

1

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORE SHEET
PROCUREMENT OF PROFESSIONAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS SERVICES (STATE)
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS P18246

2009 OCT -2 AM 7:33

OFFEROR: WILLIAMS CONSULTING GROUP, INC.

REVIEWER: Elizabeth O'Neil

DATE: 10-1-09

| <u>EVALUATION FACTOR & WEIGHT</u> | <u>SCORE</u> (0-5) | | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|--|-----------------------|---|-----------------|
| 1. Documented prior success in lobbying before the Georgia General Assembly and State Government leadership, including familiarity with relevant issues and key stakeholders; Documented prior bi-partisan success on a range of other challenging matters in lobbying advocacy and effective positioning, communications before the Georgia General Assembly, State and regional leadership (both governmental and non-governmental). | (40%) <u>4</u> | x | .40 <u>1.60</u> |

COMMENTS: numerous examples of prior challenges
in dialog w/ leadership

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|-----------------|
| 2. Project Approach – A description on how the firm would position and organize to assist MARTA by providing aggressive lobbying services to assist MARTA in developing and implementing an effective overall State advocacy program, presence, and strategic communications plan that achieve the Authority's stated objectives. | (25%) <u>5</u> | x | .25 <u>1.25</u> |
|---|----------------|---|-----------------|

COMMENTS: Strong reliance on utilizing the
access and connections - strong ideas about
positioning

3. A detail understanding of what MARTA is seeking in regards to lobbying services (20%) 5 x .20 1.00

COMMENTS: discussion of passage of key legislation - focus on need for access

4. State of Georgia lobbying staff size and current availability of experienced lobbyists in the Metro Atlanta Area. (10%) 5 x ^{.10}20 1.00

COMMENTS: not a large staff - but key players in many cases - very experienced

5. Total Proposed Cost (5%) XXX x ^{.05}.25 XXX

COMMENTS: _____

OVERALL PROPOSAL COMMENTS: _____

TOTAL PROPOSAL SCORE _____

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORE SHEET
PROCUREMENT OF PROFESSIONAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS SERVICES (STATE)
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS P18246

2009 OCT -2 AM 9:20

OFFEROR: WILLIAMS CONSULTING GROUP, INC.

REVIEWER: KEP BASTA

DATE: 10/1/09

EVALUATION FACTOR & WEIGHT

SCORE
(0-5)

TOTAL

1. Documented prior success in lobbying before the Georgia General Assembly and State Government leadership, including familiarity with relevant issues and key stakeholders; Documented prior bi-partisan success on a range of other challenging matters in lobbying advocacy and effective positioning, communications before the Georgia General Assembly, State and regional leadership (both governmental and non-governmental).

(40%)

4 1/2

x

.40

COMMENTS: Access / Access / Access - both sides of leadership issue! Top down approach - the approach for now (6-9 months)

2. Project Approach - A description on how the firm would position and organize to assist MARTA by providing aggressive lobbying services to assist MARTA in developing and implementing an effective overall State advocacy program, presence, and strategic communications plan that achieve the Authority's stated objectives.

(25%)

4.25

x

.25

COMMENTS: But for MARTA case w/ great communications execution!

3. A detail understanding of what MARTA is seeking in regards to lobbying services

(20%) 4 x .20

COMMENTS: They Know — "Budget Shut Down" right on target.

4. State of Georgia lobbying staff size and current availability of experienced lobbyists in the Metro Atlanta Area.

(10%) 2.75 x ^{.10}/_{.20}

COMMENTS: Two Strong — NOT don't know!

5. Total Proposed Cost

(5%) XXX x ^{.05}/_{.15} XXX

COMMENTS: _____

OVERALL PROPOSAL COMMENTS: _____

TOTAL PROPOSAL SCORE _____

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORE SHEET
PROCUREMENT OF PROFESSIONAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS SERVICES (STATE)
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS P18246

2009 OCT -2 PM 1:49

OFFEROR: WILLIAMS CONSULTING GROUP, INC.

REVIEWER: Phonda Briggins - Redley

DATE: 10/1/09

| <u>EVALUATION FACTOR & WEIGHT</u> | <u>SCORE</u> (0-5) | | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|--|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 1. Documented prior success in lobbying before the Georgia General Assembly and State Government leadership, including familiarity with relevant issues and key stakeholders; Documented prior bi-partisan success on a range of other challenging matters in lobbying advocacy and effective positioning, communications before the Georgia General Assembly, State and regional leadership (both governmental and non-governmental). | (40%) <u>5</u> | x | .40 <u>2</u> |

COMMENTS: Really good bi-partisan team with a proven track record and documented lobbying victories with successful passage of prior legislation. Outstanding ability to position MARTA and get it to the table to be a integral part of conversation, negotiations and legislation.

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|-----------------|
| 2. Project Approach - A description on how the firm would position and organize to assist MARTA by providing aggressive lobbying services to assist MARTA in developing and implementing an effective overall State advocacy program, presence, and strategic communications plan that achieve the Authority's stated objectives. | (25%) <u>5</u> | x | .25 <u>1.25</u> |
|---|----------------|---|-----------------|

COMMENTS: The team's approach was clear & concise with ~~action~~ action plan really to be executed. The Communications plan was outstanding with real examples ~~and~~ victories for former clients. Very strong communication's strategy and plan. Lobbying approach included real specific tactics and activities to strategic position MARTA ~~creation~~ ^{Prior to the} General Assembly with leadership and rural legislators. A strong bi-partisan approach to cover all aspects of the General Assembly ~~including~~ including plan for Governor. Grassroots plan also clear with time sensitive tactics and activities

3. A detail understanding of what MARTA is seeking in regards to lobbying services (20%) 4.5 x .20 = .9

COMMENTS: In depth ~~comprehensive~~ understanding and insight regarding MARTA's financial situation, board of Director Governance/ appointment, need of long term funding source and great need of reauthorization funding bill.
No real need to educate or brief this team/prior to session. They understand the

4. State of Georgia lobbying staff size and current availability of experienced lobbyists in the Metro Atlanta Area. (10%) 3.5 x .10 = .35

COMMENTS: A little concern about the availability (daily) of some of members of team. Need to express importance of all being available for Authority at all times.

technical workings of transit.
Also included a technical member to their team to ensure the knowledge basis was correct.

