



NEW HANOVER COUNTY  
FINANCE DEPARTMENT

To: All Bidders  
From: Tamara Matthews, Purchasing Agent  
Date: August 23, 2021  
Subject: **Award of Bid to All Clear for the RFP-Emergency Operations Plan and Continuity of Operations Plan Update**

On July 9, 2021, at 5:00 p.m., twelve (12) proposals were received in response to the County's solicitation for **RFP-Emergency Operations Plan and Continuity of Operations Plan Update**. The following firms listed below submitted proposals:

1. All Clear\*
2. Olsen Group\*
3. Insight Planning and Development\*
4. Bold Planning\*
5. Guidepost\*
6. Diligent\*
7. AARC Consultants
8. Ascentra
9. EL Robinson
10. Tidal Basin
11. Templar Shield
12. Your Crisis Team

\*Denotes Firms Selected for Interviews

Proposals were reviewed by the Selection Department Team on 07/20/2021. Six (6) firms were selected for interviews that were held on 08/09/2021, 08/10/2021, and 08/11/2021.

Following the interviews, the Selection Department Team recommended award to **All Clear**.

A copy of the RFP Summary is attached for your information. If you have any questions, please email [tmatthews@nhcgov.com](mailto:tmatthews@nhcgov.com). A special thanks to each of you for your participation in this solicitation.

**Department Selection Team:** Steven Still (NHC), Natosha Tew (Wilmington), David Heglar (Kure Beach)

Bids Mailed	Bids Received	Alternate Bids	Pre-Bids	No Bids	Bid Closing Date	Bid Closing Time	Purchasing Agent	Bid Tab By
-	12	-	-	-	07/09/2021	5:00pm	Tamara Matthews	Anna McRay

**Meeting schedule:**

- Packet review – 07/20/2021
- Vendor interviews – 08/09/2021, 08/10/2021, 08/11/2021
- Selection to Purchasing – 08/12/2021

**Summary**

S. Still	Vendor/Consultant	Which projects bid?	History, experience, qualifications (70 points)	Final Price (15 points) (Lowest bid/vendor's price)x15	Work Plan and Schedule (15 points)	Total	Comments
1	All Clear	EOP project; COOP project	70	8.9 \$89,000	15	93.9	Clear understanding of scope of work, clear experience and depth within company.
2	Insight	EOP project; COOP project	70	8.8 \$89,958	10	88.8	Small, new company but has relevant previous experience with our haz mit plan and relationships and familiarity with state of NC; very small bench
3	Olsen	EOP project; COOP project	65	10.1 \$79,500.00	10	85.1	Large company, regional experience; no NC

							presence although close by
4	AARC Consultants	EOP project; COOP project	60	5.9 \$135,540.00	15	80.9	Price too high; project information was openly available on the County website in BoCC minutes, posted budget information, and news stories
5	Ascentra	EOP project; COOP project	50	15 \$53,300.00	15	80	Heavily dependent on virtual meetings with seemingly no/little face to face time
6	Bold Planning	EOP project; COOP project	60	13.4 \$59,737.50	5	78.4	Proprietary software; would have to go to ITCG and would greatly reduce timeline; not requested in the RFP
7	Tidal Basin	EOP project; COOP project	70	3 \$262,130.00	5	78	Price too high; project information was openly available on the County website in BoCC minutes, posted budget information, and news stories

8	EL Robinson	EOP project; COOP project	60	2.4 \$329,190.20	15	77.4	Price too high; project information was openly available on the County website in BoCC minutes, posted budget information, and news stories
9	Guidepost	EOP project; COOP project	50	8.36 \$95,575.00	15	73.4	Focused on THIRA, which is not in scope
10	Diligent	EOP project; COOP project	30	11.2 \$71,160.00	10	51.2	No experience; all virtual work for projects
11	Templar Shield	EOP project; COOP project	30	0.5 \$1,760,000.00	5	35.5	Price too high; project information was openly available on the County website in BoCC minutes, posted budget information, and news stories
12	Your Crisis Team	EOP project; COOP project	0	7.9 \$100,000.00	15	22.9	Not responsive (they did not include signed sheets nor an appropriate proposal – they only submitted an unsigned letter and a timeline)

<b>N. Tew</b>	<b>Vendor/Consultant</b>	<b>Which projects bid?</b>	<b>History, experience, qualifications (7 points)</b>	<b>Final Price (15 points) (Lowest bid/vendor's price)x15</b>	<b>Work Plan and Schedule (1.5 points)</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	All Clear	EOP project; COOP project	70	8.9 \$89,000	15	93.9	Not a 'cookie cutter'; plan need to fit agency needs; aware of local needs; practical preparedness; great presentation; deep bench of resources
2	Insight	EOP project; COOP project	70	8.8 \$89,958	10	88.8	No presentation; local with experience with state EM; local NC partner experience; enough staff?
3	Olsen	EOP project; COOP project	65	10.1 \$79,500.00	10	85.1	Good presentation; not local but available to attend local meetings as needed; built flexibility into schedule; experience at local level EM; provide monthly written report; offers Senior Executive level Workshop

