



SANDY SPRINGS

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

PUBLIC FACILITIES AUTHORITY

Rusty Paul, Chair
John Paulson
Melody Kelley
Melissa Mular
Frank Roberts
Mary Ford
Andrew J. Chinsky

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Special Called Meeting

6:00 PM

The Sandy Springs Public Facilities Authority Meeting will be held in the Studio Theatre at Sandy Springs City Hall (1 Galambos Way, Sandy Springs, GA 30328).

Live-stream: www.SandySpringsGA.gov/stream

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call and General Announcements

III. Approval of Meeting Agenda

IV. Approval of Meeting Minutes

1. **PFA2026-01** Meeting Minutes
October 21, 2025 Public Facilities Authority Special Called Meeting

V. Old Business

VI. New Business

2. **PFA2026-02** Request for Public Facilities Authority Consideration of a Resolution to Approve Contract Award to Reeves Young for Construction Manager at Risk Services for Fire Station No.1 and Fire Station No.4 and to Authorize the Negotiation of a Contract for Same, and to Authorize the Public Facility Authority General Manager to Execute the Contract
(Presented by Dave Wells, Director of Facilities/Capital Construction and Building Operations)

VII. Adjournment

Individuals with disabilities who require certain accommodations in order to allow them to observe and/or participate in a public meeting, or who have questions regarding the accessibility of the meeting or facilities should contact the City Clerk at 770-730-5600 promptly for assistance. The City will make reasonable accommodations for those persons.

1 Galambos Way, Sandy Springs, Georgia 30328 • 770-730-5600 • SandySpringsGA.gov



SANDY SPRINGS

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

TO: Members of the Public Facilities Authority

FROM: Dave Wells, Director of Facilities/Capital Construction and Building Operations

DATE: February 23, 2026 Submission for the March 17, 2026 Public Facilities Authority Meeting

ITEM: Request for Public Facilities Authority Consideration of a Resolution to Approve Contract Award to Reeves Young for Construction Manager at Risk Services for Fire Station No.1 and Fire Station No.4 and to Authorize the Negotiation of a Contract for Same, and to Authorize the Public Facility Authority General Manager to Execute the Contract

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Public Facilities Authority approve a resolution to authorize a contract award to Reeves Young, LLC for Construction Manager at Risk ("CMAR) Services for the construction of the new Fire Station No.1 and Fire Station No.4.

Background:

The City of Sandy Springs (the "City") conducted a two-step solicitation process to select a construction firm with the capacity and demonstrated experience to provide Construction Manager at Risk ("CMAR") services for the construction of two new fire stations. Fire Station No.1, located at 1425 Spalding Drive, Sandy Springs, Georgia, and Fire Station No.4 located at 5275 Roswell Road, Sandy Springs, Georgia (the" Project").

On December 10, 2025, the City issued Request for Qualifications #26-022 ("RFQC") to solicit Statements of Qualifications ("Responses") from highly qualified and experienced firms to perform the services described in the RFQC. Responses were due on January 22, 2026, no later than 2:00 p.m. E.S.T.

The City received Responses from the following eight (8) firms ("Respondents"):

1. Batson-Cook Company
2. Benning Construction Company
3. Carroll Daniel Construction Co.

4. Hoar Construction, LLC
5. Hogan Construction Group, LLC
6. John W. Spratlin & Son, LLC
7. Manhattan Construction Company, LLC
8. Reeves Young, LLC

The Responses were initially examined for administrative compliance with the submittal instructions contained in the RFQC. No administrative compliance issues were noted. An Evaluation Committee consisting of the following City personnel evaluated the Responses using the criteria established in the RFQC:

- Dave Wells, Director of Facilities/Capital Construction and Building Operations
- Richard Collins, City Construction Manager
- Keith Sanders, Fire Chief

Based on the evaluation criteria outlined in the RFQC, seven (7) firms were determined to be qualified and were invited to participate in the second phase of the solicitation process.

On February 3, 2026, the City issued Request for Proposals #26-037 (“RFP”) to the seven qualified firms to solicit Proposals for CMAR services. Proposals were due on February 18, 2026, no later than 2:00 p.m. E.S.T.

