General conditions: 2.75%

McCarthy & Barnsley:

DISQUALIFIED DUE TO COST PROPOSAL CALCULATION INACCURACIES

Cost Proposal Form calculations OFF : Mrs. Adams asked the committee should they be disqualified , Committee agreed Yes will be disqualified due to inaccuracies for their submitted act proposal.

- A. Preconstruction: 30,000.00
- B. General conditions: 4,061,242.00
- C. General conditions: 2.95%

Reeves Young: Cost score 19.53

- A. Preconstruction: 75,000.00
- B. General conditions: \$3,536,816.00
- C. General conditions: 2.25%



Evaluation Committee Minutes

RFP #8162024: CMAR Services for New City Center

NEGOTIATION MEETING WITH CAROLL DANIEL CONSTRUCTION

Date: Thursday, November 14, 2024

Time: 10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Location: City Hall, Council Chambers

Attendees:

Talisa Adams – Procurement Manager & Chairperson

Yazmin Huerta – Financial Service Tech & Notetaker

Nigel Wattley – Interim Director of Public Works, Committee Member

Pauline Warrior – Chief of Staff, Committee Member

James Shelby – Project Manager, Committee Member

Ricky L. Clark, Jr. – City Manager & Observer

Absent:

Purpose: The purpose of the meeting was to discuss negotiations for the construction proposal submitted by Carroll Daniel Construction.

Discussion/Comments:

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:18a.m from Chairperson Mrs. Talisa Adams
2. Committee members introduced themselves as well as Carroll Daniel Construction.
3. Mr. Clark emphasized the importance and timing for this project for the City of Forest Park. He explained that when he came in as the new City Manager, he wanted to ensure the building was in a central, walkable node of the community to set the tone for future development. He worked closely with the project team to design a building that would be architecturally impressive and serve as a landmark for the city.
4. Mr. Clark noted that the original RFP had a 24-month timeline, but during the interviews, the other firms had suggested they could complete the project faster, in



Evaluation Committee Minutes

around 18 months. He wanted to give Carroll Daniel Construction the opportunity to also propose a shorter timeline and any associated cost savings.

5. Mr. David Stone acknowledged that they had based their original proposal on a 24-month timeline, as specified in the RFP. However, he said they believed the project could likely be completed faster, in around 18-20 months, based on their experience with a similar-sized project they were working on in Forsyth. Mr. Stone explained that the Forsyth project, which was a 4-story building of similar square footage, had an 18–20-month schedule. He felt the Forest Park project, being a 3-story building, could potentially be done in a similar 18-month time frame.
6. Mr. Stone completed some quick calculations on the spot to determine what the cost reduction would be for the 18-month timeline versus the original 24-month proposal. He explains that a lot of the general conditions costs, like insurance and bonds, are based on a monthly rate. So, by reducing the timeline from 24 to 18 months, they could take out around \$612,000 from the general conditions.
7. Mr. Clark asked regarding the pre-construction fee, Mr. Stone stated he could have the pre-construction fee at zero (no cost). He stated that the fee is mainly if for some reason the project does not move forward, it'd be nice to get that 25,000.
8. Mr. Clark let the committee and Carroll Daniel Construction know about the RFP for a complete overhaul of Star Park as well as the Amphitheater. He stated that he would want for both the City Center and Star Park renovations to be done at the same time. But since procurement does not like us to pad projects, I'm going to end up bidding this project out.
9. Mr. Clark let Carroll Daniel Construction know that he is big on branding and so the silt fencing that we put up, I want to make certain that it not only for marketing purpose, for you invited the name of the company, but also it showcases what's being built there. Carroll Daniel Construction gives Mr. Clark different types of fencing options. One of them being adding a QR code that would show a visual presentation of what's happening.
10. Mr. Shelby brings up the DLT potential additional cost. He asks what are those costs? Carroll Daniel Construction stated that those potential fees were included in case there's a cost associated with shutting down the road. There usually isn't but just in case we must protect ourselves.
11. Towards the end of the meeting Mr. Clark gives a recap of the final negotiation terms, which was an 18-month period for construction completion, \$2.7M for general conditions, no preconstruction cost once the project starts, and 1.9% construction fee. P Carroll Daniel Construction would provide a pretty bird-eye view



Evaluation Committee Minutes

- 24/7/365, personalized self-fencing, minority participation or job specific opportunities with subcontractors, to include local Forest Park small businesses.
12. Mrs. Adams thanked Carroll Daniel Construction for coming in for the negotiation meeting and let them know that she will submit a recap to them via email and asked them to present their best and final offer from the negotiation discussions in today's meeting.
 13. Mrs. Adams adjourned the meeting.