4	AARC Consultants	EOP project; COOP project	60	5.9 \$135,540.00	15	80.9	Price too high; project information was openly available on the County website in BoCC minutes, posted budget information, and news stories
5	Ascentra	EOP project; COOP project	50	15 \$53,300.00	15	80	Heavily dependent on virtual meetings with seemingly no/little face to face time
6	Bold Planning	EOP project; COOP project	60	13.4 \$59,737.50	5	78.4	Virtual workshops via online platform; ongoing maintenance cost to keep plans on servers
7	Tidal Basin	EOP project; COOP project	70	3 \$262,130.00	5	78	Price too high; project information was openly available on the County website in BoCC minutes, posted budget information, and news stories
8	EL Robinson	EOP project; COOP project	60	2.4 \$329,190.20	15	77.4	Price too high; project information was openly available on the County website in BoCC minutes, posted

							budget information, and news stories
9	Guidepost	EOP project; COOP project	50	8.36 \$95,575.00	15	73.6	Not local and unfamiliar with the territory (comment about Wilmington being rural with WUI concern?); very LEO and security centric; willing to attend council briefings
10	Diligent	EOP project; COOP project	30	11.2 \$71,160.00	10	51.2	No PowerPoint presentation; not local; experience at federal and state level; available to attend briefings
11	Templar Shield	EOP project; COOP project	30	0.5 \$1,760,000.00	5	35.5	Price too high; project information was openly available on the County website in BoCC minutes, posted budget information, and news stories
12	Your Crisis Team	EOP project; COOP project	0	7.9 \$100,000.00	15	22.9	Not responsive (they did not include signed sheets nor an appropriate proposal – they only submitted an

							unsigned letter and a timeline)
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------------

<b>D. Hegl</b>	<b>Vendor/Consultant</b>	<b>Which projects bid?</b>	<b>History, experience, qualifications (7 points)</b>	<b>Final Price (15 points) (Lowest bid/vendor's price)x15</b>	<b>Work Plan and Schedule (1.5 points)</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	All Clear	EOP project; COOP project	70	8.9 \$89,000	15	93.9	organized – more people; strong presentation highlighting entire team history; strong bench
2	Insight	EOP project; COOP project	70	8.8 \$89,958	10	88.8	Focus on governmental work - good understanding of the communities
3	Olsen	EOP project; COOP project	65	10.1 \$79,500.00	10	85.1	AGILE Proj Management – excellent experience – Focus on EOP/COOP with governmental agencies - no local footprint – VA, GA closest SENOIR LEADER WORKSHOP
4	AARC Consultants	EOP project; COOP project	60	5.9 \$135,540.00	15	80.9	Price too high; project information was openly available on the County



							website in BoCC minutes, posted budget information, and news stories
5	Ascentra	EOP project; COOP project	50	15 \$53,300.00	15	80	Too many meetings would be virtual; concerned about low price offering as compared to others and quality of product; staff expertise seemed weak
6	Bold Planning	EOP project; COOP project	60	13.4 \$59,737.50	5	78.4	Annual maintenance cost after 2 years – no limit to users or plans – enterprise license – NHC IT issues most likely
7	Tidal Basin	EOP project; COOP project	70	3 \$262,130.00	5	78	Price too high; project information was openly available on the County website in BoCC minutes, posted budget information, and news stories
8	EL Robinson	EOP project; COOP project	60	2.4 \$329,190.20	15	77.4	Price too high; project information was openly available on the County website in BoCC

							minutes, posted budget information, and news stories
9	Guidepost	EOP project; COOP project	50	8.36 \$95,575.00	15	73.4	Good experience – but focused on security and not aware of the state of the area
10	Diligent	EOP project; COOP project	30	11.2 \$71,160.00	10	51.2	Newer company detailed review of background – size? Very small – no bench strength
11	Templar Shield	EOP project; COOP project	30	0.5 \$1,760,000.00	5	35.5	Price too high; project information was openly available on the County website in BoCC minutes, posted budget information, and news stories
12	Your Crisis Team	EOP project; COOP project	0	7.9 \$100,000.00	15	22.9	Not responsive (they did not include signed sheets nor an appropriate proposal – they only submitted an unsigned letter and a timeline)