Discussion:

The City received Proposals from the following seven (7) firms (“Offerors”):

1. Batson-Cook Company
2. Carroll Daniel Construction Co.
3. Hoar Construction, LLC
4. Hogan Construction Group, LLC
5. John W. Spratlin & Son, LLC
6. Manhattan Construction Company, LLC
7. Reeves Young, LLC

The Proposals were reviewed for administrative compliance with the submittal instructions

contained in the RFP, and no compliance issues were identified.

The Evaluation Committee reviewed and scored the Proposals based on the criteria established in the RFP, including project understanding and approach, schedule and statement of services, project manager and project team qualifications, pre-construction services approach, quality assurance and quality control procedures, safety programs, and fee proposal.

Following the initial scoring of Proposals, the four (4) highest-ranked firms were invited to participate in formal interviews and presentations with the Evaluation Committee on March 2, 2026.

The four highest-ranked firms following initial evaluation were:

Firm	Technical Score	Cost Score	Total Score	Price
Reeves Young, LLC	74.64	20.00	94.67	\$2,339,535.00
John W Spartlin & Sons, LLC	71.33	14.10	85.43	\$3,319,275.00
Hogan Construction Group, LLC	69.97	15.52	85.19	\$3,014,086.00
Carroll Daniel Construction Co.	65.00	17.56	82.56	\$2,664,663.00

Note: The Project construction fee was stated by Offerors as a percentage of the cost of work (estimated at \$30 million for the purposes of scoring). The final fee will vary depending on the cost of work at the time the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) is established.

During the presentations, each firm provided an overview of its proposed project team, relevant experience, approach to pre-construction services, and overall project delivery strategy. Each firm also addressed questions from the Evaluation Committee to clarify aspects of its Proposal.

Following the presentations and discussion among the Evaluation Committee members, Reeves Young, LLC was determined to be the highest-ranked firm. Several factors contributed to this determination, including the following:

- The Reeves Young project team is led by a Project Executive with more than 25 years of municipal construction experience and extensive experience constructing public safety facilities, including fire stations and other municipal buildings.
- The proposed project team members have previously worked together on multiple projects, demonstrating strong collaboration and established working relationships that contribute to effective project delivery.
- Reeves Young demonstrated a clear understanding of the logistical challenges associated with constructing two fire stations located in high traffic areas and emphasized the importance of separating construction activities from public access and coordinating utilities and infrastructure.
- The firm emphasized strong subcontractor engagement during the preconstruction phase to support development of a reliable Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP), including scope confirmation meetings, detailed bid comparisons, and coordination with subcontractors to reduce the risk of budget overruns.
- Reeves Young demonstrated a proactive approach to working with the City and the design team during the design phase to address potential site constraints, scheduling challenges, and operational considerations early in the process.
- The firm also demonstrated a strong approach to value engineering to maintain project functionality while controlling costs and protecting the City's investment in the project.

Financial Impact:

The proposed contract amount for Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) services is \$1,454,535, with a total contract authorization not to exceed \$2,339,535. This authorization includes funding for preconstruction services and general conditions associated with the project. The final contract value will be established upon approval of the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP), which will be based on the actual construction cost and supporting documentation.

Alternatives:

The Public Facilities Authority may choose not to approve the award and provide alternative directions, which could delay project timelines.

Review:

Octavia Baynes, Administrative Asst.	Created/Initiated - 3/3/2026
Richard Collins, Construction Manager	Approved - 3/3/2026
Dave Wells, Director of Facilities/Capital Construction and Building Operations	Approved - 3/6/2026
Toni Carlisle, Chief Financial Officer	Approved - 3/10/2026
Dan Lee, City Attorney	Approved - 3/12/2026
Eden Freeman, City Manager	Final Approval - 3/13/2026

Attachments:

1. Resolution for Reeves Young Fire Station No.1 and No.4 (3.6.26)
2. Evaluation Memo

**STATE OF GEORGIA
COUNTY FULTON**

**A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CONTRACT AWARD TO REEVES YOUNG FOR
CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AT RISK SERVICES FOR FIRE STATION NO.1 AND FIRE
STATION NO.4, TO AUTHORIZE THE NEGOTIATION OF A CONTRACT FOR SAME, AND
TO AUTHORIZE THE PUBLIC AUTHORITY GENERAL MANAGER TO EXECUTE THE
CONTRACT**

