RESOLUTION NO. 2011-05-53

STATE OF GEORGIA
COUNTY FULTON

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE AWARD OF CONTRACTS AND TASK ORDER IN CONNECTION WITH THE CITY'S SOLICITATION FOR GENERAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES, RECREATION AND PARKS WORK PACKAGE

WHEREAS, the City of Sandy Springs ("City") currently has a contract with a vendor for recreation and parks services ("Current Contract"), which will expire June 30, 2011; and

WHEREAS, in anticipation of the expiration of the Current Contract, the City issued a request for proposals for general government services, including recreation and parks services, dated January 20, 2011, and received proposals from various vendors; and

WHEREAS, the proposals were evaluated by the Source Selection Evaluation Team ("SSET"), consistent with criteria established by the terms of the request for proposals, to determine the best overall value for the City and its residents; and

WHEREAS, as the result of its evaluation, the SSET has provided its Source Evaluation Memorandum, in the form attached to this resolution, presenting the results of its evaluation for recreation and parks services and recommending: (a) a contract award to Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.; (b) a task order award to Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. for the first year, beginning July 1, 2011, in the amount of $790,608.00; and (c) an award to Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. in the amount of $33,054.00 for the phase-in period for recreation and parks services, beginning June 1, 2011 and ending June 30, 2011; and

WHEREAS, it is the City's intention, pursuant to the terms of its solicitation for general government services, to award multiple indefinite-delivery, indefinite-quantity contracts for the delivery of all general government services, evaluating and identifying eligible contractors to compete for future task order awards under the terms of the contract; and

WHEREAS, the City desires to make such awards based on the recommendations of the SSET consistent with the attached Source Evaluation Memorandum;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Sandy Springs, Georgia while in regular session on May 17, 2011 at 6:00 p.m. as follows:

1. Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. is hereby awarded:

   (a) A contract for recreation and parks services;

   (b) The first year task order for recreation and parks services, beginning July 1, 2011, in the amount of $790,608.00; and

   (c) Costs for phase-in for recreation and parks services, beginning June 1, 2011 and ending

June 30, 2011, in the amount of $33,054.00.

2. In keeping with the City's intention to award multiple indefinite-delivery, indefinite-quantity contracts for the delivery of general government services, CH2M Hill is hereby awarded a contract for recreation and parks services making it eligible to compete for future task order awards under the terms of the contract.

3. The City Manager and appropriate authorized City officials are hereby authorized to execute the contracts and task order for recreation and parks services and to take any and all actions necessary to effectuate the intent of this resolution.

RESOLVED this the 17th day of May, 2011.

Approved:

Eva Galambos

Eva Galambos, Mayor

Attest:

Michael Casey

Michael Casey, City Clerk

(Seal)

SANDY SPRINGS
GEORGIA

SOURCE EVALUATION MEMORANDUM
Solicitation Number: FY12-01-063
General Government Services for the City of Sandy Springs, Georgia

1. Introduction and Summary. This procurement was conducted using the Performance Price Trade-off procedures described in Section M of the solicitation. As the Chairman of the Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET) for this acquisition, I carefully considered the findings of the Capabilities and Approaches, Performance Confidence and Cost/Price evaluation panels and, in conjunction with the panel chairs, have determined the proposals submitted by *the* Collaborative, URS Corporation, Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. and CH2M HILL provide the best overall value to satisfy the City of Sandy Spring's General Government Services requirements. This decision is based on the criteria established in Section M of the solicitation and the panels' assessments of the offerors' capability to provide the subject services, confidence in their ability to perform the requirements, and the proposed prices.

2. Evaluation Process. Section M of the solicitation set forth the following areas for evaluation: technical acceptability, performance confidence, and cost/price. An offeror's Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was evaluated for technical acceptability against both General (Factor 1) and Task Specific (Factor 2) requirements and assigned a rating of "Acceptable", "Reasonably Susceptible of being made Acceptable" and "Unacceptable." An offeror's Performance Confidence Proposal was evaluated based on: a) the description of past and present performance provided by the offeror, b) questionnaire responses provided by the offeror's references, and c) data independently obtained from other sources. The offeror's ability to perform the effort described in the solicitation was assessed and the proposal was assigned an overall performance confidence rating of "Substantial", "Satisfactory", "Limited" or "No" confidence. An offeror's Cost/Price Proposal was evaluated for reasonableness and realism and ranked based on the original submission cost/price and Final Proposal Revisions (FPR) cost/price, as applicable.

