

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): A. Competence
 Criterion (from public notice): A.1. Educational Background in Civil Eng./Env. Law of Project Manager and Staff

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
7.5	7.5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
7.5	6.5

Comments

Educational background of project manager and staff average

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
7.5	7

Comments

Educational background above average but not satisfactory in scope.

Offeror: Gresham/Smith

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
7.5	7.5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
7.5	6.5

Comments

Educational background is satisfactory but with greater emphasis on design.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): A. Competence
 Criterion (from public notice): A.2. Understanding of Env. Laws & Rules Relating to City Facilities

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
7.5	7.5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
7.5	5.5

Comments

Over-emphasis on site assessments and laws pertaining to safety.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
7.5	5

Comments

No demonstrated understanding of environmental law related to city facilities.

Offeror: Gresham/Smith

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
7.5	7.5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
7.5	7

Comments

Significant reliance on design engineering.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): A. Competence
 Criterion (from public notice): A.3. Work Experience of Staff in Environmental Regulatory Matters

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	3.5

Comments

Majority of staff experience appears focused on site assessments and not focused on regulatory matters.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	3

Comments

No demonstration of adequate depth of experience in regulatory matters.

Offeror: Gresham/Smith

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4

Comments

Design focused and insufficient regulatory structure.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): A. Competence
 Criterion (from public notice): A.4. Experience in Developing Environmental Audit Templates Based on USEPA/OEPA Guidance

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2.5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	1.5

Comments

Little demonstration of template development based on guidance.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2

Comments

Insufficient discussion of template development.

Offeror: Gresham/Smith

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2.5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2

Comments

Insufficient discussion of template development.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): A. Competence
 Criterion (from public notice): A.5. Proven Knowledge of Effective Env. Mngt. Systems Applicable to Municipal Operations

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2.5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	1.5

Comments

Very little demonstrated knowledge of EMSs.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	1.5

Comments

Very little demonstrated knowledge of EMSs.

Offeror: Gresham/Smith

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2.5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2

Comments

Adequate experience relative to EMSs applicable to government operations.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): B. Ability
 Criterion (from public notice): B.1. Environmental Specialties of Staff assigned to Project Relevant to Public Utility Operations

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4.5

Comments

Insufficient regulatory water utility experience.

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	3

Comments

Emphasis weighted to private industry.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	3.5

Comments

The extent of specialties of staff limited.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4.5

Comments

Could be stronger in electricity/hydroelectric.

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4

Comments

Weakness in regulatory compliance and electricity.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice):
 Criterion (from public notice):

B. Ability
B.2 Ability to Collaborate with In-House Staff in Performing Audit

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4

Comments

Less detailed in their integration plans.

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	2.5

Comments

Little elaboration on how staff would be integrated into audit process.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	3.5

Comments

More of a proposal to train and direct staff rather than working with staff in implementing audit.

Offeror: Gresham/Smith

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	5

Comments

Points for plans for integrating staff into audit - detail in spreadsheet

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	3.5

Comments

Only bulletized summary on how collaboration will occur.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): B. Ability
 Criterion (from public notice): B.3 Years of Experience in Performing Env. Audits for Local Govern.

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2.5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	1.5

Comments

Little, if any, demonstrated local government audit experience.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	1.5

Comments

Little, if any, demonstrated local government audit experience.

Offeror: Gresham/Smith

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2.5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	1

Comments

No mention of audits for local governments.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): B. Ability
 Criterion (from public notice): B.4. Knowledge of City of Columbus Public Utility Operations

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
10	8.5

Comments

Little discussion of water and electricity. Only water project mentioned was the RMP.

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
10	4

Comments

No apparent depth of experience for wastewater.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
10	6.5

Comments

Staff knowledge of Columbus utility operations lacks full range of environmental regulations.

Offeror: Gresham/Smith

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
10	9.5

Comments

Not as much experience in electrical operations as preferred.

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
10	9.5

Comments

Little knowledge of drinking water operations relative to City of Columbus.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice):
 Criterion (from public notice):

B. Ability
B.5. Demonstrated Capability in Using Latest Software & Electronic Communication Tools

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	1.5

Comments

Insufficient software in base package; over-reliance on proprietary software.

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	1.5

Comments

Little discussion of use of electronic communications.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	1.5

Comments

Little discussion of use of electronic communications.

Offeror: Gresham/Smith

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2.5

Comments

Satisfactory.

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2

Comments

Only bulletized reference to electronic communication provided.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice):
 Criterion (from public notice):

C. Quality and Feasibility
C.1. Sufficient Staffing in Convenient/Accessible Locations

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	2.5

Comments

Majority of team members located outside Columbus area.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	3.5

Comments

Insufficient staffing to conduct project.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	5

Comments

Satisfactory

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): C. Quality and Feasibility
 Criterion (from public notice): C.2. Proposal Clearly Written, Well-Organized, and Succinct

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4

Comments

Pages mis-numbered and electrical audit poorly defined.

