

# **ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING/CONSULTANT SERVICES**

## **SELECTION COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, November 10, 2004**

## **MINUTES**

### **Members Present:**

**Chairman: Peter S. Corr**

**Public Member: George deTarnowsky**

**Agency Representative: Kevin A. Carvalho, ARM, MBA**

**>Department of Administration/Risk Management Unit (DOA):**

**A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order by the Chairman. Minutes of the A/E/CS Selection Committee meeting of October 20, 2004 were approved by G. deTarnowsky and P. Corr. The following agenda items were addressed and voted upon by the Committee:**

**1. Department of Administration/Risk Management Unit (DOA): (9:11**

a.m.)

**RFP #B03935 – Owner Controlled Insurance Program**

**Voting Members: P. Corr, G. deTarnowsky, K. Carvalho**

**Cost: Project Based**

**Mr. Corr noted that this RFP was discussed at the October 20, 2004 meeting, but information regarding the cost of this program was not provided. The committee deferred final determination pending receipt of this information.**

**Mr. Carvalho stated that the RFP was divided into two components; one being the broker fees to administer and market the program and the other being the anticipated costs of insurance. Ten points were available for broker fees and twenty points for costs of insurance.**

**Arthur J. Gallagher proposed the most expensive broker fees and AON Associates (AON) the least expensive with William Gallagher Associates' (William Gallagher) proposal in close proximity to that of AON. The firm offering the lowest fee was given ten points; the other two firms were scored proportionately.**

**The three firms provided a wide variety of anticipated insurance costs. AON, in doing their calculations, misstated the amount of a project as \$68 million (correct amount was \$6.8 million); therefore, this firm's estimated costs for workers compensation insurance were**

**much higher than the others. William Gallagher's proposal was based on a fixed cost while Arthur J. Gallagher had anticipated a deductible program of \$250,000 with the anticipated loss expectations based on \$250,000. For remaining insurance costs, the anticipated costs for Arthur J. Gallagher's program was \$3.2 million.**

**Mr. Corr asked if this is a reasonable cost to assume we will receive the coverage we require.**

**Mr. Carvalho answered yes, it is. Part of the additional cost was the pick of the umbrella policy. Arthur J. Gallagher had a pick of \$50 million, while William Gallagher had a pick of \$100 million. Even if William Gallagher had reduced his proposal to a \$50 million pick, his cost would have been about \$900,000 higher than that of Arthur J. Gallagher.**

**Mr. Corr asked a question concerning a statement in the evaluation of Arthur J. Gallagher as follows: "The experience of the group that will represent the State of Rhode Island was between those of their two competitors." Mr. Corr asked how did the evaluation subcommittee come to that conclusion when the technical review clearly favored Arthur J. Gallagher. Arthur J. Gallagher received 67 pts on the technical review, William Gallagher 63, and AON 62. Mr. Carvalho answered that the comment contained in the evaluation was not accurate.**

**Mr. Corr clarified that Arthur J. Gallagher received the highest technical score and the highest cost score.**

**Recommendation: Upon a motion made by Dr. deTarnowsky, seconded by Mr. Carvalho and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Architectural/ Engineering/ Consultant Services Selection Committee (A/E/CS/SC) accepts the recommendation of the Department of Administration/Risk Management Unit's Technical Review Subcommittee, as approved by the Associate Director, and sends forward to the Director of Administration for her consideration the single name of Arthur J. Gallagher, the most responsive and responsible of the 3 firms that responded to the RFP. (9:17 a.m.)**

## **2. Department of Transportation (DOT): (9:20 a.m.)**

### **A. LOI #B03720 – Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Study & Development**

**Voting Members: P. Corr, G. deTarnowsky, C. Xenophontos**

**Estimated Cost: \$500,000**

**S. Devine and C. Xenophontos presented this item. C. Xenophontos noted that the purpose of this project is to evaluate numerous locations around the state for the possibility of bicycle and pedestrian facilities to be submitted to the Transportation Advisory Committee for inclusion in future projects for final design. This solicitation was for a combined LOI and technical proposal, and**

**fifteen responses were received. The Intermodal Planning section of the DOT reviewed the proposals and presented their recommendation to the DOT Consultant Selection Committee. Following the committee's approval of the recommendation to select Pare Engineering Corporation based on their outstanding proposal, staff qualifications and experience, the Director of DOT also approved the selection.**

**Mr. Corr stated that the report of the Technical Review Subcommittee was thorough and complete. The report included sub-consultants to be utilized by each firm, project approach, staff qualifications, firm experience and finally, the issue of existing workload. Mr. Corr had requested the Agency to comment on this criterion.**

**Recommendation: Upon a motion made by Dr. deTarnowsky, seconded by Mr. Xenophontos and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Architectural/ Engineering/ Consultant Services Selection Committee (A/E/CS/SC) accepts the recommendation of the Department of Transportation's Technical Review Subcommittee, as approved by the Director, and sends forward to the Director of Administration for her consideration the single name of Pare Engineering Corporation, the most responsive and responsible of the**

**15 firms that responded to the LOI. (9:23 a.m.)**

**Dr. deTarnowsky introduced a discussion concerning the criterion in the LOI relating to Existing Workload and if this related to the 15% rule to which Mr. Xenophontos answered no. Dr. deTarnowsky asked if the RIDOT's Standard Operating Procedure for Architectural/Engineering Services Selection which addresses the Existing Workload criterion had gone through the Administrative Procedures Act (and thus, have the force of law), and he noted that that document listed other criteria not addressed in the evaluation of the LOI. Mr. Xenophontos stated that he would look into this.**

**Upon a motion made by Dr. deTarnowsky, seconded by Mr. Xenophontos and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 a.m.**

---

**Gail M. Walsh**  
**Recording Secretary**

**Supporting documentation is on file at the Division of Purchases.**