



Chautauqua, Cattaraugus, Allegany & Steuben Counties

Southern Tier Extension Railroad Authority

Center for Regional Excellence, 4039 Route 219, Suite 200, Salamanca, New York 14779

Tel 716-945-5301 Fax 716-945-5550 Tdd 716-945-5301

"This institution is an equal opportunity organization"

Gerard Fitzpatrick, Chairman

Minutes of Proposal Opening

Contract STERA No. 06-1 RFQ Engineering Services

May 30, 2006

Present:	Thomas M. Barnes	STW RPDB / STERA
	Donald R. Rychnowski	STW RPDB / STERA
	William D. Burt	WNYP
	Linda Fox	WNYP

The Proposal Opening for Contract STERA No. 06-1 in response to the RFQ for Engineering Services was held on May 30, 2006 at 9:30 AM in the Conference Room at Southern Tier West Regional Planning and Development Board, Center for Regional Excellence, 4039 Route 219, Suite 200, Salamanca, NY 14779.

The RFQ for engineering services was advertised in the Salamanca Press for 3 days, plus transmitted to a short list of 6 engineering consultants. There were five responses received, from:

FRA Engineering ("FRA")
Ralph Whitehead Associates, Inc. ("RWA")
Lu Engineers ("Lu")
Bergmann Associates Architects and Engineers ("Bergmann")
Clough, Harbour & Associates LLP ("CHA")

The responses were evaluated on six criteria, specified in the RFQ, as follows:

- A. Technical Approach to addressing the proposed scope of services
- B. Qualifications and experience of the firm on railroad projects
- C. Qualifications and experience of proposed Project Manager and key staff
- D. Availability of technical resources to accomplish the work
- E. STERA's and/or WNYP's prior experience with the consultant, if any
- F. Cost Proposal

Each of the above six criteria were given equal weight, and each firm was rated on a scale of 1 to 5 for each of the above six criteria, with 5 being the highest score.

As a surrogate for evaluating the cost proposal, STERA calculated a weighted average cost of the hourly rate quoted for the senior named personnel provided in the response and the hourly rate quoted for the project manager named in the response. The weights assigned were as follows:

Senior named personnel	1/3
Project manager	2/3

Accordingly, the weighted average cost surrogates for each respondent were as follows:

FRA	$(1/3)(\$146) + (2/3)(\$125) = \$132$
RWA	$(1/3)(\$148) + (2/3)(\$111) = \$123$
Lu	$(1/3)(\$176.04) + (2/3)(\$158.37) = \$164$
Bergmann	$(1/3)(\$150) + (2/3)(\$120) = \$130$
CHA	$(1/3)(\$100) + (2/3)(\$85) = \$90$

The cost proposals were then normalized on a scale from 1 to 5 as follows:

\$66 - \$100	5
\$100 - \$133	4
\$134 - \$166	3

Following is a spread sheet for the ratings on the six review criteria for the respondents (see the schedule above for the column heading key):

Respondent	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total	Average	Rank
RWA	4	5	3	4	3	4	23	3.8	2
Lu	4	2	3	3	3	4	19	3.2	5
Bergmann	4	5	4	4	3	3	23	3.8	2
CHA	4	5	5	4	4	4	26	4.3	1
FRA	3	4	4	3	3	5	22	3.7	4

Rank is listed with 1 being the highest rated respondent and 5 being the lowest rated respondent.

In general, the review committee felt that only CHA, RWA, and Bergmann would really be able to handle the scope of capital rehabilitation projects contemplated over the next several years. Unfortunately, RWA's proposal is weakened by the fact that the project manager does not bring rail experience and the firm's main office is in North Carolina, and Bergmann's proposal is too high priced for consideration. So, there does not seem to be a close "second" in the RFQ ratings that would easily substitute for CHA.

The review committee recommended the selection of Clough, Harbour & Associates LLP.