



City of Forest Park  
Procurement

745 Forest Parkway, Forest Park, GA 30297

**EVALUATION TABULATION**

RFP No. 2024-RFP-008

Impact Fee Study

RESPONSE DEADLINE: January 22, 2025 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Tuesday, February 11, 2025

**VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL**

Question Title	DIOSS LLC	Hatley Plans LLC
Proposal Submittal Letter Form	Pass	Pass
Proponent's Technical Proposal	Pass	Pass
Illegal Immigration Reform and Enforcement Act	Pass	Pass
Contractor's Statement of Legal Status and Financial Capability	Pass	Pass
Acknowledgement of Insurance and Bonding Requirements	Pass	Pass
Proponent's Contact Directory	Pass	Pass
List of Clients	Pass	Pass
Non-Collusion Affidavit	Pass	Pass
Certificate Regarding Debarment, Suspension and other Matters	Pass	Pass
Local, Small Business, Diversity Program (Forms 1-4)	Pass	Pass
State of Georgia Certificate of Existence	Pass	Pass
W-9	Pass	Pass

## PHASE 1

### EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Organizational Structure and Resumes	Points Based	20 (20% of Total)

Description:

Provide an organizational chart that lists key team and their titles and describe the position roles in the organization. In the event there is a need to replace key team members during the term of any contract awarded, if any, the proponent must describe its back-up personnel, identify the individual(s) and role(s). Provide a resume for all staff to be used on the project. Submit a resume not exceeding two (2) pages for each person, organized as follows:

- Name and title
- Professional background
- Current and past relevant employment
- Education
- Certifications

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Experience and Past Performance	Points Based	25 (25% of Total)

Description:

Demonstrate the firm's capacity to complete the project based upon education, training and experience within the last five (5) years. The Proponent must provide a detailed understanding of project requirements & procedures to include information describing the firm's experience that pertains to the discipline described in the scope of work for this RFP, including examples past performance of similar work for municipalities.

Provide a minimum of three (3) specific references of examples of relevant and similar experience of providing a comprehensive Impact Fee Study of a similar size, scope, and complexity to include the municipality, contact person, address, phone number and email. **\*10 points out of 25 for references provided by Chairperson.**

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Management Plan	Points Based	30 (30% of Total)

Description:

Provide information on how the firm plans to perform tasks and execute the work. A 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. The proponent must submit an executive level plan describing the 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. The proponent should 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.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Cost Proposal	Points Based	15 (15% of Total)

Description:

**DO NOT INCLUDE COST IN TECHNICAL PROPOSAL.**

Provide all costs (labor, material, overhead, administration, profit, travel, etc.) associated with providing the services listed in the scope of work. The City anticipates ordering all tasks; however, it reserves the right to modify the tasks described.

Proposed fees should be listed by phase and task as well as a total for all phases and tasks. The City of Forest Park reserves the right to request a specific breakdown of item costs within each task. Costs shall be inclusive and be itemized to show the number of hours of direct labor for each task.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Technical Approach	Points Based	10 (10% of Total)

Description:

The proposal submission must have a 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. Include a statement regarding the consultant’s technical approach 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. In addition, the letter should include the company’s information including name of company (include any DBA names); headquarters and parent company locations; and brief history of the company and financial responsibility; Company’s mailing address, contact person, telephone number for primary contact person, and email address; and a principal or officer of the company authorized to execute contracts or other similar documents on the firm’s behalf must sign the letter.

Explain the methodology the firm propose to successfully perform the services outlined in the scope of works to include a project schedule indicating key milestones related to the firm’s methodology.

**AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY**

Vendor	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Hatley Plans LLC	100	95	99	98
DIOSS LLC	51	43	73	55.67

**VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Vendor	Organizational Structure and Resumes Points Based 20 Points (20%)	Experience and Past Performance Points Based 25 Points (25%)	Project Management Plan Points Based 30 Points (30%)	Cost Proposal Points Based 15 Points (15%)	Technical Approach Points Based 10 Points (10%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Hatley Plans LLC	20	25	28.3	15	9.7	98
DIOSS LLC	11.7	11.7	16.7	8	7.7	55.67

**INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES**

**DIOSS LLC**

**Organizational Structure and Resumes | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)**

Evaluator 1: 15

Resumes extended beyond two pages.

Evaluator 2: 10

No specific impact fee experience.

Evaluator 3: 10

Resume's exceeded 2 pages as requested. Did not provide back up personnel. Relative experience not with impact fee studies.

**Experience and Past Performance | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)**

Evaluator 1: 10

Due to references not responding in a timely manner. Project experiences was not related to impact fee studies.

Evaluator 2: 10

No direct experience with impact fee.

Evaluator 3: 15

Reference have not responded within the time allotted. Past work not directly centered around impact fees and studies.

**Project Management Plan | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)**

Evaluator 1: 10

Did not provide actual work relating to Impact Fees. Most of the project plan detailed performances in areas relating to methodology of working with other businesses. Illustration of SMART GOALS and LEAN Studies.

Evaluator 2: 10

The plan seemed generic.

Evaluator 3: 30

**Cost Proposal | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Evaluator 1: 8

\$175,000

Evaluator 2: 8

Evaluator 3: 8

175,000.00 total. Highest price provided compared to other submissions.

**Technical Approach | Points Based | 10 Points (10%)**

Evaluator 1: 8

Experience did not speak to impact fees, directly.

Evaluator 2: 5

The approach was generic possibly due to no specific experience with impact fee development.

Evaluator 3: 10

**Hatley Plans LLC**

**Organizational Structure and Resumes | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)**

Evaluator 1: 20

Evaluator 2: 20

Both have direct experience with impact fee projects.

Evaluator 3: 20

**Experience and Past Performance | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)**

Evaluator 1: 25

no references

Evaluator 2: 25

Evaluator 3: 25

**Project Management Plan | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)**

Evaluator 1: 30

Evaluator 2: 25

Evaluator 3: 30

**Cost Proposal | Points Based | 15 Points (15%)**

Evaluator 1: 15

\$96,500

Evaluator 2: 15

\$96,500

Evaluator 3: 15

96,500.00 Provided lowest cost

Technical Approach   Points Based   10 Points (10%)
Evaluator 1: 10
Evaluator 2: 10
Evaluator 3: 9

not a fan of excel file for future cost. File can be of non use