

Request for Proposal Number: RFP-0010-25

Sidewalk Design Services

BIDNET EVALUATION: Final Evaluation, Scores, Ranking, Shortlisting and Final Selection.

EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
 ES = Ellis Still, HK = Hari Karikaran, LR = Lance Randall, SQ = Shawanna Qawiy



RESPONDENTS:	CTS Engineering, Inc.					Kaizen Collaborative Design, LLC					Kleinfelder, Inc.					Raymond Global, Inc.				
EVALUATION CRITERIA (PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS):	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE
CRITERIA 1 -PROFILE OF FIRM																				
Profile of Firm *Provide a brief profile outlining the Proposer's expertise and experience, including experience performing the services requested herein and number of years of experience. *Provide a description experience working with State, Federal, County, and/or Municipality governmental entities for similar size and scope of services. *Provide a description of the Firm's special capabilities, techniques or resources that can contribute to projects of similar size and scope. *Describe the local availability of personnel that will be assigned to work with the City. *Point of Contact (POC) name, phone number, e-mail address. (25 Points)																				
	25.00	15.00	25.00	25.00	22.50	20.00	20.00	20.00	23.00	20.75	25.00	21.00	21.00	24.00	22.75	15.00	22.00	20.00	23.00	20.00
Subtotal	25.00	15.00	25.00	25.00	22.50	20.00	20.00	20.00	23.00	20.75	25.00	21.00	21.00	24.00	22.75	15.00	22.00	20.00	23.00	20.00
AVERAGE SCORE:	22.50					20.75					22.75					20.00				

CRITERIA 2 - QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF FIRM/TEAM/INDIVIDUAL	CTS Engineering, Inc.					Kaizen Collaborative Design, LLC					Kleinfelder, Inc.					Raymond Global, Inc.					
	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	
<p>The Proposer shall provide a brief description of the team's experience and ability to perform the scope of services herein.</p> <p>Provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Provide information for the key personnel who will be assigned to this project and who will be the primary responsible party performing the scope of services requested herein. oResumes of staff to be assigned to perform the scope of services described herein, include the following; oProfessional educational background and qualifications relevant to the scope of services described herein. oHighlight relevant specialized experience (professional categories) relevant to performing the scope of services described herein (must be similar in nature, size, complexity and environment type specifically with respects to small organizations and government/municipality agencies). *Provide a detailed description of Firm's specific project management team, inclusive of sub-consultants anticipated to be utilized and assigned to work under this contract. *Identify the roles and responsibilities of the primary team members as they pertain/apply to the Project Approach. (30 Points) 																					
Subtotal	30.00	15.00	25.00	28.00	24.50	25.00	20.00	20.00	23.00	22.00	30.00	18.00	20.00	29.00	24.25	24.00	25.00	20.00	23.00	23.00	
AVERAGE SCORE:	24.50					22.00					24.25					23.00					

CRITERIA 3 - Approach:	CTS Engineering, Inc.					Kaizen Collaborative Design, LLC					Kleinfelder, Inc.					Raymond Global, Inc.					
	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	
<p>Proposers shall provide a description of Proposers' approach to accomplishing the scope of services described herein.</p> <p>*Describe proposers' approach to becoming familiar with City operations.</p> <p>*Describe proposer's methodology including specific procedures, or techniques to be used in performing the scope of services described herein.</p> <p>*Provide a description of the process that will be used for ensuring compliance with State, Federal, Local and City regulations and requirements.</p> <p>*Describe the manner in which the Firm intends to comply with and meet the anticipated deliverables as detailed in the scope of services.</p> <p>*Provide a timeline schedule showing the proposed milestones for the project design.</p> <p>*Describe Proposers' approach to the scheduling of work and prioritizing the City's requests.</p> <p>oCurrent workload and capacity.. (35 Points)</p>																					
	21.00	18.00	20.00	24.00	20.75	23.00	22.00	20.00	22.00	21.75	21.00	23.00	16.00	24.00	21.00	18.00	25.00	20.00	23.00	21.50	
Subtotal	21.00	18.00	20.00	24.00	20.75	23.00	22.00	20.00	22.00	21.75	21.00	23.00	16.00	24.00	21.00	18.00	25.00	20.00	23.00	21.50	
AVERAGE SCORE:	20.75					21.75					21.00					21.50					
CRITERIA 4 - REFERENCES:	CTS Engineering, Inc.					Kaizen Collaborative Design, LLC					Kleinfelder, Inc.					Raymond Global, Inc.					
<p>Provide a minimum of three (3) client references, two (2) of which shall be municipalities for which the firm / individual has performed work of a similar nature to that solicited in the RFP. References shall be for services performed within a five (5) year period (current/past). (All Firms that submit the required references will automatically receive 5 Points)</p>	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	
	5.00					5.00					5.00					5.00					
PROCUREMENT DEPARTMENT DETERMINATION:	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	
SUBTOTAL:	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	
TOTAL SCORES	81.00	53.00	75.00	82.00	72.75	73.00	67.00	65.00	73.00	69.50	81.00	67.00	62.00	82.00	73.00	62.00	77.00	65.00	74.00	69.50	
AVERAGE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORES:	72.75					69.50					73.00					69.50					
PROCUREMENT DEPARTMENT DETERMINATION - (Attachment "A" - Proposer's Required Forms & Proposal Format Requirements):	Provided Required Forms and Proposal Format Requirements Compliant					Provided Required Forms and Proposal Format Requirements Compliant					Provided Required Forms and Proposal Format Requirements Compliant					Provided Required Forms and Proposal Format Requirements Compliant					
INITIAL RANKING:	3					NO - FIRM DID NOT MEET THE MINIMUM 70 POINTS REQUIREMENT					1					NO - FIRM DID NOT MEET THE MINIMUM 70 POINTS REQUIREMENT					
SHORTLISTED (YES/NO):	YES										YES										

