EVALUATION CRITERION	A. PROPOSAL QUALITY		B. PROJECT TEAM EXPERIENCE			C. TEAM WORKLOAD	D. ABILITY TO MEET SCHEDULES & BUDGET		E. LOCAL WORKFORCE		
	A.1. Project Approach is Easy to Undertsnad	A.2. Proposal Demostrates Understanding of Project	B.1. Education and Training	B.2. Experience on Similar Porjects	B.3. Past Performance	C.1. Team Availability	D.1. Demonstrated Ability to meet Budgets & Timelines	D.2. Schedule Realistic & Flexible	E.1. At least 90% of the Team's project labor costs are assignable to employees paying City of Columbus income tax on the date the proposal is submitted		
	← AVERAGE COMBINED SCORE	← AVERAGE COMBINED SCORE	← AVERAGE COMBINED SCORE	← AVERAGE COMBINED SCORE	← AVERAGE COMBINED SCORE	← AVERAGE COMBINED SCORE	← AVERAGE COMBINED SCORE	← AVERAGE COMBINED SCORE	ASSIGNED SCORE	Totals	Rank
Max Point Value =	5	10	10	20	20	5	5	5	20	100	
ADR	2.67	5.83	7.00	15.33	14.67	4.67	4.67	4.33	20	79.17	5
ARCADIS	4.00	7.50	9.00	18.33	17.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	20	90.17	3
Brown and Caldwell	4.67	8.33	8.67	18.67	18.00	4.67	4.67	4.67	20	92.33	1
GS&P/OH	5.00	8.17	8.33	18.33	17.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	20	91.17	2
Stone Environmental	3.33	6.67	7.33	16.33	15.67	4.67	4.33	4.67	20	83.00	4

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): A. Proposal Quality

Criterion (from public notice): A.1. Project Approach is Well-Structured, Easy to Understand and Succinct

Offeror: ADR & Associates

Proposed Subcontractors: Lawhon & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received
5	2.67

Comments

Approach is unclear as to why project should be segmented into four different groups with different team members. It is not easy to understand why plans should be organized into groupings.

Offeror: ARCADIS

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water, Donahue IDEAS LLC

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4.00

Comments

Project approach is succinct but structurally weak in the sense it confuses the role of DPU's OSHU with DPU's Regulatory Compliance Section.

Offeror: Brown and Caldwell

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4.67

Comments

Approach is clear, to the point and illustrates how subconsultant will be utilizied to deliver training materials.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI Engineering Services

Points Possible	Points Received
5	5.00

Comments

Approach is clear, well-structured, to the point and incorporates EMS elements.

Offeror: Stone Environmental

Proposed Subcontractors: SRM & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received
5	3.33

Comments

Project management approach section talks about preparing RFPs to solicit bids for subcontractor but unclear about why SRM was selected for the project.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): A. Proposal Quality

Criterion (from public notice): A.2. Proposal Demonstrates Understanding of Project with Detailed Breakdown of Tasks

Offeror: ADR & Associates

Proposed Subcontractors: Lawhon & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received
10	5.83

Comments

Proposal suggests grouping sites and developing an SPCC plan for each group which fails to adequately demonstrate an understanding of the nature of the project. The tasks which are itemized are based on a generalization of that concept and thus isn't sufficiently detailed.

Offeror: ARCADIS

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water, Donahue IDEAS LLC

Points Possible	Points Received
10	7.50

Comments

Proposal confuses part of project by suggesting 360water's support of SPCC training is to be reviewed by DPU OSHU staff. The DPU project is being led by the Regulatory Compliance Section, not OSHU. Additionally, only a very generalized discussion of project steps is presented.

Offeror: Brown and Caldwell

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water

Points Possible	Points Received
10	8.33

Comments

Proposal demonstrates understanding of complexity of existing program status resulting from different interpretations and need to identify inconsistencies. Proposal also proposes to expand on utilization of 360water to deliver consistent training materials across facilities.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI Engineering Services

Points Possible	Points Received
10	8.17

Comments

General understanding of project but approach suggests SPCCs prepared on behalf of City were prepared as basis for standardization and must be used in future SPCC development. Approach also recommends supporting facility staff inspections by showing facility staff how to conduct inspections when it is not clear that failure to conduct inspections is not partly the result of inspection checklists being unclear or not tailored to facility.