3. Best Value Award. Under the Performance Price Trade-off procedure, the lowest priced evaluated technically acceptable proposal judged to have a "Substantial Confidence" performance confidence assessment represents the best value for the City and it received the SSET's award recommendation. If the lowest priced offer is judged to have a performance confidence assessment of "Satisfactory Confidence" or lower, the SSET based its recommendation on an integrated best value assessment of performance confidence and cost/price.

4. Proposal Receipt. General Government Services proposals were received on Thursday, March 3, 2001, and Friday, March 4, 2011 from eight offerors: *the* Collaborative; Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.; SAFEbuilt / Keck & Wood; URS Corporation; CH2M HILL; Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.; PBS&J; and Clark Patterson Lee. The proposals were examined for compliance with the solicitation submittal instructions and compliance issues were documented. A random selection procedure was used to determine the order in which the proposals were evaluated for technical acceptability with the following results:

Offer A – CH2M HILL	Offer E – Clark Patterson Lee
Offer B – *the* Collaborative	Offer F – SAFEbuilt / Keck & Wood
Offer C – PBS&J	Offer G – Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.
Offer D – URS Corporation	Offer H – Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.

City Manager

7840 Roswell Road, Building 500 • Sandy Springs, Georgia 30350 • 770.730.5600 • 770.206.1420 fax • www.sandyspringsga.org

5. Offers. The General Government Services solicitation permitted offerors to submit proposals for any of five work packages and an Omnibus offer. Offerors choosing to submit an Omnibus offer were required to submit offers for each individual work package.

a. Individual work package offers were received as follows:

(1) Communications (Work Package 3) – CH2M HILL; *the* Collaborative; Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.

(2) Municipal Court Services (Work Package 4) – CH2M HILL; Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.

(3) Public Works (Work Package 5) – CH2M HILL; PBS&J; URS Corporation; Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.; Moreland Altobelli Associates, Inc.

(4) Recreation and Parks (Work Package 6) – CH2M HILL; Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.

(5) Community Development (Work Package 7) – CH2M HILL; *the* Collaborative; Clark Patterson Lee; SAFEbuilt / Keck & Wood; Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.

b. Omnibus offers were received from CH2M HILL and Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.

6. Initial Evaluation and Competitive Range Decisions. The Capabilities and Approaches, Performance Confidence and Cost/Price panels completed the initial evaluation of proposals received from all eight offerors and reported their findings on April 13, 2011. Based on an integrated assessment of the panels' findings, the SSET determined that five of the eight proposals had a reasonable expectation of receiving an award; therefore, these five proposals were included in the competitive range. Offerors included in the competitive range were: CH2M HILL; *the* Collaborative; URS Corporation; SAFEbuilt / Keck & Wood; Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.

7. Final Evaluation. Each offeror within the competitive range responded to written questions submitted by the SSET, participated in oral interviews and submitted Final Proposal Revisions. The three panels completed the evaluation of Final Proposal Revisions and reported their findings on May 9, 2011. Using the Performance Price Trade-off procedure described in Section M of the solicitation, the SSET formed the following source selection recommendations:

a. CH2M HILL – This offeror's Capabilities and Approaches Proposal presented an acceptable approach to perform the General Government Services requirements. The offer included proposals to perform each of the five individual work packages and presented an Omnibus offer. The Capabilities and Approaches Proposal responded satisfactorily to the General and Task Specific requirements and was rated "Acceptable." CH2M HILL's Performance Confidence Proposal presented evidence of their ability to provide services in each work package and was assigned a "Satisfactory" performance confidence assessment. The offeror presented a responsive and competitive Cost/Price Proposal for all work packages that was judged to be reasonable and realistic.

