

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

То:	Steve Rapson
Through:	Ted L. Burgess
From:	Natasha M. Duggan
Date:	January 25, 2024

Subject: Contract 2337-P: Fayette County Fire & EMS Classroom Building and Training Tower Construction Manager at Risk

The Fayette County Fire & EMS Classroom Building and Training Tower is the final phase of the development of a Public Safety Training Facility at 340 Hewell Road, Jonesboro, on the same site as the Fayette County Sheriff's Office Training Center. The project consists of a one-story 9,750sf building with training classrooms, office space, restrooms, breakroom, and an apparatus bay and a 4-5 story prefabricated metal Training Tower specifically designed to assist in the training of fire recruits. The tower will replace the existing training tower located behind the 911 Center.

The construction of the classroom building, and the training tower will be through the appointment of a Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR). The CMAR provides construction advice during the pre-construction & design phase and develops a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP). The CMAR then engages and manages the sub-contractors during construction to deliver the project for the agreed GMP. The CMAR will work closely with the Project Manager, Morgan Mill Consulting, to develop construction documents and bid packages for sub-contractors.

The Purchasing Department issued Request for Proposals 2337-P to secure a Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) for the construction of the Fire & EMS Classroom Building and the Training Tower Construction. Notice of the opportunity was emailed to 15 companies. Another 1,949 were contacted through the web-based Georgia Procurement Registry. The offer was also advertised through Georgia Local Government Access Marketplace, the Fayette County website, Channel 23, and the Fayette County News.

Five firms submitted proposals. The Evaluation Committee, comprised of members from Fire and EMS, Engineering, and the Project Manager scored the proposals based on the Technical Merit criteria documented in the RFP. The criteria included (1) firm history & capability, (2) relevant experience, (3) project personnel, (4) financial information, and (5) project approach. The prices were then scored and added to the Technical Merit scores (Attachment 1).

The Evaluation Committee recommends award of the contract to MEJA Construction, Inc. A Contractor Performance Evaluation is attached (Attachment 2).

MEJA's offered price of \$475,000 includes their General Contractor fee, pre-construction costs, and anticipated General Conditions and General Requirements Costs. These were calculated based on an estimated construction cost of \$5.5 million. The CMAR will competitively select construction subcontractors and suppliers, and then negotiate a Guaranteed Maximum Price with the County. At that point, the Board of Commissioners will be requested to approve the additional amounts, which will be added to the CMAR contract by change order.

Specifics of the proposed contract are as follows:

Contract Name	2337-P: Fayette County Fire & EMS Classroom Building and Training Tower Construction Manager at Risk			
Contractor	MEJA Construction, Inc.			
Contract Amount	\$475,000 excluding actual construction costs, which will be added by change order			
Budget:				
Fund	375	CIP		
Org Code	37530550	Fire		
Object	541210	Other Improvements		
Project	21AR4	Fire Training Building		
Available	\$1,650,000	As of 1/10/2024		

Request for Proposals 2337-P: Fayette County Fire & EMS Classroom Building and Training Tower Construction Manager at Risk

Responder Name: ECHNICAL MERIT:	MAX POINTS	Albion General Contractors, Inc.	Cooper & Co. General Contractors, Inc.	MEJA Construction, Inc.	McLeRoy, Inc.	New South Construction
1 Firm History & Capability	10	7.0	8.2	9.8	5.8	9.2
2 Relevant Experience	20	11.2	18.6	11.8	9.8	19.0
3 Project Personnel	15	10.6	14.4	13.0	6.0	15.0
4 Financial Information	5	2.0	4.0	4.0	2.2	4.6
5 Project Approach	10	8.0	9.0	9.2	3.0	9.6
Technical Merit Score	60	38.8	54.2	47.8	26.8	57.4
Construction Estimate		\$ 5,500,000.00	\$ 5,500,000.00	\$ 5,500,000.00	\$ 5,500,000.00	\$ 5,500,000.00
Pre-Construction Fee		\$ 5,000.00	\$ 19,200.00	\$-	\$ 62,330.00	\$ 45,150.00
GC&GR		\$ 446,672.00	\$ 473,800.00	\$ 310,000.00	\$ 541,502.00	\$ 573,670.00
Construction Management Fee %		4.8%	3.2%	3.0%	3.0%	4.8%
Proposed Price		\$ 712,922.00	\$ 669,000.00	\$ 475,000.00	\$ 768,832.00	\$ 880,070.00
Technical Merit Score	60	38.8	54.2	47.8	26.8	57.4
Proposed Price Score	20	<u>10.0</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>7.6</u>	<u>2.9</u>
Total Score		48.8	66.0	67.8	34.4	60.3

EVALUATION SCORING SHEET

Maximum points available are as follows:

Technical Merit 60 **Proposed Price** 20

Presentation (Optional) <u>20</u> 100

Total Points Available

Attachment 2

FAYETTE COUNTY, GEORGIA
CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Page	1
i uge	

 Use this form to record contractor performance for any contract of \$50,000 or above. 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 A	PPLICA	BLE IN	VFORM	IATIO	N
Company Name: MEJA Construction, Inc.	Contract Number: 2226-P			_		
	Contract Description or Title: Design	Public He	ealth Bu	iilding –	CMAR	vith
	Contract Term (Dates) From:	May 2023	3 - Pres	ent		E.
Phone Number: 770-775-1700	Task Order Number: n/a					
	Other Reference:					
E-Mail Address: jasonrogers@meja.us						
	DEFINITIONS		tana in terrera			
OUTSTANDING – 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. UNSATISFACTORY (UnSat) - Vendor did not meet the minimum contractual requirements or performance expectations of the products/services.				es.		
products and/or services; Performed below minimum requ EVALUATIONS (Place "X'	the second se	each c	riterio	n.)	Martin and Anna	
Criteria (includes change orders /	amendments)	Out- standing	Exc	Sat	Un- Sat	Not
1. Work or other deliverables performed on sch	edule	X			Jai	Apply
2. Condition of delivered products		X				
3. Quality of work		X				
Adherence to specifications or scope of work		X				
5. Timely, appropriate, & satisfactory problem o	r complaint resolution					X
6. Timeliness and accuracy of invoicing			X			
7. Working relationship / interfacing with county staff and citizens			Х			
8. Service Call (On-Call) response time		X				X
9. Adherence to contract budget and schedule						
10. Other (specify): 11. Overall evaluation of contractor performance						
	VALUATED BY	X				
Signature: TASUMonde	Date of Evaluation: Jan	uary 9th 2	024			
Print Name: Tim Symonds	Department/Division:					<u> </u>
Title: Consultant Project Manager	Telephone No: 404-392-5791					
Form Updated 11/16/2016						

	Mentange of Manada and Mine and Mine and	ERFORMANCE EVALUATION Inding or Unsatisfactory Ratings	Page 2		
Company N	ame: MEJA Construction Inc	Contract Number: 2226-P			
	EX	PLANATIONS / COMMENTS			
		of Outstanding or Unsatisfactory. age numbers referenced in the applicable contract, etc.). Impany name and contract number or other reference)	Continue		
normalised sources of sources and the sources of th					
	During the design phase of the Public Health Project, MEJA coordinated and marshalled their design consultants to produce a high quality design within a tight time frame.				
	MEJA's experience and depth of sub-	-contractors was key in developing a competitive and	realistic		
	GMP for the Public Health Project.	The GMP was developed over a 4 week period and co	vered		
	all aspects of the project. Any allowa	ances or risk items were clearly identified and explain	ied.		
	The quality of MEJA's staff and their	r response to questions and issues has been first class	,		
8					
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
		-			

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?):