CRITERIA 4 - PRICE PROPOSAL (FEES):	CTS Engineering, Inc.					Kaizen Collaborative Design, LLC					Kleinfelder, Inc.					Raymond Global, Inc.				
Proponent shall outline a pricing schedule that identifies all pricing elements discussed in the proposal to accomplish the City requirements. Pricing that is identified in unit measures (price per hour, day, week, etc.) shall also be accompanied by an estimated number of units expected to complete the task. (20 Points)	PROCUREMENT					PROCUREMENT					PROCUREMENT					PROCUREMENT				
PRICE PROPOSAL:	\$338,715.00					PRICE PROPOSAL NOT OPENED OR CONSIDERED. FIRM DID NOT MEET THE MINIMUM 70 POINTS REQUIREMENT					\$104,900.00					PRICE PROPOSAL NOT OPENED OR CONSIDERED. FIRM DID NOT MEET THE MINIMUM 70 POINTS REQUIREMENT				
PRICE PROPOSAL POINTS (20 Points): (Low Price / Proposer's Price) x Price Points = Proposer's Awarded Points.	6.19										20.00									
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL AND PRICE PROPOSAL SCORES:	78.94										93.00									
RESPONDENTS:	CTS Engineering, Inc.										Kleinfelder, Inc.									
FINAL RANKING:	3										1									
RESPONDENTS:	R.K. Shah & Associates, Inc.					Rochester & Associates, LLC					Spicer Group, Inc.					WSB, LLC				
CRITERIA REQUIREMENTS:	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE
CRITERIA 1 -PROFILE OF FIRM																				
Profile of Firm *Provide a brief profile outlining the Proposer's expertise and experience, including experience performing the services requested herein and number of years of experience. *Provide a description experience working with State, Federal, County, and/or Municipality governmental entities for similar size and scope of services. *Provide a description of the Firm's special capabilities, techniques or resources that can contribute to projects of similar size and scope. *Describe the local availability of personnel that will be assigned to work with the City. *Point of Contact (POC) name, phone number, e-mail address. (25 Points)						NON-RESPONSIVE														
	25.00	22.00	25.00	24.00	24.00						15.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	18.25	10.00	15.00	25.00	24.00	18.50
Subtotal	25.00	22.00	25.00	24.00	24.00						15.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	18.25	10.00	15.00	25.00	24.00	18.50
AVERAGE SCORE:	24.00										18.25					18.50				

