

Purchasing Department

140 Stonewall Avenue West, Ste 204 Fayetteville, GA 30214 Phone: 770-305-5420 www.fayettecountyga.gov

To: Steve Rapson

From: Ted L. Burgess

Date: June 24, 2021

Subject: RFP #1933-P: Debris Monitor

The federal Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act authorizes the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to provide financial assistance for removing debris from roads and other areas in the event of a natural or man-made disaster. FEMA's guidance titled RP9580.201 says, "Applicants must monitor all debris removal operations. Applicants must document all eligible debris removal expenses as a condition of receiving Public Assistance funding. Applicants may use contractors to monitor their debris removal operations."

Monitoring debris removal is a complex process. All federal laws, rules, and regulations must be followed carefully in order to not jeopardize federal financial reimbursement for costs incurred for these activities. For this reason, it is prudent to use a company that specializes in debris monitoring when the need arises.

Request for Proposals (RFP) #1933-P was issued to contract with a debris monitoring firm. Notice was direct-mailed to 110 vendors. A total of 610 companies were contacted through the web-based Georgia Procurement Registry, who had registered under Commodity Codes 91881 (Natural Disasters, Consulting), 99029 (Disaster Preparedness & Emergency Planning), 99030 (Disaster Relief Services), and 99060 (Disaster Site Clean-up & Recovery). In compliance with Federal procurement rules, the Purchasing Department notified six companies from the Small Business Administration database. In addition, invitations were extended via the Fayette News, the county website, Georgia Local Government Access Marketplace (www.glga.org), and Channel 23.

Five companies submitted proposals. An Evaluation Committee, composed of staff from Emergency Management, Public Works, the City of Peachtree City, the City of Fayetteville, and the Town of Tyrone scored the proposals using the evaluation criteria in the RFP.

The RFP states, "It is intended that this joint procurement will result in a single contract which includes other jurisdictions within the county." Staff from the municipalities participated in the RFP development process as well as evaluation.

This will be a "pre-positioned" contract, so there will be no cost to the county unless and until a natural or man-made disaster occurs, and a Notice of Activation is issued to the contractor. At that time, the

county would request performance and payment bonds, and establish a not-to-exceed amount based on the nature and extent of the damage.

The multi-jurisdictional Evaluation Committee recommends Tetra Tech, Inc. for the Debris Monitor contract (Attachment 1). While the county has not previously contracted with Tetra Tech for debris monitoring services, a Contractor Performance Evaluation is attached for work they did related to replacement of a culvert on Chappell Road (Attachment 2).

Specifics of the proposed contract are as follows:

Contract Name 1933-P: Debris Monitor

Type of Contract Pre-Positioned Contingency Contract

Vendor Tetra Tech, Inc.

Contract Term:

Initial Term Terminates June 30, 2022
Renewal Terms Two 12-month renewal terms

Contract Amount Established upon activation, if needed

Attachment 1

1933-P: Debris Monitor Evaluation Scores

		Max Points	Debris Tech	Goodwin Mills Cawood	Tetra Tech, Inc.	Thompson Consulting Services	Volkertz Inc.
1	Proj. Understanding & Approach	25	21.6	19.8	22.6	23.4	16.4
2	Co. Background & Experience	20	17.2	13.0	19.4	19.4	16.4
3	Project Team	15	13.4	10.6	13.8	14.2	9.0
4	Level of Effort	5	4.4	4.6	4.2	4.8	3.0
5	Load Ticket System	5	4.6	4.2	5.0	4.8	3.4
	Total Technical	70	61.2	52.2	65.0	66.6	48.2

Proposed Prices (Normalized)	\$157,700	\$314,240	\$142,150	\$173,330	\$128,720
------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Technical Score	70%	61.2	52.2	65.0	66.6	48.2
Price Score	30%	23.2	0.0	<u>26.9</u>	<u>19.6</u>	30.0
Total Score Technical & Price		84.4	52.2	91.9	86.2	78.2

FAYETTE COUNTY, GEORGIA CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Page 1

- 1. Use this form to record contractor performance for any contract of \$50,000 or above.
- 2. The person who serves as project manager or account manager is the designated party to complete the evaluation.
- This form is to be completed and forwarded to the Purchasing Department not later than 30 days after completion or expiration of a contract. Past performance is considered on future contracts.