WHEREAS, the City of Sandy Springs Public Facilities Authority (“PFA”) desires to construct two new fire stations, Fire Station No.1 located at 1425 Spalding Drive, Sandys Springs, Georgia 30328, and Fire Station No.4 located at 5275 Roswell Road, Sandy Springs, Georgia 30342 (the “Project”); and

WHEREAS, the PFA has engaged the services of an architectural firm and now desires to engage the services of a qualified contractor to serve as the construction manager at risk to construct the Project according to plans developed by the architectural firm and the City of Sandy Springs (the “City”); and

WHEREAS, to advance that objective, the City utilized a two (2) phase solicitation process (“Solicitation”), including the issuance of a Request for Qualifications (“RFQC”) on December 10, 2025, and the issuance of a Request for Proposals (“RFP”) on February 3, 2026, to select a qualified construction manager at risk for the Project; and

WHEREAS, an evaluation committee formed by the City (“Evaluation Committee”) evaluated the Responses consistent with criteria established by the terms of the RFQC; and

WHEREAS, following evaluation of the Responses, the Evaluation Committee invited seven (7) firms, including Reeves Young, LLC, to submit proposals in the RFP phase of the Solicitation, to enable the Evaluation Committee to select a proposal for the Project that represents the best overall value for the City and its residents; and

WHEREAS, as the result of its evaluation, the Evaluation Committee has provided its Evaluation Memorandum, in the form attached to this Resolution, presenting the results of its evaluation and recommending contract award to Reeves Young, LLC; and

WHEREAS, Reeves Young, LLC proposed a cost of services of \$1,454,535.00 plus 2.95% of the total construction cost of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the PFA desires to make award to Reeves Young, LLC based on the recommendations of the Evaluation Committee consistent with the attached Evaluation Memorandum.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF SANDY SPRINGS PUBLIC
FACILITIES AUTHORITY, AS FOLLOWS:**

1. Reeves Young, LLC is hereby awarded a contract for construction of the Project in the amount of \$1,454,535.00 plus 2.95% of the total construction cost of the Project, upon such terms and conditions as agreed by the parties; and
2. The General Manager and the City Attorney are hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with Reeves Young, LLC incorporating terms and conditions determined to be in the best interest of the PFA and the City; and

3. The General Manager is hereby authorized to execute the contract, pending the approval of the City Attorney and the Treasurer; and
4. The General Manager and appropriate staff are hereby authorized to take such actions as shall be deemed necessary or desirable to effectuate the intent of this Resolution.

SO RESOLVED this the 17th March 2026.

Approved:

Russell K. Paul, Chairman

Attest:

Raquel Gonzalez, Secretary

(Seal)

EVALUATION MEMORANDUM
Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposals #26-022 & 26-037
Construction Manager at Risk Services
For New Fire Stations No. 1 and No. 4

General

The City of Sandy Springs (“City”) conducted a two-step solicitation process to select a construction firm with the capacity and demonstrated experience to provide Construction Manager at Risk (“CMAR”) services for two new fire stations: Fire Station No. 1, located at 1425 Spalding Drive, Sandy Springs, Georgia 30328, and Fire Station No. 4 located at 5275 Roswell Road, Sandy Springs, Georgia 30342 (the “Project”). The first step consisted of issuing a Request for Qualifications (“RFQC”), followed by a Request for Proposals (“RFP”). On December 10, 2025, the City issued the RFQC to solicit Statements of Qualifications (“Responses”) from highly qualified and experienced firms to perform the Services described in the RFQC. Responses to the RFQC were due on January 22, 2026, no later than 2:00 p.m. E.S.T.

