

**REVIEW COMMITTEE  
FOR THE SELECTION OF  
OWNER'S PROJECT MANAGER  
UNION STATION REGIONAL INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION CENTER**

**Memorandum**

To: Springfield Redevelopment Authority Governing Board

From: Union Station Review Committee for Owner's Project Manager

Subject: Review Committee's Report and Recommendations

Date: October 26, 2010

---

This memorandum provides the rankings and recommendations of the Union Station Review Committee for Owner's Project Manager (OPM Review Committee) for the Union Station Regional Intermodal Transportation Center, in connection with a Request for Services issued by the Springfield Redevelopment Authority (SRA) on August 4, 2010. That request (RFS Bid No. 08-20100001) was issued to obtain the services of an Owner's Project Manager (OPM) to represent the interests of the SRA in the design and construction of Springfield's historic Union Station. The services were sought in accordance with Chapter 149, Section 44A½, and Chapter 193 of the Public Construction Reform Law.

The Review Committee appointed by the SRA consisted of:

William A. MacGregor, Secretary, Springfield Redevelopment Authority  
Vice-President, TD Bank

Timothy Brennan, Executive Director  
Pioneer Valley Planning Commission

Leslie Lawrence, Director of Lending  
Western Mass. Enterprise Fund  
(Formerly Vice President of Commercial Lending - MassDevelopment)

Jose Claudio - DevelopSpringfield Board Member  
Director of Community Development and Public Relations  
New North Citizens' Council

Guy Bresnahan, Office of Transportation and Planning  
Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT)

The OPM Review Committee, which held four meetings, was subject to the open meeting law. All meetings were duly posted and open to the public and minutes were prepared. Copies of those minutes are attached to this memorandum. The Review Committee had access to, and the benefit of, legal advice to ensure that the process that was employed to reach these recommendations to the SRA Board was sound, comprehensive and equitable.

On September 9, 2010, the SRA received six proposals in response to the RFS for OPM services. The firms submitting proposals were:

1. Western Mass. OPM Services, LLC
2. Skanska USA Building, Inc.
3. HEERY, Inc.
4. URS Corporation – New York
5. Louis Berger Group, Inc.
6. Arcadis US, Inc.

The proposals were screened by SRA staff to ensure that they met the minimum requirements contained in the RFS. Staff determined that all proposals met those requirements and all proposals were forwarded to the committee for review. The OPM Review Committee evaluated each response based on the comparative evaluation criteria contained in the RFS, as noted below:

- General Quality of Response:
  - Compliance with RFS requirements.
  - Completeness of response.
  - Familiarity with project goals and objectives.
- Previous Prior experience:
  - Experience with projects of comparable scale, complexity and significance, as well as the technical expertise required to successfully complete the scope of work.
  - Experience with public projects of similar scope.
  - Experience with historic restoration, public-private development projects, sustainable building methods, cost estimating and value engineering etc.
  - Experience with and knowledge of Massachusetts construction procurement laws, regulations, policies and procedures as amended by 2004 Construction Reform Laws including CM at Risk Delivery Method.
  - Experience working with FTA, rail (Amtrak and freight) carriers and their respective funding requirements, facilities and TOD projects.
- References and Reputation:

- A track record of successful performance on similar projects, demonstrating an acceptable level of creativity, innovation, resourcefulness and positive outcomes.
- Project Approach:
  - Appropriateness of general approach to performing scope of services, resources to be applied, and degree of creativity and innovation contained in the response.
  - Tools proposed to increase efficiency and effectiveness.
  - Innovative recommendations designed to promote creativity, cost savings, efficiency, etc.
  - Allocation of responsibilities among the team members.
- Proposed Staffing:
  - Quality of key personnel and subcontractors.
  - Appropriateness of team including size, number of firms, and prior experience of team members working together (if applicable).
  - Education/professional registration(s).
  - Complexity of completed projects.
  - Experience with Massachusetts public building construction.
  - DBE/WBE/MBE participation.
- Firm's stability and capacity:
  - Strength of firm's history and ownership.
  - Current workload.
  - Past or pending litigation.
- Satisfactory completion of all forms and required certifications.

On September 22, 2010, the Review Committee met and deemed all submittals to be responsive overall to the RFS. The members discussed their individual assessments of each proposal in forming a general consensus as to the content, merit, approach and staffing of each submittal and reviewed and discussed the strengths and weaknesses of each. They agreed to eliminate Western Mass. OPM Services, LLC, and HEERY, Inc. from further consideration. Western Mass. OPM Services, LLC, was eliminated because the firm had no prior track record; there was no depth to the organization and no demonstrated transportation experience. HEERY, Inc. was eliminated because of the lack of clarity in its response, including inconsistencies concerning its past performance records, ambiguity concerning team members and the relationships between the firm and its proposed subcontractors.

