

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

METRO EXPRESSLANES PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

1.	Contract Number: AE275020011497	
2.	Recommended Vendor: Parsons Brinckerhoff, 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: February 13, 2015	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: February 13, 2015	
	C. Pre-proposal/Pre-Bid Conference: February 26, 2015	
	D. Proposals/Bids Due: March 13, 2015	
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: May 15, 2015	
	F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics: April 7, 2015	
	G. Protest Period End Date: June 23, 2015	
5.	Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded: 138	Bids/Proposals Received: 1
6.	Contract Administrator: Aielyn Dumaua	Telephone Number: 213-922-7320
7.	Project Manager: Philbert Wong	Telephone Number: 213-922-2642

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. AE275020011497 to provide program management support for the development of the Los Angeles County ExpressLanes network, including the preparation of planning, engineering and market research studies and reports per Metro Board direction. Potential tasks under this contract are classified into three categories:

- A. Project initiation, planning and preliminary engineering;
- B. Project and program management oversight; and
- C. Public education, community relations, and market research.

Tasks related to tolling operations, maintenance, and construction are not included in this scope of work.

This is an Architect and Engineer (A&E) qualifications based procurement. Price cannot be used as an evaluation factor pursuant to state and federal law. Small Business Enterprise preference is not applicable to A&E procurements.

The Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued as a standard A&E competitive procurement in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and Procedure Manual and the contract type is Firm Fixed Labor-Hour. This solicitation is exempt from the Small Business Set-Aside Program guidelines; therefore, the contract may be awarded to a non-SBE firm.

Two amendments were issued during the solicitation phase of this RFP:

- Amendment No. 1, issued on February 17, 2015, clarified the schedule of the Pre-proposal Conference.
- Amendment No. 2, issued on March 3, 2015, provided changes to the submittal requirements for key personnel, provided electronic copies of the Plan-Holders' List and sign-in sheets for the pre-proposal conference, and provided responses to proposer questions.

The RFP was included in Metro's website listing for Future Contract Opportunities for the months of January and February, 2015 prior to RFP issue date. The RFP was released on February 13, 2015, as a full and open public competition for Architectural & Engineering (A&E) services. The solicitation was available for download from Metro's website. Advertisements were placed in four leading publications within Los Angeles County (Los Angeles Daily News, L.A. Watts Times, La Opinion and Asian Week) and in two popular tolling websites (tollroadsnews.com and ibtta.org) to notify potential proposers of this solicitation. Further, Metro notified potential prime contractors identified by the Project Office and other potential proposers from Metro's vendor database based on applicable North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes.

A pre-proposal conference was held on February 26, 2015, and attended by 31 participants representing 26 firms.

The solicitation period was for 31 days. One hundred thirty-eight firms downloaded the RFP and were included on Metro's planholders' list. Four questions were received regarding the solicitation and responses were released prior to the proposal due date. Firms did not request for any extension of the proposal due date. One proposal was received on March 13, 2015.

Since only one proposal was received, Metro staff canvassed the potential proposers to determine why there were no other proposers. The following is a summary of the market survey:

1. Potential proposer has experience nationally on the operations and maintenance of the express lanes. However, this is not the business strategy of its local office.
2. Potential proposer has sufficient resources to prime the project but it could not identify a local based Project Manager with sufficient availability to manage the project. Timeframe provided to submit a proposal is sufficient.

3. Potential proposer does not want to be conflicted in pursuing future express lanes/toll road implementation projects.
4. Potential proposer was looking for subcontracting opportunities only but could not find a prime contractor that would be willing to team up.
5. Potential proposer was not properly positioned to pursue this project.
6. Potential proposer does not have the technical capabilities to pursue this project as a prime contractor.
7. Potential proposer indicated that timeframe given to submit a proposal was insufficient. Further, the statement of work seemed specially focused on express lane experience, which the firm does not have qualifications for such a narrow focus.

Metro staff determined that the solicitation was not restrictive and, based on the market survey, the decisions not to propose were based on individual business considerations. All but one of the firms surveyed indicated that sufficient time was made available for firms to respond. Adequate competition existed as the solicitation was performed in an environment where all proposers believed that competition was available. Therefore, this solicitation can be awarded as a competitive award.

B. Evaluation of Proposals/Bids

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Congestion Reduction and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) was convened and conducted a comprehensive technical evaluation of the proposal received.

The proposal was evaluated based on the following evaluation criteria and weights:

- Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Contractor's Team 40%
- Management Plan and Controls 30%
- Degree of Skills and Experience of Personnel on the Team 30%

The evaluation criteria are appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for similar procurements for on-call express lanes program management support. Several factors were considered when developing these weights, giving the greatest importance to the experience and capabilities of the firms on the contractor's team. The PET evaluated the proposal according to the pre-established evaluation criteria and reasonableness of the technical proposal.

Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (PB) was the only proposer that responded to this solicitation. Between April 2 and April 9, 2015, PB's proposal was distributed to the PET. From April 10 to April 24, 2015, the PET scored the proposal received. On April 27, 2015, an oral presentation was held. PB's project manager and key team members had an opportunity to present each team member's qualifications and respond to the evaluation committee's questions. In general, PB's presentation addressed the requirements of the RFP, experience with all aspects of the required tasks, and stressed the team members' commitment to the success of the project.