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	2.5

Comments

Proposal did not address items of need expressed in RFP.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	3

Comments

Proposal missed project goals expressed in RFP.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4

Comments

Project approach not as descriptive as it should have been.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): C. Quality and Feasibility
 Criterion (from public notice): C.3. Proposal Includes Reasonable Time-Lines

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	1.5

Comments

Schedule was too long and too much time spent on electrical audit.

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	1.5

Comments

Proposed pilot project was not envisioned in RFP.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2

Comments

No elaboration on how time would be allocated among tasks.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2.5

Comments

Satisfactory.

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2.5

Comments

Satisfactory

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice): C. Quality and Feasibility
 Criterion (from public notice): C.4. Proposal Defines how Consultant's Staff and Department Staff will work together

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4

Comments

Less detail for incorporating Department staff into audit process.

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	2

Comments

Insufficient discussion on how staffs work together.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4

Comments

Little discussion beyond training on how staffs would work together.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4.5

Comments

Too general of a description on how staffs will work together.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice):
 Criterion (from public notice):

C. Quality and Feasibility
C.5. Proposal Includes Methods for Template and Questionnaire Development

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2

Comments

Over-reliance on standard boiler-plate without necessary customization.

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	1.5

Comments

Minimal discussion on template development.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2

Comments

Lack of specifics in template development.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2.5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
2.5	2

Comments

Lack of specifics in template development.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice):
 Criterion (from public notice):

D. Past Performance
D.1 Successful Completion of Environmental Audits for Municipal Operations

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	1.5

Comments

Minimal demonstration of completion of such audits shown.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	2

Comments

Successful completion of such audits not adequately shown.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4.5

Comments

Fewer broad-based environmental municipal audits by firm

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	3

Comments

Only limited experience shown in these types of audits.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice):
 Criterion (from public notice):

D. Past Performance
D.2. Specific Experience in Wastewater Operations

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	2.5

Comments

Emphasis more on solid and hazardous waste and environmental health and safety as opposed to wastewater operations.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	3

Comments

Only general references provided, and no specific experience listed.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	5

Comments

Satisfactory

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice):
 Criterion (from public notice):

D. Past Performance
D.3. Specific Experience in Drinking Water for Large Municipalities

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	3.5

Comments

Insufficient drinking water experience highlighted.

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	1.5

Comments

Few staff have specific experience, and firm has shown no specific experience.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	2.5

Comments

Offerer only provided general reference relative to specific experience in drinking water.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	5

Comments

Satisfactory

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	3.5

Comments

Little specific experience in drinking water shown.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice):
 Criterion (from public notice):

D. Past Performance
D.4. Specific Experience in Municipal Electrical Hydro Electric/
 Transmission Operations

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	2.5

Comments

Little experience of hydroelectric operations.. No firm experience highlighted.

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	2.5

Comments

Only limited experience confined to one individual relative to electricity operations.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	2.5

Comments

Specificity of experience not provided.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4

Comments

Some experience of hydroelectric operations.

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
5	4

Comments

Some specific experience demonstrated.

Evaluation of Proposal

Criteria (from public notice):
Criterion (from public notice):

D. Past Performance
D.5. Specific Experience in Homeland Security Matters

Offeror: Malcolm Pirnie

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
0	0

Comments

Item removed from RFP.

Offeror: URS

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
0	0

Comments

Item removed from RFP.

Offeror: ERM

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
0	0

Comments

Item removed from RFP.

Offeror: Gresham, Smith and Partners

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
0	0

Comments

Item removed from RFP.

Offeror: Burgess & Niple

Proposed Subcontractors: _____

Points Possible	Points Received
0	0

Comments

Item removed from RFP.

Project Score Sheet

Criteria =	A. COMPETENCE					25
	A.1. Educational Background in Civil Engineering/Environmental Law of Project Manager & Staff	A.2. Understanding of Environmental Laws and Rules Related to City Facilities	A.3. Work Experience of Staff in Environmental Regulatory Matters	A.4. Experience in Developing Environmental Audit Templates based on USEPA/OEPA Guidance	A.5. Proven Knowledge of Effective Environmental Management Systems Applicable to Municipal Operations	
Possible Generic Questions =	<i>Does the proposed project management team have the appropriate education and training?</i>	<i>Evidence of understanding the scope of the work and to what degree?</i>	<i>Evidence of experience of proposed staff in complying with environmental rules and regulations?</i>	<i>Does the firm/staff have a demonstrated history of developing, implementing, and maintaining Environmental Audit processes & procedures?</i>	<i>How much experience has firm/staff had producing an effective Environmental Management System?</i>	
Max Point Value =	7.5	7.5	5.0	2.5	2.5	
Malcolm Pirnie	7.5	7.5	5.0	2.5	2.5	
URS	6.5	5.5	3.5	1.5	1.5	
ERM	7.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	1.5	
Gresham/Smith	7.5	7.5	5.0	2.5	2.5	
B & N	6.5	7.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	

