

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

**EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT
AE58083E0129**

1.	Contract Number: AE58083E0129	
2.	Recommended Vendor: Gannett Fleming, Inc.	
3.	Type of Procurement (check one): <input type="checkbox"/> IFB <input type="checkbox"/> RFP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RFP-A&E <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Competitive <input type="checkbox"/> Modification <input type="checkbox"/> Task Order	
4.	Procurement Dates:	
	A. Issued: November 16, 2018	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: November 18, 2018	
	C. Pre-Proposal Conference: December 11, 2018	
	D. Proposals Due: March 18, 2019	
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: July 1, 2019	
	F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics: June 6, 2019	
	G. Protest Period End Date: Est. July 22, 2019	
5.	Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded: 41	Proposals Received: 5
6.	Contract Administrator: Helen Gates-Bryant	Telephone Number: 213-922-1269
7.	Project Manager: Monica Born	Telephone Number: 213-418-3097

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. AE58083E0129 issued in support of the East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor Project, a proposed light rail system that will extend north from the Van Nuys Metro Orange Line Station to the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station, a total of 9.2 miles. The project will be delivered in three phases: Preliminary Engineering (PE); Solicitation Support (SS); and Design Support During Construction Services (DSDC). Board approval of contract award is subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest.

The RFP was issued in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and California Government Code §4525-4525.9. The contract type is a Cost Reimbursable, specifically a Cost Plus Fixed Fee.

Eight (8) amendments were issued during the solicitation phase of this RFP:

- Amendment No. 1, issued on December 10, 2018 clarified location of Pre-Proposal Conference;
- Amendment No. 2, issued on December 17, 2018 clarified time proposals are due;
- Amendment No. 3, issued on December 21, 2018 clarified proposal due date;
- Amendment No. 4, issued on February 4, 2019 changed the date proposals were due;

- Amendment No. 5, issued on February 8, 2019 clarified/revise solicitation document (including submittal requirements, SOW, and evaluation criteria)
- Amendment No. 6, issued on February 12, 2019 clarified/revise solicitation document (including submittal requirements and evaluation criteria)
- Amendment No. 7, issued on February 22, 2019 to change the date proposals were due
- Amendment No. 8, issued on February 25, 2019 clarified/revise solicitation documents (including submittal requirements, and evaluation criteria)

A total of five (5) proposals were received on March 18, 2019. Metro held a pre-proposal conference on December 11, 2018, with a total of seventy (70) people in attendance. Metro had representation from the Risk Management, Ethics, Pre-Qualification, Project Management and DEOD, to highlight the main elements of the RFP including the Small Business Enterprise (SBE) goal of twenty-five percent (25 %) and the Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) goal of three (3%) of the Total Estimated Cost. A total of forty-four (44) questions were received between the issuance of the solicitation and the RFP due date. All questions were addressed by four (4) separate Question and Answer memorandums and the Amendments listed above.

On April 30, 2019, Metro held Oral Presentations with all five (5) proposing firms, at which time Metro received five (5) sealed cost proposals that remain unopened.

B. Evaluation of Proposals

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Executive Office, Transit Project Delivery; Transportation Planning, Systemwide; Executive Office, Transit Operations; Engineering Management; and Regional Rail, Project Engineering was convened and conducted a comprehensive technical evaluation of the proposals received.

The proposals were evaluated based on the following evaluation criteria and weights:

- Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant’s Project Team 15 percent
- Key Personnel’s Skills and Experience 35 percent
- Effectiveness of Management Plan 20 percent
- Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation 25 percent
- Innovation 5 percent

The evaluation criteria are appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other, similar Architect and Engineers (A&E) procurements. Several factors were considered when developing these weights, giving the greatest importance to the skills and experience of key personnel, particularly the Project Manager's technical and managerial experience, and capabilities on similar projects and phases of work. The understanding and approach to implementing the work, with emphasis on maintaining schedule and budget in managing the three phases of the project.

This is an A&E, qualifications based procurement; therefore, price cannot be used as an evaluation factor pursuant to state and federal law.

Of the five (5) proposals received, all five (5) were determined to be within the competitive range. The five (5) firms are listed below in alphabetical order:

1. AECOM
2. East Valley Transit Partnership (Joint Venture of HNTB Corporation; Parsons Transportation Group; and Valle & Associates)
3. Gannett Fleming, Inc.
4. Mott MacDonald LLC & STV, Joint Venture
5. Valley First Transit Partners (Joint Venture of WSP USA, Inc.; KOA Corporation; and RAW International)

All appointed PET representatives reviewed a list of the Proposers and their subconsultants; none were aware of any actual or potential conflict of interest that may arise due to their participation in the evaluation of the Proposals, then completed and certified the Declaration of Confidentiality / No Conflict of Interest form.

During the oral presentations, in general, each team's presentation addressed the requirements of the RFP, experience with all aspects of the required tasks, and stressed each firm's commitment to the success of the project. Also highlighted were staffing plans, work plans, and perceived project issues. Each team was asked questions relative to each firm's proposed alternatives and previous experience.

The PET evaluated and scored the capabilities of each proposer and its team of subconsultants, in accordance with the Evaluation Criteria in the RFP Documents.

Qualifications Summary of Recommended Firm:

The PET ranked the proposals and assessed major strengths, weaknesses and associated risks of each of the Proposers to determine the most qualified firm. The evaluation performed by the PET determined Gannett Fleming, Inc., as the most qualified firm to provide Preliminary Engineering (PE), Solicitation Support (SS), and Design Support During Construction (DSDC), as provided in the RFP Scope of Services. What distinguished Gannett Fleming, Inc. was they demonstrated, through their written proposal and oral presentation, their extensive technical experience performing PE, SS and DSDC services and significant expertise in meeting the street-running, shared use corridor challenges identified in the Scope of Services. Gannett Fleming, Inc. also demonstrated an exceptionally thorough and comprehensive understanding of managing multiple deliverables. The team is highly experienced in delivering similar projects with an excellent record in client satisfaction on Metro projects Division 16 Southwestern Yard, Regional Connector, Willowbrook/Rosa Parks Station Improvements and similar projects around the U.S.

