

**COUNCIL ACTION FORM**

**SUBJECT:** RESOLUTION APPROVING AWARD OF CONTRACT TO URS CORPORATION TO CONDUCT AN ANALYSIS OF CYRIDE'S ORANGE ROUTE

**BACKGROUND:** In August 2012, the Transit Board of Trustees approved a study to examine the Orange Route Corridor to determine how best to serve the needs of its riders today and into the future. The Scope of Work included specific questions to help guide the study as well as requirements of the federal grant program funding a majority of the study with 80% federal funds. The total budget for the project is set at \$200,000.

Proposals from interested firms were due on November 9, 2012. CyRide received three proposals from the following firms:

1. URS Corporation
2. SRF Consulting Group
3. Olsson Associates

Five CyRide and City of Ames staff reviewed each of the proposals based on the general evaluation language contained in the RFP and the Federal Transit Administration's Two-Step Process as is required for professional services contracts, which first evaluates proposals based only on their technical merit and then based on technical criteria and price together. Specifically the following criteria/weights were used, with each category ranked using a scale from 1 - 10.

| Criteria                   | Percentage Weight |
|----------------------------|-------------------|
| Key Personnel              | 20%               |
| Team Composition           | 10%               |
| Firm qualifications        | 15%               |
| Project Approach           | 15%               |
| Understanding of the Study | 20%               |
| Time Schedule              | 5%                |
| Price                      | 15%               |

In reviewing the technical ranking and points, the team determined that that each member of the evaluation had substantially rated the URS firm higher as indicated on the following page based on the 10-point scale and also unanimously ranked URS as their #1 choice:

- URS – Average 7.63
- SRF – 6.76
- Olsson – 6.95

The team then opened the price proposals from the three firms with the following results:

- URS - \$201,880
- SFR - \$198,443
- Olsson - \$197,980

The price proposal spread is very small, within less than 2%. The results for the combined **technical and price analysis** are attached with URS Corporation identified as the best firm to provide the services requested with the highest point total, even though its price was slightly higher. The additional \$1,880 required above the budgeted amount will be provided with local dollars from CyRide's capital budget.

The Transit Board of Trustees approved the contract award to URS Corporation at their December 10, 2012 meeting.

#### **ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Award the #23 Orange Route Analysis to URS Corporation for a not-to-exceed amount of \$201,880.
2. Reject all proposals and direct CyRide staff to rebid the project.
3. Do not proceed with a #23 Orange Route analysis.

#### **MANAGER'S RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

URS Corporation's technical response satisfactorily addressed all questions included in the RFP, developed tasks that addressed these questions, met federal planning requirements, and formed a well qualified team that would be able to assist the community in indentifying modifications allowing this route to operate as its maximum efficiency. With less than \$4,000 difference in price, the technical capabilities of URS Corporation identified their firm as the best choice for this study.

Therefore, it is the recommendation of the City Manager that the City Council adopt Alternative No. 1, thereby awarding the contract to URS Corporation for a not-to-exceed amount of \$201,880.

## Orange Route Alternatives Analysis Evaluation Results - Technical & Price

|   |              | URS          | SRF          | Olsson       |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>I. Key Personnel</b>                                 |              |              |              |              |
| Qualifications of key staff, availability of time       | Evaluator #1 | 1.8          | 1.6          | 1.6          |
| (score = rating x 20%)                                  | Evaluator #2 | 1.6          | 1.6          | 1.4          |
|   | Evaluator #3 | 1.6          | 1.6          | 1.6          |
|   | Evaluator #4 | 1.6          | 1.6          | 1.6          |
|   | Evaluator #5 | 2            | 2            | 2            |
| <b>II. Team Composition</b>                             |              |              |              |              |
| Qualifications of the team.                             | Evaluator #1 | 0.8          | 0.8          | 0.7          |
| (score = rating x 10%)                                  | Evaluator #2 | 0.9          | 0.8          | 0.8          |
|   | Evaluator #3 | 0.8          | 0.7          | 0.7          |
|   | Evaluator #4 | 0.9          | 0.8          | 0.8          |
|   | Evaluator #5 | 1            | 1            | 0.9          |
| <b>III. Firm Qualifications</b>                         |              |              |              |              |
| Experience with similar studies, staff to back up       | Evaluator #1 | 1.35         | 1.35         | 1.05         |
| (score = rating x 15%)                                  | Evaluator #2 | 1.2          | 1.35         | 1.2          |
|   | Evaluator #3 | 1.2          | 1.05         | 1.2          |
|   | Evaluator #4 | 1.2          | 1.2          | 1.2          |
|   | Evaluator #5 | 1.35         | 1.35         | 1.35         |
| <b>IV. Project Approach</b>                             |              |              |              |              |
| Logical, comprehensive, technically sound               | Evaluator #1 | 1.5          | 1.2          | 1.2          |
| (score = rating x 15%)                                  | Evaluator #2 | 1.35         | 0.9          | 1.35         |
|   | Evaluator #3 | 1.35         | 1.2          | 1.2          |
|   | Evaluator #4 | 1.35         | 1.05         | 1.35         |
|   | Evaluator #5 | 1.5          | 1.05         | 1.05         |
| <b>V. Understanding of the Study</b>                    |              |              |              |              |
| Understand the scope                                    | Evaluator #1 | 1.6          | 1.4          | 1.6          |
| (score = rating x 20%)                                  | Evaluator #2 | 2            | 1.2          | 1.6          |
|   | Evaluator #3 | 1.8          | 1.6          | 1.6          |
|   | Evaluator #4 | 2            | 1.4          | 1.6          |
|   | Evaluator #5 | 2            | 1.6          | 1.6          |
| <b>VI. Time Schedule</b>                                |              |              |              |              |
| Within RFP schedule                                     | Evaluator #1 | 0.4          | 0.4          | 0.5          |
| (score = rating x 5%)                                   | Evaluator #2 | 0.5          | 0.5          | 0.5          |
|   | Evaluator #3 | 0.5          | 0.5          | 0.5          |
|   | Evaluator #4 | 0.5          | 0.5          | 0.5          |
|   | Evaluator #5 | 0.5          | 0.5          | 0.5          |
| <b>TOTAL Technical</b>                                  |              | <b>38.15</b> | <b>33.8</b>  | <b>34.75</b> |
| <b>Average</b>  |              | <b>7.63</b>  | <b>6.76</b>  | <b>6.95</b>  |
| <b>VI. Price</b>  |              |              |              |              |
| (score = rating x 15%)                                  |              | 0.6          | 0.9          | 0.9          |
| 5% over budget - 0 pts, 2.5% - 4.9% over budget – 2pts, |              | \$201,880    | \$198,885    | \$197,980    |
| 0 - 2.5% over budget - 4 pts, .1 - 2.4% under budget -  |              | 100.940%     | 99.443%      | 98.99%       |
| 6 pts, 2.5 - 4.9% under budget - 8 pts,                 |              | 4 pts        | 6 pts        | 6 pts        |
| 5% under budget - 0 pts                                 |              |              |              |              |
| <b>Total Points</b>                                     |              | <b>8.230</b> | <b>7.660</b> | <b>7.850</b> |