Offeror: Stone Environmental

Proposed Subcontractors: SRM & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received
10	6.67

Comments

Approach appears narrowly focused on individual plan preparation and doesn't speak to need to establish uniformity across DPU facilities. Project approach outlines that SPCC plan revisions would include compliance with 40 CFR 109 provisions but is unclear as to when an Oil Removal/Spill Contingency Plan would be necessitated.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): B. Project Team Experience

Criterion (from public notice): B.1. Education and Training fits the Project's needs demonstrating background in civil engineering and understanding of federal and state laws and rules related to petroleum handling, storage, and containment

Offeror: ADR & Associates

Proposed Subcontractors: Lawhon & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
10	7.00	Very limited discussion of civil engineering experience relative to the certification of SPCCs. Experience seems centered on transportation and constructuion-related projects. Technical lead appears not to be a P.E. Only 6 years of SPCC experience for Principal and Project Manager.

Offeror: ARCADIS

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water, Donahue IDEAS LLC

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
10	9.00	Project team demonstrates breadth of engineering experience, including advanced degree in civil engineering.

Offeror: Brown and Caldwell

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
10	8.67	Resumes of project manager and lead technical support staff show registration as professional engineers with one having background in civil engineering. Additional training as ISO EMS 14001 Lead Auditor cited on one resume.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI Engineering Services

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
10	8.33	Resumes indicate two registered professional engineers, both with background in chemical engineering.

Offeror: Stone Environmental

Proposed Subcontractors: SRM & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
10	7.33	Primary contractor shows two registered professional engineers, one with background in chemical engineering, the other with background in mechanical engineering.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): B. Project Team Experience

Criterion (from public notice): B.2. Experience on Similar Projects completed in the Past 10 years for this Department, other governmental and/or business entities

Offeror: ADR & Associates

Proposed Subcontractors: Lawhon & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	15.33	No apparent experience relative to SPCC development at water, wastewater and power facilities. Experience in SPCC development as Asphalt facilities.

Offeror: ARCADIS

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water, Donahue IDEAS LLC

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	18.33	Project team has extensive experience in developing SPCCs for municipal operations, and federal and private facilities.

Offeror: Brown and Caldwell

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	18.67	Project team has extensive experience in developing SPCCs for municipal operations with broad exposure to a variety of municipal facilities like wastewater plants, water booster stations, and administrative complexes and state facilities like OSU. Project Team has experience developing on-line SPCC training modules.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI Engineering Services

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	18.33	Project team has experience in numerous SPCC plan preparations for municipal and state agencies including two for DoSD, one for the Compost facility and another for a DoSD pump station.

Offeror: Stone Environmental

Proposed Subcontractors: SRM & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	16.33	Project team has demonstrated experience in developing SPCCs for municipal electrical substations.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): B. Project Team Experience

Criterion (from public notice): B.3. Past Performance Demonstrates familiarity with varied aspects of pertoleum handling and requirements (e.g., aboveground storage, underground storage, electrical substation storage, mobile equipment)

Offeror: ADR & Associates

Proposed Subcontractors: Lawhon & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	14.67	Past performance confined to industrial activities at asphalt plants with aboveground storage tanks.

Offeror: ARCADIS

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water, Donahue IDEAS LLC

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	17.33	Past performance with City demonstrates familiarity with broad range of oil-handling issues but also seems unclear as to what standard/s ought to be applied to establish an integrity testing interval for non-BUSTR-regulated underground storage tanks.

Offeror: Brown and Caldwell

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	18.00	Past SPCC deliverables to City reflect thorough review of regulatory applicablity, including extensive explanations of applicability or lack of applicability of regulations to oil-handling activities such as STI SP-001 for aboveground tanks or NFPA 30 Section 21.5 for underground storage tanks. Prior SPCC plans include unique tank information sheets summarizing regulatory status, condition, volumes, spill rates and other relevant information. Plans include extensive training outlines and other supporting documentation to back regulatory interpretations. Prior SPCC plan was only one to have been reviewed and found virtually non-deficient in plan preparation. Prior performance of 360water demonstrates ability to produce on-line training material incorporating SPCC content and EMS-based procedures.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI Engineering Services

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	17.33	Previous performance demonstrates general familiarity with oil-handling activities. Inspection checklists rely on STI SP001 checklists without clarifiying which sections may not be applicable based on initial research such as whether inspector ought to check for cathodic protection or not.

