DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES FISCAL – CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS SECTION REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION FORM

DATE SUBMITTED TO FISCAL: 6/30/09 **PROJECT ENGINEER:** Nicholas J. Domenick, P.E. **PROJECT NAME**: General Engineering Services ORIGINAL CONTRACT FOR: Watershed Impervious Area Pollution Reduction Project CIP: 690506 \$686,641.40 Engineering Agreement Modification: _____ **TYPE**: Engineering Agreement: _X__ Construction Contract Modification: _____ Construction Contract: Guaranteed Maximum Cost Agreement: Reimbursement: _____ Waive Competitive Bidding Provisions:* Other: **DESIGNATION:** Emergency___ X___ 30-Day JUSTIFICATION FOR EMERGENCY DESIGNATION: Due to the accelerated timeline required by the project funding source (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act), execution of the agreement for professional services on emergency basis is necessary. OTHER DIVISION/AGENCIES PARTICIPATING: (Provide project name, amount and contact information) RFSQ & RFP INFORMATION (Engineering Only): 1) What companies sent in an RFSQ and when were they received? July 20,2007 American Structurepoint, Inc. Burgess & Niple **Chester Engineers** Civil & Environmental Consultants, Inc. Columbus Engineering Consultants Crawford, Murphy, & Tilly, Inc. DLZ Ohio, Inc. EL Robinson Engineering Co. EMH&T Fanning Howey Civil Engineering Division Floyd Browne Group **GGC** Engineers HDR Engineering, Inc. HWTB Ohio, Inc. Jones-Stuckey Ltd. Korda/Nemeth Engineering, Inc. M.E. Companies

Prime Engineering R.D. Zande

Poggemeyer Design Group Pomeroy & Associates

Moody Nolan ms Consultants

R.W. Armstrong
Resource International
Ribway Engineering Group
Stone Environmental
Woolpert, Inc.
URS

- 2) When were the RFP's received? May 16, 2008
- 3) State the scoring criteria and how the recommended bidder was determined?

Proposal Evaluation Criteria

Total Maximum Points

(Criteria and associated point values shown may be modified to fit project conditions)

1. Proposal Quality:

50 Points Total

How easily does the proposal lend itself to review and evaluation? (5 points)

Does Consultant present and explain their approach in a clear/concise manner? (15 points)

How effectively does the Offeror's approach address project requirements? (15 points)

Does Offeror demonstrate knowledge of project site conditions? (15 points)

2. Project Schedule:

25 Points Total

Did Offeror present a realistic and achievable project timeline? (10 points)
Are task hours reasonable to complete all tasks in the scope? (15 Points)

3. Environmentally Preferable Offeror

5 Points Total

Does the proposal discuss the use of environmentally beneficial methods and technologies?

4. Local Workforce:

20 Points Total

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, or at least 90% of the Team's project labor costs are assignable to the office location within Franklin County if office established prior to 1995 (20 points)

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 (15 points)

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 (15 points)

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 (10 points)

Note: The offeror shall indicate their percentage of local workforce and show how this number was determined. The Team includes the prime consultant and all sub-consultants.

Total Available Points:

100 Points

An evaluation committee reviewed the proposals and scored them based on the above criteria. URS Corporation and Stantec Consulting Services were the two firms selected to be recommended to the Director to perform the design services for this project. The General Engineering Services contract for URS has already been legislated.

NOTES & OTHER INFORMATION:

Revised 07/24/07

Construction Contracts Engineering Agreements □ Electronic Information Sheet □ Electronic Information Sheet □ Electronic Map (not necessary for Citywide or Plant Proj.) □ Electronic Map □ Electronic Bid Waiver (if applicable)* □ Electronic Bid Waiver (if applicable)* □ Electronic Bid Tabulation (if not prepared by Fiscal) □ Electronic Engineering Agreement □ Electronic Quality Factor Form (if not prepared by Fiscal) □ (Incl. appendices for Time Schedule, Labor Hours, Cost Summary, and Design/Maps)	