

From: [Kelsey, Mark](#)
To: [Cofield, Alex A.](#)
Cc: [Wayton, Daniel J.](#); [Austin, Patti A.](#); [Bauman, Max A.](#); [Bell, Timothy A.](#); [Bowman, Randall](#); [Cordetti, Steven R.](#); [Crabill, Melanie J.](#); [Figley, Russ U.](#); [Gallagher, Jennifer L.](#); [Giffin, Benjamin M.](#); [Johnson, Daniel L.](#); [Lewis, William A.](#); [Ludwig, Rachel D.](#); [Lundine, Mark A.](#); [Miller Jr, Richard A.](#); [O'Callaghan, Timothy L.](#); [Parks, Duane M.](#); [Roberts, Doug](#); [Robinson, Valuise E.](#); [Stephens, Thomas H.](#); [Tilton, Rick C.](#); [Wentzel, Steve J.](#); [Zahran, Hassan Y.](#)
Subject: RE: RECOMMENDATION: Arterial Street Rehabilitation - Hague Avenue - Broad Street to Sullivant Avenue
Date: Friday, February 22, 2013 2:51:48 PM

I approve of the recommended consultant for selection

From: Cofield, Alex A.
Sent: Friday, February 22, 2013 8:53 AM
To: Kelsey, Mark
Cc: Wayton, Daniel J.; Austin, Patti A.; Bauman, Max A.; Bell, Timothy A.; Bowman, Randall; Cofield, Alex A.; Cordetti, Steven R.; Crabill, Melanie J.; Figley, Russ U.; Gallagher, Jennifer L.; Giffin, Benjamin M.; Johnson, Daniel L.; Kelsey, Mark; Lewis, William A.; Ludwig, Rachel D.; Lundine, Mark A.; Miller Jr, Richard A.; O'Callaghan, Timothy L.; Parks, Duane M.; Roberts, Doug; Robinson, Valuise E.; Stephens, Thomas H.; Tilton, Rick C.; Wentzel, Steve J.; Zahran, Hassan Y.
Subject: RECOMMENDATION: Arterial Street Rehabilitation - Hague Avenue - Broad Street to Sullivant Avenue

To: Mark Kelsey, Director
Department of Public Service
From: Alex Cofield, Capital Fiscal Manager

Date: February 22, 2013

Subject: Arterial Street Rehabilitation – Hague Avenue – Broad Street to Sullivant Avenue

The Department of Public Service solicited Requests for Proposals for the Arterial Street Rehabilitation – Hague Avenue – Broad Street to Sullivant Avenue Contract. The budget is \$300,000, funded from the 2012 CIB.

The intent of this project is to provide the City of Columbus preliminary and final engineering for improvements to Hague Avenue between Sullivant Avenue and Broad Street. Design will proceed in two parts with Part 1 being that defined within the Scope of Services below. The specific scope of work for Part 2 will be developed upon completion of Part 1.

Pavement overlays throughout the life of the roadway has raised the pavement surface to the point that curb has lost its effectiveness as a barrier to vehicles and as an element of the drainage system. The primary goals of the Part 1 contract are to evaluate alternatives to provide a long-term remedy and develop one alternative to be advanced to the Part 2

contract. The remaining Preliminary Engineering and Final Engineering will be performed in Part 2.

The project was formally advertised on the Vendor Services web site from January 24, 2013, to February 14, 2013. The city received three (3) responses. All proposals were deemed responsive and were fully evaluated when the Evaluation Committee met on February 22, 2013. The responding firms were:

CONSULTANT/						
Subconsultant	BUSINESS ENTERPRISE STATUS		CONTRACT COMPLIANCE NO.			
	ACTIVE	% OF WORK	% MAJORITY	% OTHER		
CRAWFORD, MURPHY & TILLY	Majority		370844662	Yes	62%	62% MAJ
			20% PHC			
			18% OTH			
Parsons Brinckerhoff	PHC	111531569		Yes	20%	
Resource International	FBD	310669793		Yes	8%	
Dynotec MBD		311319961		Yes	10%	
CT CONSULTANTS	Majority		340792089	Yes	85%-89%	85-89% MAJ
			11-15% OTH			
DLZ Ohio	ASN	311268980		yes	3%-5%	
Columbus Engineering Consultants	ASN	310716498		Yes	5%-8%	
Policy Works	AFA	300193496		Yes	1%-2%	
COLUMBUS ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS			ASN	310716498	Yes	70% 15%
						MAJ
						85% OTH
DLZ Ohio	ASN	311268980		yes	15%	
American Structurepoint	Majority		351127317	yes	15%	

This RFP Evaluation Committee included three (3) voting members from the Department of Public Service – Jennifer Gallagher , Hassan Zahran and Patti Austin.

Crawford, Murphy & Tilly received 83.33 points from the Evaluation Committee (out of a possible 100). The next closest firm was Columbus Engineering Consultants with 78.67 points.

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

Crawford, Murphy & Tilly 83.33

Columbus Engineering Consultants 78.67

The Committee would like to submit Crawford, Murphy & Tilly for the Director's review and recommendation. The Committee felt that Crawford, Murphy & Tilly submitted the strongest overall proposal for the following reasons:

1. Good partnership with other team members
2. Mentioned the parking issue we are having with people parking over the curb
3. Went into details about issues that will need to be resolved during Public Involvement (e.g. parking issues, drainage issues, MOT with buses and gas tankers, do residents want to maintain the grass lawn, etc)
4. Talked about bike lane/shared use path with the proximity to the school
5. Good innovative concepts that include green elements, cost savings, and drainage options

Per City Code 329.14(h), please provide direction for proceeding on this project by replying to this e-mail. Four options include:

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