Project Score Sheet

Criteria =	B. ABILITY					25
	B.1. Environmental Specialties of Staff Assigned to Project Relevant to Public Utility Operations	B.2. Ability to Collaborate with in-house Staff in Performing Audit	B.3. Years of Experience in Performing Environmental Audits for Local Governments	B.4. Knowledge of City of Columbus Public Utility Operations	B.5. Demonstrated Ability in Utilizing Latest Software and Electronic Communication Tools	
Possible Generic Questions =	<i>Does the proposed project management team have the appropriate breadth of specialization?</i>	<i>Demonstrated experience in intergrating City staff into audit process?</i>	<i>How much experience does the firm/staff have with projects of similar size, complexity, and coordination requirements?</i>	<i>How extensive is knowledge of City's Electric Generation/ Transmission, Water Distribution, and Stormwater & Wastewater Collection facilities and operations?</i>	<i>How much experience does firm/staff have with latest environmental audit tracking tools and communication software?</i>	
Max Point Value =	5.0	5.0	2.5	10.0	2.5	
Malcolm Pirnie	4.5	4.0	2.5	8.5	1.5	
URS	3.0	2.5	1.5	4.0	1.5	
ERM	3.5	3.5	1.5	6.5	1.5	
Gresham/Smith	4.5	5.0	2.5	9.5	2.5	
B & N	4.0	3.5	1.0	9.5	2.0	

Project Score Sheet

Criteria =	C. QUALITY & FEASIBILITY					20
	C.1. Sufficient Staffing in Convenient/Accessible Locations	C.2. Proposal Clearly Written, Well-Organized, and Succinct	C.3. Proposal Includes Reasonable Time-lines	C.4. Proposal Defines how Consultant's Staff and Department Staff will work together	C.5. Proposal Includes Methods for Template and Questionnaire Development	
Possible Generic Questions =	<i>Does the Offeror demonstrate sufficient staffing in convenient/feasible locations?</i>	<i>Are proposal objectives clearly presented, thorough, comprehensive, well-organized, and succinct?</i>	<i>Does the Proposal include reasonable time-lines?</i>	<i>Does the Offeror have a clear plan to incorporate Department staff into pre-audit, audit, and post-audit processes?</i>	<i>Does proposal outline methods, processes, procedures, templates, and questionnaires to be utilized?</i>	
Max Point Value =	5.0	5.0	2.5	5.0	2.5	
Malcolm Pirnie	5.0	4.0	1.5	4.0	2.0	
URS	2.5	2.5	1.5	2.0	1.5	
ERM	3.5	3.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	
Gresham/Smith	5.0	5.0	2.5	5.0	2.5	
B & N	5.0	4.0	2.5	4.5	2.0	

Project Score Sheet

Criteria =	D. PAST PERFORMANCE					20
	D.1. Successful Completion of Environmental Audits for Municipal Operations	D.2. Specific Experience in Wastewater Operations	D.3. Specific Experience in Drinking Water for Large Municipalities	D.4. Specific Experience in Municipal Electric Hydroelectric/ Transmission Operations	D.5. Specific Experience in Homeland Security Matters	
Possible Generic Questions =	<i>How much experience does firm have completing environmental audits for municipal utility operations?</i>	<i>Has the firm been involved with any environmental compliance issues related to wastewater systems and to what degree?</i>	<i>Has the firm been involved with compliance issues relative to Water purification and distribution and to what degree?</i>	<i>Has the firm been involved with compliance issues relative to Electric generation and transmission and to what degree?</i>	<i>[Homeland Security has been removed from Bid Proposal]</i>	
Max Point Value =	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	
Malcolm Pirnie	5.0	5.0	3.5	2.5	0.0	
URS	1.5	2.5	1.5	2.5	0.0	
ERM	2.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	0.0	
Gresham/Smith	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.0	0.0	
B & N	3.0	5.0	3.5	4.0	0.0	

Project Score Sheet

Criteria =	E. Local Workforce [select only one]				10	Totals
	E.1. 90% in Columbus	E.2. 75% in Columbus	E.3. 90% inside Franklin County	E.4. 50% in Columbus		
Possible Generic Questions =	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 (10)	At least 75% of the Team's project labor costs are assignable to employees paying City of Columbus income tax on the date the proposal is submitted (8)	At least 90% of the Team's labor will be performed in an office location within Franklin County but outside of the Columbus Corporate limits on the date the proposal is submitted (8)	At least 50% of the Team's project labor costs are assignable to employees paying City of Columbus income tax on the date the proposal is submitted (5)		
Max Point Value =	10.0	8.0	8.0	5.0		100.0
Malcolm Pirnie			10.0			88.5
URS			5.0			54.0
ERM			10.0			69.5
Gresham/Smith			8.0			95.5
B & N			8.0			83.0