

To: Tracie Davies, Director
Department of Public Utilities

From: Melinda Cunningham, Capital Fiscal Manager

Date: June 20, 2017

Subject: Holton Park and Eureka Avenue Green Infrastructure Improvements Project
CIP 611030-100000

The Department of Public Utilities solicited Requests for Proposals for the Holton Park and Eureka Avenue Green Infrastructure Improvements Project.

The intent of this project is to provide the City of Columbus, Division of Sewerage and Drainage (DOSD) with detailed design, specifications, contract documents, and other reports required for the construction of the Holton Park and Eureka Ave Green Infrastructure Improvements Project. The scope of work for this project is to perform all the requisite investigation, evaluation, formulation and design work to prepare construction documents for the improvement of water quantity and water quality within the project area(s) using a green infrastructure approach. The City envisions the project shall focus on providing positive treatment of stormwater with Green Infrastructure (GI) prior to its discharge into storm sewers.

The project was formally advertised on the Vendor Services website from May 5, 2017, to May 26, 2017. The city received seven (7) responses. All proposals were deemed responsive and were fully evaluated when the Evaluation Committee met on June 6, 2017.

The responding firms were:

CONSULTANT Sub-consultant	Business Enterprise Status	Contract Compliance Number	Active	% OF WORK	% MAJ. % OTH.
GPD Group	CC	34-1134715	Y	71%	74% MAJ/ 26% OTH
XYZ Professional Serv.	MBE	04-3846618	Y	23%	
NEAS, Inc.	CC	31-1347309	Y	3%	
CTL Engineering	CC/AS1	31-0680767	Y	3%	
RESOURCE INTERNATIONAL, INC.	FBE	31-0669793	Y	56%	61% FBE 39% MAJ
AECOM	CC	95-2661922	Y	24%	
MKSK	TBD	45-3413259	Y	15%	
DHDC	AS1	32-0376762	Y	5%	

Hazen and Sawyer	MAJ	13-2904652	Y	51%	51% MAJ 49% OTH
Dynotec	MBE	31-1319961	Y	45%	
DHDC	AS1	32-0376762	Y	4%	
RA Consultants, LLC	Majority	20-0654077	Y	59%	87% MAJ 13% OTH
Stantec	CC	11-2167170	Y	28%	
DHDC, Inc.	AS1	32-0376762	Y	4%	
E.P. Ferris	CC	31-1194974	Y	65%	85% MAJ 15% OTH
T and M Associates	MAJ	22-1806708	Y	20%	
CTL Engineering, Inc.	AS1	31-0680767	TBD	5%	
Columbus Engineering	MBE	31-0716498	Y	5%	
The Garden Sage	FBE	47-2423067	Y	5%	
GS & P/OH, Inc	CC	62-1736493	Y	72.8%	73% MAJ/ 27% OTH
XYZ Professionals Services	MBE	04-3846618	Y	17.8%	
DHDC, Inc.	AS1	32-0376762	Y	5.4%	
ASC Group	FBE	31-1167506	Y	4%	
Columbus Engineering	MBE	31-0716498	Y	57%	12% MAJ/ 88% OTH
Cha Consulting Inc.	CC	16-0966259	Y	12%	
DLZ	MBR	31-1268980	Y	18%	
Stone Environmental Eng. & Sci	FBE	06-1716807	Y	6%	
Donahue-Ideas	FBE	06-1716807	Y	7%	

This RFP Evaluation Committee included five (5) voting members – Ann Aubry, Danella Pettenski, Steve Salay, and Susan Ashbrook from the Department of Public Utilities and Kaelyn Poindexter from the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. Non-voting members, but attendees, included Monica Hawkins and Lisa Wilson.

Resource International, Inc. received 88 points from the Evaluation Committee (out of a possible 100). The next closest firm was GPD Group with 82 points.

The following is a list of the results of the Evaluation Committee's assessment of the three evaluated proposals for your final selection.

Resource International , Inc.	88
GPD Group	82
E.P. Ferris	81
RA Consultants	81
GS & O/OH	81
Hazen	78
Columbus Engineering	65

The Committee would like to submit Resource International for the Director's review and recommendation. The Committee felt that Resource International submitted the strongest overall proposal for the following reasons:

1. Resource International, Inc. discussed sizing the SWDM and SCPZ.
2. Resource International, Inc. had a strong PM based upon its resume'.
3. Resource International, Inc. discussed potential issues DPU may want to consider.

Per City Code 329.28, please provide direction for proceeding on this project by replying to this e-mail. Four options include:

1. Approve of the committee's recommendation, Resource International, Inc.
2. Reject the committee's recommendations and designate a firm.
3. Call for an oral presentation of the three highest scoring firms.
4. Other.