

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 - Refugee Road - Gender to Hines
Date: Wednesday, March 13, 2013 11:37:17 AM

I approve of the recommended consultant for selection

From: Cofield, Alex A.
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2013 3:12 PM
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.; 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 - Refugee Road - Gender to Hines

To: Mark Kelsey, Director
Department of Public Service

From: Alex Cofield, Capital Fiscal Manager

Date: March 11, 2013

Subject: Arterial Street Rehabilitation - Refugee Road - Gender to Hines

The Department of Public Service solicited Requests for Proposals for the Arterial Street Rehabilitation - Refugee Road - Gender to Hines Contract. The budget is \$400,000, funded by the 2012 CIB.

The intent of this project is to provide the City of Columbus preliminary and final engineering for improvements to Refugee Road from Gender Road to Hines Road and to Hines Road from Refugee Road to a point north of Refugee as needed to achieve project goals. 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.

There are two main goals of the project: 1) Improve capacity and safety of the intersection of Refugee Road and Hines Road; and 2) Extend pedestrian, bikeway, and street lighting, and traffic signal interconnect facilities along Refugee Road from the eastern terminus of each such facility to be installed by City of Columbus Department of Public Service project, Intersection Improvements – Gender Road at Refugee Road, Capital Improvement Project

No. 530086-100023, to new eastern termini for each within, through, or in close proximity to the Hines at Refugee intersection improvement limits and connecting the pedestrian and bikeway facilities to the Blacklick Trail.

Improvements to the intersection of Hines at Refugee will likely impact at least one of the following: an at-grade railroad crossing of Refugee Road, a railroad bridge over Blacklick Creek, a Refugee Road bridge over Blacklick Creek, Blacklick Creek, and parkland. As such, various alternatives need to be conceived and evaluated to determine a cost-effective approach that will limit impacts to the aforementioned items.

The primary goals of the Part 1 contract relative to the intersection of Hines at Refugee are to determine current and future traffic needs, develop, and evaluate conceptual alternatives to improve the intersection, further evaluate feasible alternatives, and develop a preferred alternative to be advanced to the Part 2 contract. The primary goal of the Part 1 contract relative to the extension of facilities east from Gender is to develop conceptual typical sections and alignment of the pedestrian and bikeway facilities. 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 February 7, 2013, to February 28, 2013. The city received four (4) responses. All proposals were deemed responsive and were fully evaluated when the Evaluation Committee met on March 11, 2013. The responding firms were:

CONSULTANT

| Sub-consultant | Business Enterprise Status | Contract Compliance Number |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| Active % OF WORK | % MAJ. | % OTH. |
| American Structurepoint Majority | 351127317 | Y 66% 66% MAJ 34% OTH |
| Prime Engineering ASN | 260546656 | Y 15% |
| Columbus Engineering Consultants | ASN 310716498 | Y 15% |
| CTL Engineering ASN | 310680767 | Y 3% |
| ASC Group, Inc. FBE | 311167506 | Y 1% |
| CT Consultants Majority | 340792089 | Y 55%-65% 55% MAJ 45% OTH - 65% MAJ 35% OTH |
| Transystems PHC | 430839725 | Y 15%-18% |
| Columbus Engineering Consultants | ASN 310716498 | Y 10%-15% |
| CTL Engineering ASN | 310680767 | Y 5% |
| ASC Group, Inc. FBE | 311167506 | Y 5%-7% |
| URS Majority | 340939859 | Y 80% 80% MAJ 20% OTH |
| Dynotec MBE | 311319961 | Y 5% |
| Resource International FBE | 310669793 | Y 8% |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|------------------|----------|------------|----------------|----------------|
| Lawhon & Assocs. | FBE | 311153141 | Y | 5% | | |
| AEC ASN | | 311612308 | Y | 1% | | |
| Engage Public Relations | FBE | 201593274 | Y | 1% | | |
| MS Consultants, Inc. Majority | | 346546916 | Y | 70% | 70% MAJ | 30% OTH |
| ASC Group, Inc. | FBE | 311167506 | Y | 2% | | |
| Resource International | FBE | 310669793 | Y | 8% | | |
| Ribway Engineering Group | MBE | 311406579 | Y | 20% | | |

This RFP Evaluation Committee included three (3) voting members from the Department of Public Service – Jennifer Gallagher , Hassan Zahran, and Randall Bowman. Attendees, but non-voting members, included Alex Cofield. A representative from EBOCO was invited to attend, but declined.

American Structurepoint received 88.00 points from the Evaluation Committee (out of a possible 100). The next closest firm was URS with 82.00 points.

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

American Structurepoint 88.00

URS 82.00

MS Consultants, Inc. 80.67

CT Consultants 79.00

The Committee would like to submit American Structurepoint for the Director’s review and recommendation. The Committee felt that American Structurepoint submitted the strongest overall proposal for the following reasons:

1. American Structurepoint presented innovative alternative concepts.
2. American Structurepoint provided the most coverage/discussion of public involvement.
3. American Structurepoint provided a thorough coverage of environmental concerns.
4. American Structurepoint put together a strong team.
5. American Structurepoint presented multiple alternatives and ideas for the project.
- 6.

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, American Structurepoint
2. Reject the committee's recommendations and designate a firm
3. Call for an oral presentation of the three highest scoring firms
4. Other