VENDOR INFORMATION	COMPLETE ALL APPLICABLE INFORMATION
Company Name: Tetra Tech, Inc.	Contract Number: #940-P
Mailing Address: 3475 E. Foothill Blvd.	Contract Description or Title: Engineer of Record for Public Works
City, St, Zip Code: Pasadena, CA 91107	Contract Term (Dates) From: Chappell Road Culvert Replacement
Phone Number: 626-351-4664	Task Order Number: 27
Cell Number: N/A	Other Reference: For award of contract 1933-P
E-Mail Address:	

DEFINITIONS

<u>OUTSTANDING</u> – Vendor considerably exceeded minimum contractual requirements or performance expectations of the products/services; The vendor demonstrated the highest level of quality workmanship/professionalism in execution of contract.

EXCELLENT (Exc) - Vendor exceeded minimum contractual requirements or performance expectations of the products/services.

SATISFACTORY (Sat) - Vendor met minimum contractual requirements or performance expectations of the products/services.

<u>UNSATISFACTORY (UnSat)</u> - Vendor did not meet the minimum contractual requirements or performance expectations of the products and/or services; Performed below minimum requirements

EVALUATIONS (Place "X" in appropriate box for each criterion.)

Criteria (includes change orders / amendments)	Out- standing	Exc	Sat	Un- Sat	Not Apply
Work or other deliverables performed on schedule			Х		
2. Condition of delivered products			X		
3. Quality of work			X		
4. Adherence to specifications or scope of work			X		
5. Timely, appropriate, & satisfactory problem or complaint resolution			X		
6. Timeliness and accuracy of invoicing			X		
7. Working relationship / interfacing with county staff and citizens			X		
8. Service Call (On-Call) response time			X		
9. Adherence to contract budget and schedule			X		
10. Other (specify):					Χ
11. Overall evaluation of contractor performance			X		

EVALUATED BY

Signature: Courting Happy Happy all	Date of Evaluation: June 2, 2021		
Print Name: Courtney Hassenzahl	Department/Division: Environmental Management		
Title: Assistant Director	Telephone No: 770-305-5410		

Form Updated 11/16/2016

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Explanation of Outstanding or Unsatisfactory Ratings

Page 2

Company Name:		Contract Number:				
	EX	PLANATIONS / COMMENTS				
	1. Do not submit page 2 without page 1.					
	2. Use this page to explain evaluations of Outstanding or Unsatisfactory.					
	3. Be specific (include paragraph and page numbers referenced in the applicable contract, etc.). Continue on separate sheet if needed (show company name and contract number or other reference)					
	Tetra Tech was the Engineer of Reco	rd (EOR) for the Public Works Department for over a three				
	year period. During this time Tetra T	ech provided Hydraulics & Hydrology studies and complete				
	design and Specification packages for	r several stormwater culvert replacement projects. Tetra Tech				
	also teamed up with sub consultants f	For daily project oversight/monitoring, materials testing				
	and inspections, and survey services.					
	The plan submittals Tetra Tech subm	itted for County review were typically returned with the same				
	comments, most of them minor in con	mparison to the project. Some design issues and concerns				
	did occasionally arise during construc	ction, as with most projects, but were handled onsite between				
	the County and the Contractor.					
	The daily oversight conducted by Tet	ra Tech's sub consultant was minimal, and included tasks				
	such as taking photos and formulating	g a daily report of construction activities. Any discrepancies				
	between the plans and the field condi	tions were noted and handled internally with County staff.				

Purchasing Department Comments (e.g. did the vendor honor all offers; submit insurance, bonds & other documents in a timely manner; and provide additional information as requested?):