CRITERIA 2 - QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF FIRM/TEAM/INDIVIDUAL	R.K. Shah & Associates, Inc.					Rochester & Associates, LLC					Spicer Group, Inc.					WSB, LLC										
	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE	ES	HA	LR	SQ	AVERAGE						
<p>The Proposer shall provide a brief description of the team's experience and ability to perform the scope of services herein.</p> <p>Provide the following: *Provide information for the key personnel who will be assigned to this project and who will be the primary responsible party performing the scope of services requested herein.</p> <p>oResumes of staff to be assigned to perform the scope of services described herein, include the following;</p> <p>oProfessional educational background and qualifications relevant to the scope of services described herein.</p> <p>oHighlight relevant specialized experience (professional categories) relevant to performing the scope of services described herein (must be similar in nature, size, complexity and environment type specifically with respects to small organizations and government/municipality agencies).</p> <p>*Provide a detailed description of Firm's specific project management team, inclusive of sub-consultants anticipated to be utilized and assigned to work under this contract.</p> <p>*Identify the roles and responsibilities of the primary team members as they pertain/apply to the Project Approach. (30 Points)</p>						NON-RESPONSIVE																				
Subtotal	25.00	25.00	25.00	30.00	26.25											28.00	20.00	20.00	22.00	22.50	22.00	15.00	25.00	30.00	23.00	
AVERAGE SCORE:	26.25										22.50					23.00										
CRITERIA 3 - Approach:	R.K. Shah & Associates, Inc.					Rochester & Associates, LLC					Spicer Group, Inc.					WSB, LLC										
<p>Proposers shall provide a description of Proposers' approach to accomplishing the scope of services described herein.</p> <p>*Describe proposers' approach to becoming familiar with City operations.</p> <p>*Describe proposer's methodology including specific procedures, or techniques to be used in performing the scope of services described herein.</p> <p>*Provide a description of the process that will be used for ensuring compliance with State, Federal, Local and City regulations and requirements.</p> <p>*Describe the manner in which the Firm intends to comply with and meet the anticipated deliverables as detailed in the scope of services.</p> <p>*Provide a timeline schedule showing the proposed milestones for the project design.</p> <p>*Describe Proposers' approach to the scheduling of work and prioritizing the City's requests.</p> <p>oCurrent workload and capacity.. (35 Points)</p>						NON-RESPONSIVE																				
Subtotal	20.00	25.00	20.00	23.00	22.00											12.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	18.00	10.00	18.00	20.00	24.00	18.00	
Subtotal	20.00	25.00	20.00	23.00	22.00						12.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	18.00	10.00	18.00	20.00	24.00	18.00						

AVERAGE SCORE:	22.00		18.00	18.00
----------------	-------	--	-------	-------

CRITERIA 4 - REFERENCES:	R.K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	Rochester & Associates, LLC	Spicer Group, Inc.	WSB, LLC
Provide a minimum of three (3) client references, two (2) of which shall be municipalities for which the firm / individual has performed work of a similar nature to that solicited in the RFP. References shall be for services performed within a five (5) year period (current/past). (All Firms that submit the required references will automatically receive 5 Points)	PROCUREMENT	PROCUREMENT	PROCUREMENT	PROCUREMENT
	5.00	NON-RESPONSIVE	5.00	5.00
PROCUREMENT DEPARTMENT DETERMINATION:	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00		5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
SUBTOTAL:	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00		5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
TOTAL SCORES	75.00 77.00 75.00 82.00 77.25		60.00 63.00 65.00 67.00 63.75	47.00 53.00 75.00 83.00 64.50
AVERAGE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORES:	77.25		63.75	64.50
PROCUREMENT DEPARTMENT DETERMINATION - (Attachment "A" - Proposer's Required Forms & Proposal Format Requirements):	Provided Required Forms and Proposal Format Requirements Compliant	NON-RESPONSIVE	Provided Required Forms and Proposal Format Requirements Compliant	Provided Required Forms and Proposal Format Requirements Compliant
INITIAL RANKING:	2	NON-RESPONSIVE	FIRM DID NOT MEET THE MINIMUM 70 POINTS REQUIREMENT	FIRM DID NOT MEET THE MINIMUM 70 POINTS REQUIREMENT
SHORTLISTED (YES/NO):	YES			
CRITERIA 5 - PRICE PROPOSAL (FEES):	R.K. Shah & Associates, Inc.	Rochester & Associates, LLC	Spicer Group, Inc.	WSB, LLC
Proponent shall outline a pricing schedule that identifies all pricing elements discussed in the proposal to accomplish the City requirements. Pricing that is identified in unit measures (price per hour, day, week, etc.) shall also be accompanied by an estimated number of units expected to complete the task. (20 Points)	PROCUREMENT	NON-RESPONSIVE	PRICE PROPOSAL NOT OPENED OR CONSIDERED. FIRM DID NOT MEET THE MINIMUM 70 POINTS REQUIREMENT	PRICE PROPOSAL NOT OPENED OR CONSIDERED. FIRM DID NOT MEET THE MINIMUM 70 POINTS REQUIREMENT
PRICE PROPOSAL:	\$241,873.00			
PRICE PROPOSAL POINTS (20 Points): (Low Price / Proposer's Price) x Price Points = Proposer's Awarded Points.	8.67			
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL AND PRICE PROPOSAL SCORES:	85.92			
RESPONDENTS:	R.K. Shah & Associates, Inc.			
FINAL RANKING:	2			
NOTE: Kaizen Collaborative Design, LLC, Raymond Global, Inc., Spicer Group, LLC, and WSB, LLC did not meet the minimum 70 points technical proposal points for price proposals to be opened. Rochester & Associates, LLC did not submit Attachment "A" - Proposer's Required Forms with submittal and has been deemed non-responsible to the solicitation and its requirements. Kleindelder, Inc. is the top ranked firm with a score of 93.00 points.				
Prepared by: Tanisha Boynton, Procurement Manager/Procurement Official				