Furthermore, the recommended team demonstrated that it is versed in providing the Scope of Services related to this contract, and has the capabilities to provide staffing for the type of work that is required under this contract. Gannett Fleming, Inc. exceeds the requirements of the three highest weighted criteria. It shows the Team is exceptionally thorough and has a comprehensive understanding of Metro’s goals and methods, and resource allocation.

1	Firm	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
2	Gannett Fleming, Inc.				
3	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant’s Project Team	84.20	15.00%	12.63	
4	Key Personnel’s Skills and Experience	86.26	35.00%	30.19	
5	Effectiveness of Management Plan	88.26	20.00%	17.65	
6	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	86.53	25.00%	21.63	
7	Innovation	73.40	5.00%	3.67	
8	Total		100.00%	85.77	1
9	Mott MacDonald/STV, JV				
10	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant’s Project Team	81.46	15.00%	12.22	
11	Key Personnel’s Skills and Experience	83.26	35.00%	29.14	

12	Effectiveness of Management Plan	82.40	20.00%	16.48	
13	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	84.86	25.00%	21.22	
	Innovation		5.00%	4.05	
14	Total		100.00%	83.11	2
15	East Valley Transit Partnership, JV				
16	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant's Project Team	87.26	15.00%	13.09	
17	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	80.80	35.00%	28.28	
18	Effectiveness of Management Plan	82.33	20.00%	16.47	
19	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	80.60	25.00%	20.15	
	Innovation	86.00	5.00%	4.30	
20	Total		100.00%	82.29	3
20	Valley First Transit Partners				
21	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant's Project Team	83.53	15.00%	12.53	
22	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	83.80	35.00%	29.33	
23	Effectiveness of Management Plan	78.93	20.00%	15.79	
24	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	82.60	25.00%	20.65	
	Innovation		5.00%	3.94	
25	Total		100.00%	82.24	4
26	AECOM				
27	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant's Project Team	84.60	15.00%	12.69	
28	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	78.73	35.00%	27.56	
29	Effectiveness of Management Plan	78.66	20.00%	15.73	
30	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	86.46	25.00%	21.62	
31	Innovation	86.00	5.00%	4.30	
32	Total		100.00%	81.90	5

C. Cost Analysis

The recommended cost has been determined to be fair and reasonable based upon a cost analysis of labor rates, indirect rates and other direct costs completed in accordance with Metro's Procurement Policies and Procedures. The analysis includes, among other things, a comparison with similar firms; an analysis of rates and factors for labor, and other direct cost upon which the consultant will base its billings. Metro negotiated and established provisional indirect (overhead) rates, plus a fixed fee based on the total estimated cost for the contract term to compensate the consultant. Additionally, direct labor (level of effort) was reduced in several disciplines within the scope of services. This in turn reduced overhead costs, subconsultant costs and fixed fee for the prime and subconsultants.

Audits will be completed, where required, for those firms without a current applicable audit of their indirect cost rates, other factors, and exclusion of unallowable costs, in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 31. In order to prevent any unnecessary delay in contract award, provisional overhead rates have been established subject to Contract adjustments. In accordance with FTA Circular 4220.1 f, if an audit has been performed by any other cognizant agency within the last twelve month period, Metro will receive and accept that audit report for the above purpose rather than perform another audit.

Proposer Name	Proposal Amount	Metro ICE	Recommended NTE amount
Gannett Fleming, Inc.	\$120,104,664.09	\$68,620,182.23	\$61,974,852

D. Background on Recommended Contractor

The recommended firm, Gannett Fleming, Inc., located in Los Angeles, California, has been in business for 104 years and is a leader in the delivery of light rail transit projects. Gannett Fleming, Inc. ranks #8 for Mass Transit and Rail and has delivered a number of LRT projects in urban settings, similar to the location of the ESFV project. Additionally, their experience includes P3/Design Build, street-running and shared-use projects which are important elements within the scope of this project.

Gannett Fleming, Inc. has been delivering light rail systems in Los Angeles County for nearly 40 years, and the identified Project Manager, has successfully delivered Design Build light rail systems for more than 20 years. The multidisciplinary team includes 20 subconsultants that have a vast knowledge and experience with Metro, including work on the Metro Regional Connector Transit Corridor Project, the Crenshaw Southwestern Yard Division 16 Maintenance Facility, Willowbrook/Rosa Parks Station Improvements.

The Project Manager has managed large teams and transitioning light rail projects into viable transportation systems for 30 years. Delivering four operating Design

Build light rail projects on the Metro system. Served as Project Manager on the Pasadena Gold Line LRT, and Gold Line Eastside Extension LRT, as well as the Chief Project Officer on the Exposition Phase1 and Phase 2 LRT. The Project Manager's commitment to this project will be 100% availability.

The LRT Design Manager and the Project Manager have worked together for more than eight years, including Phase 2 of the Exposition LRT Project. The Station and Urban Design Manager has delivered transit projects in Los Angeles for the last 10 years. He currently serves as the design lead for Metro's Orange Line Grade Separation project and served as the Project Director for the Willowbrook/Rosa Parks Transit Station. Other Leads or Key Members of the team with multiple years of has experience working with Metro and in Los Angeles County, are the Maintenance Facility Design Manager, the Project Management and Controls Manager; and the Quality Control/Quality Assurance Manager.