5. Total Proposed Cost (5%) XXX x .05 = XXX

COMMENTS: _____

OVERALL PROPOSAL COMMENTS: Excellent team - very creative joint venture - technical expert brilliant move. They thought provoking strategy and communications plan - This is what the Authority needs to position itself during 2010 General Assembly. This team didn't lack anything - they get it!

TOTAL PROPOSAL SCORE

~~4.5~~ 4.5

4

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORE SHEET
PROCUREMENT OF PROFESSIONAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS SERVICES (STATE)
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS P18246

2009 OCT -2 PM 1:52

OFFEROR: WILLIAMS CONSULTING GROUP, INC.

REVIEWER: Ryland N. McClinton

DATE: Oct 1, 2009

| <u>EVALUATION FACTOR & WEIGHT</u> | <u>SCORE</u> (0-5) | | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------|
| 1. Documented prior success in lobbying before the Georgia General Assembly and State Government leadership, including familiarity with relevant issues and key stakeholders; Documented prior bi-partisan success on a range of other challenging matters in lobbying advocacy and effective positioning, communications before the Georgia General Assembly, State and regional leadership (both governmental and non-governmental). | (40%) <u>4</u> | x | .40 <u>1.6</u> |

COMMENTS: Demonstrated successes; access to Majority leadership is unobtainable. no demonstrated access to Minority leadership indicated they will work the ropes; NO conflicts in transportation lobbying understood the issues

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|----------------|
| 2. Project Approach – A description on how the firm would position and organize to assist MARTA by providing aggressive lobbying services to assist MARTA in developing and implementing an effective overall State advocacy program, presence, and strategic communications plan that achieve the Authority’s stated objectives. | (25%) <u>4</u> | x | .25 <u>1.0</u> |
|---|----------------|---|----------------|

COMMENTS: Solid approach understood the imp. of communications getting the info out first; ~~not~~ indicated how they would handle the opposition. suggested some allies we need to mobilize.

3. A detail understanding of what MARTA is seeking in regards to lobbying services (20%) 3 x .20 .60

COMMENTS: Not sure if all members of the team understand; the principal partner needs to be advised of MARTA's expectations since our needs are critical.

4. State of Georgia lobbying staff size and current availability of experienced lobbyists in the Metro Atlanta Area. (10%) 3 x ¹⁰/₂₀ .60

COMMENTS: Team adequate if everyone pulls their weight. Miss 10% heavy lift

5. Total Proposed Cost (5%) XXX x .15 XXX

COMMENTS: _____

OVERALL PROPOSAL COMMENTS: _____

TOTAL PROPOSAL SCORE _____

5

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORE SHEET
 PROCUREMENT OF PROFESSIONAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS SERVICES (STATE)
 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS P18246

2009 OCT -2 PM 1:59

OFFEROR: WILLIAMS CONSULTING GROUP, INC.

REVIEWER: Scott Haggard

DATE: 10/1/09

| <u>EVALUATION FACTOR & WEIGHT</u> | <u>SCORE</u> (0-5) | | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|--|-----------------------|---|----------------|
| 1. Documented prior success in lobbying before the Georgia General Assembly and State Government leadership, including familiarity with relevant issues and key stakeholders; Documented prior bi-partisan success on a range of other challenging matters in lobbying advocacy and effective positioning, communications before the Georgia General Assembly, State and regional leadership (both governmental and non-governmental). | (40%) <u>5</u> | x | .40 <u>2.0</u> |

COMMENTS: The team has strong experience w/ key members of leadership, as well as bipartisan success on a range of issues, including transit and transportation. Excellent familiarity with MARTA issues.

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|-----------------|
| 2. Project Approach – A description on how the firm would position and organize to assist MARTA by providing aggressive lobbying services to assist MARTA in developing and implementing an effective overall State advocacy program, presence, and strategic communications plan that achieve the Authority's stated objectives. | (25%) <u>5</u> | x | .25 <u>1.25</u> |
|---|----------------|---|-----------------|

COMMENTS: The team has a well-thought-out strategy for positioning MARTA in 2010, and an outstanding approach using strategic communications to build statewide support.

3. A detail understanding of what MARTA is seeking in regards to lobbying services (20%) 4.5 x .20 0.9

COMMENTS: The team's understanding of MARTA's needs is very good. One small weakness is perhaps outreach to minority legislators.

4. State of Georgia lobbying staff size and current availability of experienced lobbyists in the Metro Atlanta Area. (10%) 4 x .10 ~~0.4~~ 0.4

COMMENTS: Although the team itself is mostly small firms, the principals on the team will be doing most of the day-to-day work.

5. Total Proposed Cost (5%) XXX x .05 XXX

COMMENTS: _____

OVERALL PROPOSAL COMMENTS: Overall, an excellent proposal and presentation with a solid grasp of MARTA's needs.

TOTAL PROPOSAL SCORE ~~4.55~~ 4.55