b. *the* Collaborative – This offeror's Capabilities and Approaches Proposal responded appropriately to the General requirements and presented sound approaches to the Task Specific requirements for the Communications and Community Development work packages. The Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was rated "Acceptable." The offeror's Performance Confidence Proposal presented convincing evidence of the firm's ability to perform the Communications requirements and received a "Substantial" confidence assessment for that

work package. The Performance Confidence Proposal to perform the Community Development work package initially received an “Unknown” performance confidence assessment. The panel requested additional information regarding the firm’s ability to operate a municipal community development department. *The* Collaborative was given an opportunity to expand on the firm’s experience during written and oral discussions. Material presented during discussions and Final Proposal Revisions resolved the uncertainty and the offer received a “Satisfactory” performance confidence assessment for the Community Development work package. The offeror presented a responsive and competitive Cost/Price Proposal for both work packages that was judged to be reasonable and realistic.

c. URS Corporation – This offeror’s Capabilities and Approaches Proposal responded appropriately to the General requirements and presented a sound approach to the Task Specific requirements for the Public Works requirement. The Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was rated “Acceptable.” The offeror’s Performance Confidence Proposal clearly demonstrated the firm’s ability to perform the Public Works requirements and was assigned a “Substantial” performance confidence assessment. The offeror presented a responsive and competitive Cost/Price Proposal for the work package that was judged to be reasonable and realistic.

d. SAFEbuilt / Keck & Wood – This offeror presented a combination fixed-price/fee-for-service approach to provide Community Development services with SAFEbuilt providing project management and responsible for Building Safety and Code Enforcement and Keck & Wood, as subcontractor, responsible for Planning, Zoning and Economic Development.

(1) The offeror’s staffing plan presented full-time, on-site skills supported by “FTE as needed” skills tailored to respond to fee-based requirements. The proposal depended on the subcontractor for engineering expertise to be provided on the “FTE as needed” basis. The level of effort and scope of work associated with the full-time, on-site skills was clearly defined, as were the “FTE as needed” skills to be provided on the fee-for-services basis. The offeror acknowledged that “FTE as needed” skills to support City requirements not funded through fees would be available at the additional proposed rates. This approach introduced staffing uncertainty and therefore created risk in the cost associated with such staffing uncertainty. In addition, the offeror did not submit an acceptable commitment letter from its proposed Community Development Director who was replaced in its Final Proposal Revisions. In consideration of these weaknesses and the cost/price risk, the offeror’s Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was rated “Unacceptable.”

(2) The offeror’s Performance Confidence Proposal established SAFEbuilt’s ability to perform permitting and code enforcement under the combination fixed-price/fee-for-service approach and received a “Satisfactory” performance confidence assessment for these aspects of the Community Development requirement. The proposal, however, did not adequately demonstrate Keck & Wood’s ability to perform the planning, zoning and economic development on primarily a fee-for-service basis. The offeror was given an opportunity to expand on the firm’s experience during written and oral discussions, but additional information presented during discussions did not resolve the uncertainty. The panel therefore assigned a “Limited” performance confidence rating for the planning, zoning and economic development aspects of this offeror’s Performance Confidence Proposal, resulting in an overall “Limited” performance confidence rating for the proposal.

e. Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. – This offeror’s Capabilities and Approaches Proposal presented a sound approach to perform the General Government Services requirements. The offer included proposals to perform each of the five individual work packages and presented an

Omnibus offer. The Capabilities and Approaches Proposal responded appropriately to the General and Task Specific requirements and was rated "Acceptable." Jacobs' Performance Confidence Proposal clearly established its ability to provide the Public Works, Community Development, and Recreation and Parks requirements. In the areas of Communications and Municipal Court Services, Jacobs initially received "Unknown" performance confidence assessment due to the lack of information in its Performance Confidence Proposal relating to those requirements. The offeror was given the opportunity to clarify its abilities to perform the Communications and Municipal Court Services requirements through written and oral discussions and Final Proposal Revisions. The Performance Confidence panel considered this additional information and assigned a "Satisfactory" performance confidence assessment to Jacobs for Communications and Municipal Court Services. The offeror presented a responsive and competitive Cost/Price Proposal for all work packages that was judged to be reasonable and realistic.

8. Analyses. The following paragraphs show: a) the Performance Price Trade-off analyses that resulted in the selection decision; and b) the phase-in costs associated with each recommended offer. The SSET's recommendations for the award of contracts (see paragraph 9, Recommendations) are based on the Performance Price Trade-off Analyses, with the best value offer receiving a base year task order (TO).

a. Performance Price Trade-off Analyses.

Communications (Work Package 3)

Offeror	Technical Acceptability	Cost (base-year TO price)	Performance Confidence
the Collaborative	Acceptable	$ 594,413	Substantial
CH2M HILL	Acceptable	725,318	Satisfactory
Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.	Acceptable	752,939	Satisfactory

Municipal Court Services (Work Package 4)

Offeror	Technical Acceptability	Cost (base-year TO price)	Performance Confidence
Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.	Acceptable	$ 794,239	Satisfactory
CH2M HILL	Acceptable	884,396	Satisfactory

Public Works (Work Package 5)

Offeror	Technical Acceptability	Cost (base-year TO price)	Performance Confidence
URS Corporation	Acceptable	$ 3,086,205	Substantial
Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.	Acceptable	4,202,536	Satisfactory
CH2M HILL	Acceptable	4,906,656	Satisfactory

Recreation and Parks (Work Package 6)

Offeror	Technical Acceptability	Cost (base-year TO price)	Performance Confidence
Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.	Acceptable	$ 709,608	Satisfactory
CH2M HILL	Acceptable	965,204	Satisfactory

Community Development (Work Package 7)

Offeror	Technical Acceptability	Cost (base-year TO price)	Performance Confidence
the Collaborative	Acceptable	$ 2,226,774	Satisfactory
CH2M HILL	Acceptable	3,334,377	Satisfactory
Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.	Acceptable	3,366,406	Satisfactory

Omnibus Offer

Offeror	Technical Acceptability	Cost (base-year TO price)	Performance Confidence
Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.	Acceptable	$ 8,861,461	Satisfactory
CH2M HILL	Acceptable	10,179,965	Satisfactory

b. Phase-in and Total Base Year Cost (base year task order plus phase-in costs) for each of the selected offers:

Work Package	Recommended Offeror	Phase-In Price	Total Base Year Cost
Communications	*the* Collaborative	$14,500*	$ 608,913
Municipal Court	Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.	16,728	810,968
Public Works	URS Corporation	98,250	3,184,455
Recreation and Parks	Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.	33,054	823,662
Community Development	*the* Collaborative	0*	2,226,774

**the* Collaborative proposed $14,500 for the combined phase-in for both work packages (Communications and Community Development)

9. Recommendations. Based on the assessment of proposals described herein, it is the SSET's recommendation that the proposals submitted by *the* Collaborative, URS Corporation, Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. and CH2M HILL represent the best value to the City of Sandy Springs for General Government Services. Our recommendations with respect to the award of contracts and base year task orders are as follows:

a. Award ***the* Collaborative** a contract to provide Communications (Work Package 3) and Community Development (Work Package 7) services for the City of Sandy Springs and execute the base year task order authorizing *the* Collaborative to perform these services.

b. Award **URS Corporation** a contract to provide Public Works (Work Package 5) services for the City of Sandy Springs and execute the base year task order authorizing URS Corporation to perform these services.

c. Award **Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.** a contract to provide Communications, Municipal Court, Public Works, Recreation and Parks, and Community Development services for the City of Sandy Springs and execute the base year task orders authorizing Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. to perform Municipal Court (Work Package 4) and Recreation and Parks (Work Package 6) services.

d. Award **CH2M HILL** a contract to provide Communications, Municipal Court, Public Works, Recreation and Parks, and Community Development services for the City of Sandy

Springs and, thereby, establish the firm's eligibility to compete for future task order awards under the terms of the contract.

John McDonough
City Manager and Chairman, Source Selection Evaluation Team
May 16, 2011