PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET (CONSENSUS)

EVALUATION FACTOR: MANAGEMENT (RATED)

PROPOSER: MBCR

DATE: 8/19/2013

CONSENSUS RATING: ACCEPTABLE

NARRATIVE SUMMARY: MBCR has submitted an acceptable proposal. The management team is led by the Chief Mechanical Officer who has exhibited consistent performance and industry wide expertise. The proposed General Manager lacks experience in a similar sized Commuter Rail Operation but does possess a solid background in FRA rules compliance and safety. The Chief Transportation Officer is newly appointed and while he does have experience in subway rail systems he lacks experience in railroad operations. The Manager of Quality brings significant private sector experience but also lacks traditional experience in the rail industry. The Chief Engineer has shown acceptable performance during his tenure but lacks the desired technical background. All other positions represent an adequate level of knowledge and experience in their given areas of expertise. MBCR has demonstrated over the course of the present contract an ability and willingness to work harmoniously with organized labor and abide by all collective bargaining agreements and fair wage provisions. MBCR has also committed to enhanced training and mentoring programs for its employees. MBCR has provided some Best Practices, notably the Performance Indicator Dashboard which will be made available to the MBTA and its customers as well as an Advisory Committee made up of top transit professionals to monitor performance in a number of areas.

Objective:

The following are the objectives for the Management evaluation factor:

1) To identify Proposers with a Boston-based organizational structure and personnel who will ensure full compliance with all Contract requirements;

2) To identify Proposers with a Boston-based organizational structure and personnel who will ensure the cost effective provision of all Commuter Rail Services;

3) To identify Proposers with a Boston-based organizational structure and personnel committed to providing the MBTA with
all required information related to the operation, maintenance, compliance and costs of operating Commuter Rail Services;

4) To identify Proposers with a demonstrated capability to work cooperatively with the MBTA to integrate new technologies and industry practices to improve overall system safety, cost effectiveness and performance; and

5) To identify Proposers with an effective staffing plan, labor structure, and workforce training.

Evaluation Criteria:

The Proposer has identified personnel who will ensure full compliance with all Contract requirements and the cost effective provision of all Commuter Rail Services. The Proposer has proposed personnel who are committed to providing the MBTA will all required information related to the operation, maintenance, compliance and costs of operating the Commuter Rail Service. The Proposer has demonstrated a capability to work cooperatively with the MBTA to integrate new technologies and industry practices to improve overall systems safety, cost effectiveness and performance. The Proposer has identified an effective staffing plan, labor structure, and workforce training.

Instructions:

Evaluators must rate each requirement outlined in the table below as one of the following: (i) Exceptional; (ii) Good; (iii) Acceptable; (iv) Potential to Become Acceptable; or (v) Unacceptable. Please note the following explanations when rating each requirement:

1) A rating of Exceptional is appropriate when the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to significantly exceed stated criteria in a way that is beneficial to the MBTA. This rating indicates a consistently outstanding level of quality, with very little or no risk that this Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the solicitation. There are no weaknesses.

2) A rating of Good is appropriate when the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to exceed stated criteria. This rating indicates a generally better than acceptable quality, with little risk that this Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the solicitation. Weaknesses, if any, are very minor. Correction of the weaknesses would not be necessary before the Proposal would be considered further.
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3) A rating of **Acceptable** is appropriate if the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to meet the stated criteria. This rating indicates an acceptable level of quality. The Proposal demonstrates a reasonable probability of success. Weaknesses exist but can be readily corrected through requests for Clarification or Communications.

4) A rating of **Potential to Become Acceptable** is appropriate if the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that fails to meet stated criteria as there are weaknesses, but they are susceptible to correction through Discussions. The response is considered marginal in terms of the basic content and/or amount of information provided for evaluation, but overall the Proposer is capable of providing an acceptable or better Proposal.

5) A rating of **Unacceptable** is appropriate if the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that indicates significant weaknesses and/or unacceptable quality. The Proposal fails to meet the stated criteria and/or lacks essential information and is conflicting and/or unproductive. There is no reasonable likelihood of success; weaknesses are so major and/or extensive that a major revision to the Proposal would be necessary.