Offeror: Stone Environmental

Proposed Subcontractors: SRM & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	15.67	Past performance demonstrates narrow exposure to municipal petroleum handling and storage activities particularly related to electrical substations.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): C. Project Team Workload

Criterion (from public notice): C.1. Proposal Demonstrates the availability of the project team to complete the project expeditiously

Offeror: ADR & Associates

Proposed Subcontractors: Lawhon & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.67	Although project manager is projected to be available, engineering supports seems not as readily available.

Offeror: ARCADIS

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water, Donahue IDEAS LLC

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.67	Proposal notes availability of staff but given small size of contract and likelihood of staff being dedicated to larger, more extensive projects, it is unclear how timely responses might be given they "have brought on our teaming your needs."

Offeror: Brown and Caldwell

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.67	Engineering support appears readily available to address project needs in timely manner.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI Engineering Services

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.67	Proposal indicates availability of staff to deliver task completions in timely manner.

Offeror: Stone Environmental

Proposed Subcontractors: SRM & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.67	Proposal demonstrates availability of project team members to perform expeditiously.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): D. Demonstrated Ability to Meet Schedules and Budgets

Criterion (from public notice): D.1. Proposal Demonstrates ability to meet budgets and Timelines

Offeror: ADR & Associates

Proposed Subcontractors: Lawhon & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.67	References are offered but not in the context that the references will speak to projects coming in on time and on budget.

Offeror: ARCADIS

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water, Donahue IDEAS LLC

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.67	Not much discussion on ability to meet budget and timelines.

Offeror: Brown and Caldwell

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.67	Appendix B provided to demonstrate organization of time and efficient individual task implementation.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI Engineering Services

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.67	Nothing in proposal suggests inability to meet budgets and timelines.

Offeror: Stone Environmental

Proposed Subcontractors: SRM & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.33	Proposal offers no examples of ability to meet budgets and timelines.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): D. Demonstrated Ability to meet Schedules and Budgets

Criterion (from public notice): D.2. Project Schedule is Realistic and Flexible enough to meet Department Needs

Offeror: ADR & Associates

Proposed Subcontractors: Lawhon & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.33	Project schedule is based on developing a plan for a group which isn't a practical approach.

Offeror: ARCADIS

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water, Donahue IDEAS LLC

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.67	Limited discussion on schedule but offers commitment to meeting schedule after "rules of engagement" finalized.

Offeror: Brown and Caldwell

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.67	Project schedule demonstrates flexibility and realistic expectations of effort.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI Engineering Services

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.67	Given project is based on as-needed service basis, schedule is realistic given expectations.

Offeror: Stone Environmental

Proposed Subcontractors: SRM & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
5	4.67	Given project is based on provision of services on as-needed basis, proposed schedule seems reasonable.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): E. Local Workforce

Criterion (from public notice): E.1. Project Labor Costs ≥ 90% in City of Columbus, etc ...

Offeror: ADR & Associates

Proposed Subcontractors: Lawhon & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	20.00	At least 90% of Project Team labor costs are assignable to employees based in City of Columbus

Offeror: ARCADIS

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water, Donahue IDEAS LLC

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	20.00	At least 90% of Project Team labor costs are assignable to employees based in City of Columbus

Offeror: Brown and Caldwell

Proposed Subcontractors: 360water

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	20.00	At least 90% of Project Team labor costs are assignable to employees based in City of Columbus

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: CCI Engineering Services

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	20.00	At least 90% of Project Team labor costs are assignable to employees based in City of Columbus

Offeror: Stone Environmental

Proposed Subcontractors: SRM & Associates

Points Possible	Points Received	Comments
20	20.00	At least 90% of Project Team labor costs are apparently assignable to employees in office location within Franklin County if accepted that Stone Environmental was doing business as Sparham & Sparham in 1977, as GBS Environmental in 1995, renamed as Stone Environmental in 1999, and not relocated to Westerville until 2007.