

Steege, Jerry K.

From: Kelsey, Mark
Sent: Thursday, October 06, 2011 2:07 PM
To: Atkinson, Jennifer L.
Cc: DeLay, Susan E.; 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.; McGuinness, Rory O.; Miller Jr, Richard A.; O'Callaghan, Timothy L.; Poindexter, Kaelyn C.; Roberts, Doug; Robinson, Valuise E.; Rundio, Ted; Steege, Jerry K.; Stephens, Thomas H.; Tilton, Rick C.; Zahran, Hassan Y.
Subject: Re: RECOMMENDATION: Recycling and Public Relations Yard Waste Campaign

I approve of the recommended consultant for award
Mark Kelsey sent from my blackberry

From: Atkinson, Jennifer L.
To: Kelsey, Mark
Cc: DeLay, Susan E.; Atkinson, Jennifer L.; 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.; McGuinness, Rory O.; Miller Jr, Richard A.; O'Callaghan, Timothy L.; Poindexter, Kaelyn C.; Roberts, Doug; Robinson, Valuise E.; Rundio, Ted; Steege, Jerry K.; Stephens, Thomas H.; Tilton, Rick C.; Zahran, Hassan Y.
Sent: Thu Oct 06 12:00:26 2011
Subject: RECOMMENDATION: Recycling and Public Relations Yard Waste Campaign

To: Mark Kelsey, Director
Department of Public Service

From: Jennifer Atkinson, Management Analyst I

Date: October 6, 2011

Subject: Recycling and Yard Waste Public Relations Campaign

The Department of Public Service solicited Requests for Proposals for the Recycling and Yard Waste Public Relations Campaign. The budget is \$330,000. The final, to be negotiated dollar amount, shall be funded by the Refuse GPIF, Fund 748.

The intent of this project is to assist the City of Columbus, Department of Public Service Communications Office and the Mayor's Office of Environmental Stewardship in introducing the new comprehensive yard waste and recycling program to Columbus residents and developing and maintaining a public education/marketing campaign for the program.

The project was formally advertised on the Vendor Services web site from August 30, 2011, to September 15, 2011. The city received three (3) responses. All proposals were deemed minimally compliant and were fully evaluated when the Evaluation Committee met on October 6, 2011. The responding firms were:

CONSULTANT Sub-consultant	Business Enterprise Status	Contract Compliance Number	Active	% OF WORK	% Majority % Other
MURPHY EPSON	FBE	311263605	Y	80%	0% Majority 100% Other

Columbus Policy Works	AFA	300193496	Y	10%	
Engage Public Affairs	FBE	201593274	Y	10%	
PAUL WERTH ASSOCIATES	FBE	310726286	Y	80%	80% FBE 20% Unknown
Best Light Video	Unknown	264186678	N	5%	
White Rock Media	Unknown	311652241	N	5%	
Geben Communication	Unknown	271395719	N	10%	
ELEVATE THINKING	Unknown	264203499	N	100%	100% Unknown

This RFP Evaluation Committee included three (3) voting members from the Department of Public Service – Jennifer Gallagher, Ted Rundio and Rick Tilton – a representative from EBOCO was invited to attend, but declined, and Jennifer Atkinson.

MurphyEpson received 93.33 points from the Evaluation Committee (out of a possible 100). The next closest firm was Paul Werth Associates with 84 points.

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

MurphyEpson	93.33
Paul Werth Associates	84.00
Elevate Thinking	79.00

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

1. MurphyEpson grasped the project very well and offered a strong project team.
2. MurphyEpson offered good past performance with the Healthy Homes Initiative and demonstrated understanding of the diversity of Columbus neighborhoods.
3. MurphyEpson offered concrete suggestions and clever ideas for the campaign.
4. MurphyEpson acknowledged the challenge of reaching citizens who don’t traditionally recycle.
5. MurphyEpson’s proposal acknowledged that recycling is not free while stressing the importance of increased recycling leading to reduced landfill usage.

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