Responses Received

The City received Responses from the following eight (8) firms (“Respondents”):

1. Batson-Cook Company
2. Benning Construction Company
3. Carroll Daniel Construction Co.
4. Hoar Construction, LLC
5. Hogan Construction Group, LLC
6. John W. Spratlin & Son, LLC
7. Manhattan Construction Company, LLC
8. Reeves Young, LLC

The Responses were initially examined for administrative compliance with submittal instructions contained in the RFQC. No administrative compliance issues were noted.

Evaluation

The City formed a committee (“Evaluation Committee”) consisting of the following City personnel to evaluate Responses using the criteria set forth in the RFQC and to recommend a qualified firm to perform the Services:

1. Dave Wells, Director of Facilities/Capital Construction and Building Operations, City of Sandy Springs
2. Richard Collins, City Construction Manager, City of Sandy Springs
3. Keith Sanders, Fire Chief, City of Sandy Springs

Evaluation Criteria

Section 4 of the RFQC identified the criteria on which the City would base evaluation of Responses. The Evaluation Committee used the following criteria to review Responses and to determine which Respondents would be invited to submit on the RFP portion of the proposal.

1. General Qualifications

2. Relevant experience of the company
3. Statement of Suitability of the company for the Project

Utilizing all criteria stated, Responses were scored and ranked in accordance with the following:

CRITERIA	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION	SCORE
General Qualifications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Company Overview <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Proposing company’s name and primary contact for the Response. b) Address of company’s headquarters and, if applicable, the address of the local branch. c) Office designated for the Project, and distance to the Project. d) Indicate number of years in business under the name stated above. Describe company ownership structure and provide a brief company history. e) Organizational chart of the company showing authority, structure, and depth of resources. f) List number of permanent employees. If a branch office will be utilized, further indicate the employee breakdown by professional discipline for that office and an organization chart for that office. g) Describe significant company changes that are anticipated to occur over the duration of the Project. h) Provide a list of current ongoing projects (including preconstruction and construction) i) A Georgia Commercial General Contractors License or a Commercial General Contractor License with Qualifying Agent being associated with the Respondent shall be required. 2. Financial / Legal Information <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) List company’s total annual billings for the past five (5) years. b) Provide a copy of your company’s latest financial statement and the name/phone of company’s primary banker. c) Provide the name of company’s bonding company and name/phone of the local agent. d) Provide a letter from the surety indicating company’s current bonding capacity and the surety’s willingness to bond the work under consideration. Indicate the A.M. Best rating for company’s surety and its status to do business in Georgia. e) Has the company ever defaulted on a contract? If so, explain. f) Has the company been involved in litigation or arbitration with an owner in the last five (5) years? If so, describe each instance giving specific details regarding the reasons for the claim and amount in dispute. Explain how the claim was resolved. 	Pass / Fail

Relevant Experience	<p>a) Distinguish the company by describing its local office’s current, and relevant experience with project components described within this RFQC, similar renovation projects, police, courts, etc., and the year each project was completed. Identify each project as to whether it was constructed by this office or performed by other out-of-state offices.</p> <p>b) Provide a description of the company’s (local office’s) five (5) most relevant projects currently underway or completed within the last five (5) years. Include name of project, location, construction value, schedule, completion date, owner (with name and current phone number of contact), architect (with name and phone number of contact), and the names of project team members involved. Identify each project as to whether it was constructed by this office or performed by other out-of-state offices.</p> <p>c) Describe the company’s approach to utilizing technology in construction and what technologies you intend to incorporate into the Project.</p> <p>d) Describe the company’s understanding of the open book contracting approach.</p> <p>e) Provide resumes of your proposed main Project team members, including proximity to the Project, similar project experience, years with the firm, years in this position, project references, projects constructed together. (Do not provide resumes of individuals that will not be involved day to day in the Project or those who will not be on-site).</p>	Pass / Fail
Statement of Suitability for Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a statement or specific information that may serve to differentiate the firm from other firms in suitability for the Project. Suitability may include, but is not limited to, the firm’s fit to the Project and/or needs of the City, any special or unique qualifications for the Project, current and projected workloads, the proximity of office to Project location, and any techniques or methodologies offered by the firm that may be particularly suitable for unique aspects of the Project. 	Pass / Fail

Evaluation

Following individual review and scoring, Evaluation Committee members met to discuss the Responses. The Evaluation Committee reached consensus and selected seven (7) qualified Respondents that passed all criteria and clearly demonstrated a superior understanding of the Project, with past experience very relevant to the Project. The following Respondents were invited to submit proposals in the second step in the solicitation process pursuant to the requirements of the RFP:

COMPANY	CONSENSUS SCORE
Batson-Cook Company	Pass
Carroll Daniel Construction Co.	Pass
Hoar Construction, LLC	Pass
Hogan Construction Group, LLC	Pass
John W. Spratlin & Son, LLC	Pass
Manhattan Construction Company, LLC	Pass
Reeves Young, LLC	Pass
Benning Construction Company	Fail

On February 3, 2026, the City issued the RFP to seek proposals (“Proposals”) from the seven (7) firms above to perform the Services described in the RFP. Proposals were due on February 18, 2026, no later than 2:00 PM E.S.T.

Proposals Received

The City received Proposals from the following seven (7) firms (“Offerors”):

1. Batson-Cook Company
2. Carroll Daniel Construction Co.
3. Hoar Construction, LLC
4. Hogan Construction Group, LLC
5. John W. Spratlin & Son, LLC
6. Manhattan Construction Company, LLC
7. Reeves Young, LLC

Proposals were initially examined for administrative compliance with RFP submittal instructions. No administrative compliance issues were noted.

Evaluation Criteria

Section 4 of the RFP identified the criteria on which the City would base evaluation of Proposals. Proposals were divided into two (2) components: Technical Proposal and Fee/Cost Proposal. The Evaluation Committee used the following criteria to review Proposals and to determine which Offerors would be invited for formal interviews and presentations.

Technical Proposal criteria were as follows:

1. Project Understanding and Approach
2. Schedule / Statement of Services
3. Project manager and Project Team
4. Pre-Construction Services
5. Quality Assurance-Quality Control / Safety

Fee/Cost Proposal criteria were as follows:

1. Lump sum pre-construction fee for the Project
2. Lump sum general conditions fee for the Project
3. Lumps sum bond fee for the Project
4. Project construction fee stated as a percentage of direct costs and general conditions costs

Utilizing all criteria stated, Proposals were scored and ranked in accordance with the following:

CRITERIA	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION	POINTS
Project Understanding/ Approach	Include a description of the Offeror's understanding of the proposed Project as outlined in the RFP, the magnitude of the scope of services, and the desired outcomes for the Project. The overall approach should include any tools or methodologies that are needed to complete multiple sites on time and within scope and budget.	10% 10 points possible
Schedule/Statement of Services	Include a description of how the Offeror proposes to complete the Project. It should spell out how this work can be performed in a cost-effective manner. Describe the Offeror's approach to schedule adherence and the specific methods and techniques that are utilized. Address specifically the approaches used to bring the Project back on overall schedule should the short-term schedule fall behind, including but not limited to supply chain disruptions and weather delays. Give specific examples and details where the team proposed for this Project has used these approaches successfully. Provide conceptual schedules for this project.	10% 10 points possible
Project Manager and Project Team	Submit the name of the proposed Project Manager and team members for this Project. Provide related individual experience on essential facilities not limited to fire stations, police stations, emergency operation centers, and other similar facilities and provide the organizational chart for the project team. The proposed project Team shall be the same Team that the offeror intends to provide for the project. Switching of Team members during the project will prompt contract provisions to be enacted.	25% 25 points possible
Pre-Construction Services	<p>a) Describe how the Offeror provides pre-construction services and who will be responsible for the day-to-day estimating effort. Provide a detailed description of the process that this individual will follow to develop a GMP while holding subcontractors accountable for a complete scope of services based upon incomplete documents.</p> <p>b) Explain how the Offeror will provide meaningful design, construction, cost, logistics, and value engineering input during pre-construction and the extent to which subcontractors will be utilized.</p> <p>c) Provide examples where the Offeror has identified value engineering ideas, what those ideas were, what the cost/schedule impact was, and the end result</p>	25% 25 points possible
Quality Assurance- Quality Control / Safety	<p>Describe the Offeror's quality assurance and quality control program and indicate the parties responsible for quality assurance and quality control. Does the Offeror have a formal quality control program? How will the Offeror coordinate any special inspections as required by applicable code(s) including but not limited to NFPA 1500, 1581, and 1851 and City required inspections?</p> <p>a) Describe the Offeror's safety program and indicate the parties</p>	10% 10 points possible

