

**CITY OF COLUMBUS
BID WAIVER INFORMATION FORM**

TO ACCOMPANY LEGISLATION WHICH WAIVES ANY PROVISIONS OF COLUMBUS CITY CODES CHAPTER 329
(PLEASE LIMIT YOUR RESPONSE TO THIS SHEET)

1. Reasons for waiving City Code bid procedure:

- emergency breakdown causing unplanned need
- item to be purchased is of a perishable nature
- need to extend an existing contract
- there is not enough time to obtain formal bids to satisfy need
- non-price error on either the bidder's or the City's part in the bid proposal
- a new law or regulation requires immediate compliance
- other The bids were opened without a representative of the City Auditor's Office present.

2. Detailed explanation of reason (must be completed by division):

The department failed to request a representative of the Auditor's Office to be present when the bids were opened. The procurement process for professional services was otherwise followed consistent with city code.

3. Informal procedure used: Note: Formal proposals were submitted consistent with city code.

- telephone quotations
- written quotations
- negotiations

4. Informal bids received and prices for each:

AECOM \$296,361; Bay Area Urban Economics \$246,400; Bird Houk \$320,614; Blostein/Overly Architects \$263,288; Cooper Carry \$287,135; Forest City/RW Armstrong and Associates \$449,138; Goody Clancy \$298,888; HKS/FuMorton \$713,315; KKG \$184,500; M+A Architects \$315,175; Meisner & Associates/Land Vision \$196,495; NBBJ/Chan Krieger \$516,770; Perkins & Will \$697,815; RKG Associates \$231,300

5. If lowest bid was not accepted, explain criteria for award:

The criteria used were consistent with city code: understanding of the project and familiarity with Columbus; competence of the offeror to perform the required services as indicated by the technical training, education and experience of the offeror's personnel who would be assigned to perform the work; quality and feasibility of the offeror's technical proposal; ability of the offeror to perform the required services competently and expeditiously as indicated by the offeror's workload and the availability of necessary personnel, equipment and facilities; past performance of the offeror as reflected by evaluations of the city agency, other city agencies and other previous clients of the offeror with respect to such factors as quality

of work, success in controlling costs, and success in meeting deadlines; quality and completeness of the written submittal; and quality of the presentation (for firm that were short listed and interviewed).

ORDINANCE #: 0962-2011

APPROVED BY: *Authorized Approval on Corresponding Legislative File*

DATE:
