

MEMO

To: Mayor and Council of the Borough of Metuchen

From: Rebecca Cuthbert, CFO/CTC/Acting QPA

Date: July 9, 2021

Re: Summary Report of the Evaluation of Proposals Submitted for awarding a Historic Preservation Consultant

On March 8, 2021, pursuant to *N.J.S.A. 40A:11-4.3*, and by way of Resolution 2021-86 the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Metuchen authorized the use of competitive contracting for Services for Development of a Historic Preservation Ordinance for the Borough of Metuchen. Thereafter, a Request for Proposal (“RFP”) was prepared by the Borough for a Historic Preservation Professional. On or about June 3, 2021, the Borough of Metuchen advertised a Notice of the Request for Proposal for a Historic Preservation Professional. The RFP required that all proposals were to be submitted to the Borough by June 25, 2021. The Borough received two (4) proposals in response to the RFP from the following: (1) PS &S, (2) Richard Grubb & Associates, (3) Easton Architects and (4) Barton Ross & Partners LLC.

An Evaluation Committee was formulated to review and evaluate the proposals submitted and to make a recommendation to the Mayor and Council. The Evaluation Committee was comprised of the following: (1) Borough Administrator Melissa Perilstein, (2) CFO/CTC/Acting QPA Rebecca Cuthbert, (3) Councilperson Tyler Kandel and (4) Historic Preservation Committee Member Suzanne Andrews.

Pursuant to the criteria set forth in the RFP, proposals were evaluated by the Committee on the basis of the most advantageous, cost and all relevant factors considered for the Borough, more specifically, the Committee evaluated the proposals using the following criteria:

CRITERIA: Management, Technical and cost related criteria used to evaluate the Contractors	Weighting Factor	Points (5 is the highest)
1 – Management Criteria: Experience and reputation in the field. Considers financial viability, stability, performance investigation, litigation/pending litigation, experience, and list of references. Considers the proposed staffing and the availability to accommodate the Borough’s needs and any required meetings of the Borough or other Agency.	30%	0 to 5

<p>2 – Technical Criteria: Considers the ability to provide services, operational efficiency, management capabilities. Considers the Consultant’s program overview, resources, systems, procedures, processes, and evaluation and implementation criteria.</p>	<p>40%</p>	<p>0 to 5</p>
<p>3 – Cost Criteria: What is the cost of the services to be provided? How do the costs compare among consultants?</p>	<p>30%</p>	<p>0 to 5</p>

It is my understanding that the Evaluation Committee independently reviewed and evaluated each of the proposals received. Two proposals received were not submitted for evaluation as those two proposals were above the available grant and required matching funds of \$20,000. The individual scoring sheets of the Evaluation Committee were used to prepare the within Summary Report to the Mayor and Council. The results of the scoring of the Committee are as follows:

Barton Ross & Partners LLC						
Criteria (Weighting Factor)	Borough Administrator Scoring (Weighted Score)	CFO/CTC/Acting QPA Scoring (Weighted Score)	Borough Councilperson Scoring (Weighted Score)	Historic Preservation Committee Member Scoring (Weighted Score)	Total Score (Weighted Average)	Total Weighted Score
Management (30%)	5 (1.5)	5 (1.5)	5 (1.5)	5 (1.5)	20 (.15)	6
Technical (40%)	5 (2)	5 (2)	4 (1.6)	4 (1.6)	18 (1.8)	7.2
Cost Criteria (30%)	5 (1.5)	5 (1.5)	5 (1.5)	5 (1.5)	20 (1.5)	6
	5	5	4.6	4.6	(4.8)	19.2

Richard Grubb & Associates						
Criteria (Weighting Factor)	Borough Administrator Scoring (Weighted Score)	CFO/CTC/Acting QPA Scoring (Weighted Score)	Borough Councilperson Scoring (Weighted Score)	Historic Preservation Committee Member Scoring (Weighted Score)	Total Score (Weighted Average)	Total Weighted Score
Management (30%)	4 (1.2)	4 (1.2)	4 (1.2)	3(0.9)	15 (.113)	4.5
Technical (40%)	4 (1.6)	3 (1.2)	5 (2)	4 (1.6)	16(1.6)	6.4
Cost Criteria (30%)	4 (1.2)	4 (1.2)	4 (1.2)	3.5 (1.05)	15.5 (1.16)	4.65
	4	3.6	4.4	3.55	(3.89)	15.55

Based upon the above, Barton Ross & Partners, LLC has the highest weighted score in the amount of 19.2 to 15.55 of Richard Grubb & Associates. In fact, all the members of the Committee had Barton Ross & Partners, LLC overall score above Richard Grubb & Associates.