The Review Committee, by unanimous vote, selected the following four semi-finalists, which were asked to appear for interviews before the committee on October 7, 2010:

- Skanska USA Building, Inc
- URS Corporation – New York
- Louis Berger Group, Inc.
- Arcadis US, Inc.

Each interview consisted of a 20-minute presentation by the firm with a 30-minute question-and-answer period. The committee indicated it was interested in hearing from the project manager, clerk of the works and any other team member who would interact with the SRA concerning the project. The committee asked that there be no PowerPoint presentations or supplemental information distributed during the interviews.

Four questions were formulated by the committee and sent to each firm in advance of the interview for them to address at the interview. The questions were:

- Describe one assignment like Union Station (that you have worked on)?
- What are your thoughts about and experiences with the Construction Manager at Risk construction method?
- What is the availability of the team, not just the lead members or firm, to successfully execute the project?
- What further enhancements might you suggest that would increase or improve the value and quality of the project?

After the interviews were completed, the Review Committee requested that SRA staff conduct respondent reference checks and a due diligence review of each firm and its proposed subcontractors. This process included the references provided in the submittals, inquiries of other public agency contacts, as well as background information from Web sources. The committee met on October 18, 2010, to discuss the findings and information obtained and to discuss how each of the respondents demonstrated that it has significant experience, knowledge and abilities with respect to public construction projects of similar size, scope and complexity as the Union Station Regional Intermodal Transportation Center. The committee took into account all available information including: the scope of work; project-specific criteria and information; references; respondents' performance records on previous public and private work; interviews; and information contained in the response.

Following extensive deliberations about each consultant team's qualifications, skills, personnel, experiences and references; each Review Committee member verbally presented his or her individual ranking of the finalists in order of qualification, along with the rationale for the ranking. The rankings were unanimous, and a subsequent vote of the Review Committee was taken.

The Review Committee has ranked the three finalists in order of qualification, as follows:

- #1 Skanska USA Building, Inc.
- #2 Arcadis US, Inc.
- #3 URS Corporation – New York

The Skanska USA Building, Inc., (Skanska) team was ranked first because the committee viewed it as most qualified to provide the scope of work outlined in the RFS. The firm was well-prepared for its interview and demonstrated the best understanding of the project and project

goals. The experience of assigned personnel, including the project manager and clerk of the works, as confirmed by reference checks, was determined to be exceptional and the team has expertise with Massachusetts construction, including the CM at Risk method. Skanska is under contract with the Division of Capital Asset Management (DCAM) serving as CM at Risk for the new Springfield Information Technology Data Center, a LEED Certified building conversion project located in an historic area and involving partial demolition and facade preservation, on which the firm has received very favorable reviews.

The Skanska team demonstrated an understanding of historic rehabilitation and LEED certification, as well as building constraints and potential construction risks, and offered innovative phasing and technological ideas, which will be extremely beneficial in this assignment. Skanska has provided service as OPM to DCAM on the Brockton Courthouse project and the Fitchburg State University Aubuchon Hall renovations. Skanska received favorable reviews from the committee for taking a proactive role in the communities in which it works with regard to providing notification of jobs opportunities and efforts to enhance participation by local and minority individuals. The Skanska team also included a member, GLC, which is proposed to provide real estate services and financial structuring for the project. These services were not requested in the RFS and the committee has not rendered an opinion on the SRA's need or desire for them.

The Arcadis team was ranked second. It demonstrated the relevant project experience necessary to provide the services requested including the team's experience of having worked together on similar projects. The team has the required expertise and demonstrated a good understanding of the construction risk and the need to coordinate site logistics and multiple agency involvement. The team has expertise with software applications such as BIM, MultiVista, and LaserScan. Arcadis also has experience working on an FTA Project Management Plan in relation to the Bridgeport Transit Center. Arcadis is under contract to the MBTA, providing independent cost estimating to their Design and Construction division and to the City of Springfield as OPM for the Putnam High and Forest Park Middle school projects.

The URS Corporation team was ranked third. The team had a very intellectual approach to the project – and included a project designer who would provide initial services in an effort to mitigate potential pitfalls that might occur later in the operational phase. URS has rail-sector experience and is involved in work to update the Amtrak tunnels and electric signage in the New Haven Station for the Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT). The URS team stressed the need to do as much of the work necessary now to anticipate future needs and identified parking as an example. URS also has worked with DCAM on early energy construction projects.

In summary, the committee viewed the Skanska USA Building team as the best qualified to undertake this assignment, followed by Arcadis and then URS.

The Review Committee would like to thank you for the opportunity to have served in this capacity.