Ratings for each requirement must be recorded in the associated Rating column, and a detailed explanation of why a particular rating was given to a requirement must be recorded in the associated Comments/Justification for Rating column. The Appendix B Section column identifies relevant sections of Appendix B (Operations and Management Proposal Instructions) to the Instructions to Proposers.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement No.</th>
<th>Appendix B Section</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments/Justification for Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>B9.2(A)</td>
<td>The Proposer shall include an organizational chart listing the names, reporting relationships, titles and geographic locations for the following key management positions dedicated to the performance of the Contract:</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Proposer’s Management Team is acceptable. Individuals represent adequate experience in rail operations. Chief Mechanical Officer has proven track record of satisfactory performance. Chief Transportation Officer has been recently appointed to position with some experience in rail operations and appears qualified. General Manager’s recent duties have been regulatory in nature and has prior operational experience. All other senior management team members have adequate credentials. General Manager’s experience in managing a comparable commuter rail system is not evident in the proposal or resume. Although the General Manager does have extensive knowledge of FRA rules and Regulations having most recently been Deputy Associate Administrator-Safety&amp;Compliance with FRA. Chief Transportation Officer is new to the position although he has been with MBCR for five years in other positions. Resume does not articulate experience and knowledge of FRA Rules&amp;Regulations. Manager of Quality has limited rail sector experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Chief Transportation Officer;
2. Chief Mechanical Officer;
3. Chief Engineer;
4. Director - Finance and Administration;
5. Manager - Customer Service;
6. Manager - Safety;
7. Manager – Quality; and
8. General Manager (as proposed in the Statement of Qualifications).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement No.</th>
<th>Appendix B Section</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments/Justification for Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>B9.2(B)</td>
<td>If duties are to be distributed in a manner other than that described in B9.2(A)(1) – (8) (such as the combining or splitting of functions, if permitted by the Contract), the Proposer should describe how those functions will be managed. Different position titles are acceptable for functionally equivalent areas.</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>All positions in B9.2(A) (1)-(8) are filled as described. Resumes for management positions in B9.2(A)(1)-(8) have been satisfactorily provided. Each proposed individual has the commensurate experience. Proposed General Manager’s experience is at a smaller property than MBTA. MBCR commits to these individuals working in Boston providing services exclusive to this operating agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.             | B9.2(B)            | The Proposer shall furnish resumes for the management positions identified in B9.2(A)(1) – (8), demonstrating the commensurate experience for each position as articulated in Schedule 3.9 (Management and Personnel) of the Commuter Rail Operating Agreement. Those filling the positions identified shall work exclusively in providing the Agreement Services unless, and only to the extent the prior work approval to the contrary is secured from the MBTA. | Acceptable | Resumes for management positions in B9.2(A)(1)-(8) have been satisfactorily provided. Each proposed individual has the commensurate experience. Proposed General Manager’s experience is at a smaller property than MBTA. MBCR commits to these individuals working in Boston providing services exclusive to this operating agreement.  
  1. CTO – Proposed person for the CTO position offers strong transportation experience and an in-depth knowledge of the MBTA system. Length of previous experience working under an FRA operating environment is less than preferred.  
  2. CMO – exceeds RFP requirements. Candidate has an extensive background in rail mechanical with large systems.  
  3. Chief Engineer – does not meet or exceed the requirements of the RFP. This candidate does have extensive experience working with the MBTA. However, the background presented does not meet the stipulated requirements. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement No.</th>
<th>Appendix B Section</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments/Justification for Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>B9.2(C)</td>
<td>The Proposer shall provide a demonstration of its ability to provide effective employee and labor relations, including the following:</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Currently manages 14 labor unions providing the existing services. Recently negotiated a pattern setting Collective Bargaining Agreement with two unions and similar terms and conditions were adopted by the remaining unions. MBCR has worked effectively with the unions to implement productivity improvements such as the Mechanical Department's Truck Shop. Also created a Management/Labor Health and Welfare Committee. MBCR has demonstrated the ability to work with Labor in a cohesive manner and the proposal reinforces that commitment. The proposal also outlines a satisfactory plan for all training programs for the managers and frontline personnel. MBCR has a demonstrated history of positive working relationships with labor and complying with prevailing wage statutes and a proper administration of the collective bargain agreements in effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. A plan for complying with the labor provision detailed in the Operating Agreement, including Schedules 3.9 (Management and Personnel) and 3.10 (Training of Operator Personnel) and other requirements relating to the existing commuter rail workforce;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. A history of positive working relationships and harmony with employees and their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement No.</td>
<td>Appendix B Section</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Comments/Justification for Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.             | B9.2(D)           | The Proposer shall: (i) identify those portions of the information that it provided in response to Section B9.2(A) through B9.2(C) of Appendix B that it considers to be innovative, best practice, beneficial to MBTA Customers and/or cost efficient, and (ii) submit information supporting or otherwise validating its position that said portions are innovative, best practice, beneficial to MBTA Customers and/or cost efficient. | Acceptable | Proposer has proposed ideas and programs that are innovative, best practice, beneficial to MBTA customers and cost efficient such as:  
- A new headquarters in Boston  
- KPI Dashboard for customers/employees  
- Mentoring program for employee advancement  
- Advisory committee made up of industry leaders  
- Quality Assurance program provides standards and controls to lead to continuous improvement  
- Enhanced mobile ticketing application  
- Zone Plan – geographical management of the systems allows MBCR to focus on needed areas. |

Evaluators #1, #9, #12 and #25
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Susan D. Coff
PMT