	responsible for safety. Provide the Offeror's safety record (EMR) ratings for the past one (1) year and five (5) years. b) Indicate the Offeror's policy on drugs, alcohol, and smoking for both employees and subcontractors working on the Project.	
Fee/Cost Proposal	The Cost Proposal will be evaluated for technically qualified Offerors after Technical Proposals are evaluated. The cost criterion is rated by giving the Proposal with the lowest total cost the maximum number of cost points available (20 points).	20% 20 points possible
	TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE	100%

Formal Interviews and Presentations

After initial scoring of Proposals, the four (4) highest-ranking Offerors were invited to make presentations to the Evaluation Committee on March 2, 2026. The top-ranked Offerors were:

FIRM	TECHNICAL SCORE	COST SCORE	TOTAL SCORE	PRICE
Reeves Young, LLC	74.67	20.00	94.67	\$2,339,535.00
John W. Spratlin & Son, LLC	71.33	14.10	85.43	\$3,319,275.00
Hogan Construction Group, LLC	69.97	15.52	85.19	\$3,014,086.00
Carroll Daniel Construction Co.	65.00	17.56	82.56	\$2,664,663.00

NOTE: The Project construction fee was stated by Offerors as a percentage of the cost of work (estimated at \$30M for the purposes of scoring). The actual final fee will vary depending on the cost of work at the time the guaranteed maximum price is determined under the contract to be entered into between the City and the selected firm.

In the presentations, each Offeror provided a brief overview of the proposing firm and prior relevant experience examples. Each Offeror also responded to Evaluation Committee questions for clarification of aspects of its Proposal.

Results

Following presentations, the Evaluation Committee discussed each presenting Offeror to determine a final ranking. After considering information and clarification gained in the presentations, the Evaluation Committee determined that Reeves Young received the highest rankings. Several factors were important to the Evaluation Committee in making this selection, including the following:

- The Reeves Young project team is led by a Project Executive with more than 25 years of municipal construction experience. The team has extensive public safety construction experience, primarily involving fire stations, along with additional municipal work including fleet maintenance facilities and public safety complexes. In addition, the proposed team members have previously worked together on multiple projects, demonstrating strong collaboration and established working relationships that contribute to effective team synergy.

- The Reeves Young team understands the importance of phasing work with both fire stations, being built in high traffic areas separating the construction traffic from public access, understanding the importance of the coordination of utilities and infrastructure.
- Expressed the importance of subcontractor involvement during the preconstruction phase to ensure an accurate and valid established Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP):
 - Establishing inclusions and exclusions of the scope of work, schedule, expectations, and bonding requirements.
 - Upon receipt of bids from subcontractor the Lead Estimator, completes a line-by-line comparison to identify potential concerns that need to be addressed.
 - Engages in scope confirmation meetings with subcontractors, providing bid leveling documentation to reduce the risk of budget overruns.
- Reeves Young staff will engage proactively with the City and Architect, addressing key elements such as budget, schedule, and long-term performance.
- Potential issues such as site constraints, concurrent operations, and workflow demands will be identified and addressed during the design phase rather than during construction, helping to reduce potential time delays.
- The firm understands that value engineering is a tool for maintaining desired functional and operational needs. They provided past examples demonstrating how these efforts have helped shorten project schedules and reduce costs. This approach reflects strong stewardship of public funds by ensuring that allocated resources are used efficiently, allowing potential savings to be reinvested for the benefit of the community.

Recommendation

Based upon evaluation of Proposals in accordance with the criteria and process described herein, in the RFQC and in the RFP, the Evaluation Committee believes that the Proposal submitted by Reeves Young, LLC represents the best value for the City and therefore recommends it for contract award.

Name: Dave Wells, Director of Facilities and Capital Construction
 Title: Evaluation Committee Chair