



Criterion (from public notice): Qualifications of Offeror of the Primary Staff to provide services - Criteria 1

Offeror: EMH&T

Proposed Subcontractors: Ribway Engineering Group

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
25	20

**Identify personnel and training/education**

Note: Does the proposed project manager have the appropriate education and training. (10 points) Does the offeror have Utility and Government experience? (5 points) Does the personnel proposed by the offeror have experience with projects of similar size, complexity, and coordination requirements? (10 points) 8, 5, 7. Good experience with Utility and Government with a good project manager. Experience with projects of this size is limited.

Offeror: Sanborn

Proposed Subcontractors: Resource International, HLG Engineering

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
25	17

**Identify personnel and training/education**

6, 5, 6 While the PM looks good on paper, he was unavailable for the presentation. This was important to the team as he was involved with previous City of Columbus Vision project. Sanborn lacks experience as a prime in project of similar size, complexity, and coordination.

Offeror: Woolpert

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
25	24

**Identify personnel and training/education**

10, 5, 9, Vendor has experience with 12 data conversion project of which 8 were Water data conversion. Sub lacks experience with projects of this size.

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Subcontractors: \_\_\_\_\_

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received

**Identify personnel and training/education**

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Subcontractors: \_\_\_\_\_

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received

**Identify personnel and training/education**

Criterion (from public notice): Project Approach - methodology - Criteria 2

Offeror: EMH&T

Proposed Subcontractors: Ribway Engineering Group

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
25	20

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**

Note: Did the Offeror provide a suggested project plan that is realistic? (10 points) Evidence of understanding scope of work and challenges of project? (10 points) Did the offeror define an innovative approach that clearly defines a positive impact on the project scope, budget, and schedule? (5 points) 8, 7, 5. Project approach was realistic and innovative but lacked detail in describing challenges of this project.

Offeror: Sanborn

Proposed Subcontractors: Resource International, HLG Engineering

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
25	16

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**

7, 6, 3. AML procedures will not satisfy all of the requirements of a geo-database validation. The project plan was heavily reliant on GPS. Presentation focused on Dallas project which was a GPS project. Vendor wants to use GPS instead of available source documents.

Offeror: Woolpert

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
25	24

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**

9, 10, 5. Conversion will be done in ArcGIS using the city data model. Custom tools will be provided for editing of data. Proposing using city staff to do conversion as an intergrated team. This will serve as a training process for city employees. Will provide conversion procedures manual.

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Subcontractors: \_\_\_\_\_

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**

Offeror: Westin

Proposed Subcontractors: \_\_\_\_\_

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**

Criterion (from public notice): Success in controlling costs - maintaining schedules Criteria 3

Offeror: EMH&T

Proposed Subcontractors: Ribway Engineering Group

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
15	13

**Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided**

Note: Availability of Project Personnel for this project? (5 points) Availability of hardware and software dedicated to this project? (5 points) Location(s) of all work that will be performed? (5 points) 5, 3, 5. Concern for what software is available and what software will have to be secured.

Offeror: Sanborn

Proposed Subcontractors: Resource International, HLG Engineering

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
15	14

**Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided**

4, 5, 5 Project Manager was not available for presentation, nor did vendor request to reschedule when PM would be available. Not able to determine what office the PM, coordinator and principal will work from.

Offeror: Woolpert

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
15	13

**Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided**

5, 5, 3. Woolpert has staff that are wrapping up projects and will be available by the end of April. All software and hardware will be provided by Woolpert. 50% of the work will be done in Columbus, the other 50% will be done in Dayton.

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Subcontractors: \_\_\_\_\_

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received

**Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided**

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Subcontractors: \_\_\_\_\_

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received

**Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided**

Criterion (from public notice): Past Performance on similar projects- Criteria 4

Offeror: EMH&T

Proposed Subcontractors: Ribway Engineering Group

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	17

**Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided**

Note: Has the Offeror been successful in completing similar projects on budget and on time? (10) Has the Offeror demonstrated past success in controlling cost? (10) 8, 9. Past experience with the CMOM project was very positive with regards to time, budget and cost. Other references had similar experience.

Offeror: Sanborn

Proposed Subcontractors: Resource International, HLG Engineering

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	16

**Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided**

8, 8 Reference checks indicated past success in staying on time and within budget.

Offeror: Woolpert

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
20	18

**Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided**

9, 9 Reference checks indicated on-time and on-budget with good quality control. Use Microsoft Project to track resources.

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Subcontractors: \_\_\_\_\_

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received

**Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided**

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Subcontractors: \_\_\_\_\_

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received

**Major Concerns: Explanation of Points Provided**

Criterion (from public notice): Professional Qualifications - Criteria 5

Offeror: EMH&T

Proposed Subcontractors: Ribway Engineering Group

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
5	5

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**

Note: Did Offeror provide a list of references of similar projects? (5) 5 All references checked were very positive.

Offeror: Sanborn

Proposed Subcontractors: Resource International, HLG Engineering

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
5	5

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**

5. Only concern is that Sanborn has normally been the sub on previous projects, limited experience as the prime.

Offeror: Woolpert

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
5	5

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**

5 - Good reference checks. This firm offers a problem resolution form website using live data, along with some automated QA/QC tools. They have a conversion checklist. In addition to delivering converted data in the data model, they will use the city data model during the conversion.

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Subcontractors: \_\_\_\_\_

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Subcontractors: \_\_\_\_\_

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**

Criterion (from public notice): Location of staff - Criteria 6

Offeror: EMH&T

Proposed Subcontractors: Ribway Engineering Group

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
10	10

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**

Note: Location of office of Lead Consultant where majority of work will be performed? 1. Within City of Columbus corporate limits or Franklin County (10 points) 2. Within counties contiguous to Franklin County, but not within City of Columbus (8 points) 3. Within State of Ohio (5 points) 4. Outside the State of Ohio (2 points). 10. This is a local firm that does significant business with the City of Columbus.

Offeror: Sanborn

Proposed Subcontractors: Resource International, HLG Engineering

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
10	10

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**

10 - Lead consultant will work in Columbus, but is headquartered in Colorado.

Offeror: Woolpert

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received
10	5

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**

Lead consultant is located in Dayton.

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Subcontractors: \_\_\_\_\_

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**

Offeror: Westin

Proposed Subcontractors: \_\_\_\_\_

Max. # pts. Possible	Avg. pts. Received

**Major Concerns; Explanation of Points Provided**