Based on a thorough evaluation of the proposal, the PET determined PB to be technically qualified to perform the work.

Qualifications Summary of Recommended Firm:

Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.

The recommended firm, PB, has been in business for 81 years. PB has a history of managed lanes experience in the region and across the state. PB has provided advisory services to Metro on planning, developing, implementing and monitoring the performance of the managed lanes network in Los Angeles County for almost 20 years. It provides program management expertise, lessons learned and best practices gained from its various roles on multiple express lane projects.

The PB team has a readily accessible pool of personnel resources that have expertise in a variety of disciplines covering the full the range of services necessary for the implementation of additional ExpressLanes projects in the Los Angeles County. PB’s strengths were in their depth of expertise and experience in delivering express lanes projects, proposed management plan, strong key personnel, project delivery techniques, and clear understanding of the scope of work.

PB’s performance on Metro projects has been satisfactory.

The following is a summary of the PET scores:

1	FIRM	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
2	Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.				
3	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Contractor’s Team	85.98	40.00%	34.39	
4	Management and Controls	84.00	30.00%	25.20	
5	Degree of Skills and Experience of Personnel on the Team	88.89	30.00%	26.67	
6	Total		100.00%	86.26	1

C. Cost/Price Analysis

The final firm fixed negotiated fully burdened rates will comply with all requirements of the Metro Acquisition Policy and Procedures Manual, including MASD audit, fact-finding, clarifications, negotiations, and cost analysis to determine a fair and reasonable price before contract execution.

Work for this contract will be authorized through the issuance of task orders. Metro will issue a solicitation request inclusive of a Statement of Work. Upon receipt of an acceptable response and upon completion of applicable negotiation, Metro will issue a task order accordingly.

D. Background on Recommended Contractor

PB is a leading engineering professional services consulting firms worldwide. PB is headquartered in New York, NY. PB’s expertise ranges from environmental remediation to urban planning, from engineering iconic buildings to designing sustainable transport networks and from developing the energy sources of the future to enabling new ways of extracting essential resources.

The PB Team has played major roles in the planning of Southern California’s commuter and transit systems, freeways, High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes and ExpressLanes. The PB Team is composed of 23 subcontractors, 15 of which are Metro SBE certified firms. The proposed team has expertise in key areas such as traffic and revenue forecasting, concept of operations development, highway engineering, environmental resources, and market research/public outreach. The team has a successful history working together on various express lanes projects in different capacities.

The Project Manager (PM) has 14 years of experience working with Southern California stakeholders to successfully implement managed lanes in the region. PM previously led the Congestion Reduction Demonstration Program for Los Angeles County that established the Concept of Operations, preliminary design and project deliver mechanism for implementing express lanes on I-10 and I-110, served as strategic advisor during the design, construction and testing of facilities, and led performance evaluation efforts during the initial operation of the facilities.

E. Small Business Participation

The Diversity and Economic Opportunity Department (DEOD) established a 25% Small Business Enterprise (SBE) goal for this task order contract. SBE attainment is based on the aggregate value of all task orders issued. Parsons Brinckerhoff listed 15 SBE subcontractors and made an overall goal commitment of 25% SBE.

Small Business Enterprise Goal	25% SBE	Small Business Enterprise Commitment	25% DBE
---------------------------------------	----------------	---	----------------

	SBE Subcontractors	% SBE Committed
1.	AFSHA Consulting, Inc.	TBD
2.	Arellano Associates, LLC	TBD
3.	Diaz Yourman & Associates	TBD
4.	Epic Land solutions	TBD

	SBE Subcontractors	% SBE Committed
5.	FPL and Associates, Inc.	TBD
6.	Galvin Preservation (GPA)	TBD
7.	Intueor Consulting	TBD
8.	Kal Krishnan Consulting	TBD
9.	Noble Insight, Inc.	TBD
10.	Redhill Group, Inc	TBD
11.	System Metrics Group, Inc.	TBD
12.	Terry Hayes & Associates	TBD
13.	VCS Environmental	TBD
14.	Value Management Strategies, Inc.	TBD
15.	WKE, Inc.	TBD
	Total SBE Commitment	25%

F. Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy Applicability

The Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy is not applicable to this contract.

G. All Subcontractors Included with Recommended Contractor's Proposal

	Subcontractor	Services Provided
1.	HNTB Corporation	Tolling/Engineering
2.	AFSHA Consulting, Inc.	Modeling Support
3.	Arellano Associates, LLC	Outreach
4.	Argabright Consulting, LLC	Procurement Specifications
5.	Chuck Fuhs, LLC	Managed Lanes Operations
6.	Diaz Yourman & Associates	Geotechnical
7.	ECONorthwest	Traffic and Revenue Forecasting
8.	Epic Land Solutions, Inc.	Right-of-way
9.	FAST – Fixing Angelenos Stuck in Traffic	Outreach
10.	FPL and Associates, Inc.	Traffic Engineering
11.	GPA Consulting	Environmental
12.	Intueor Consulting, Inc.	Operational Analysis
13.	Iteris, Inc.	Analytics/Performance
14.	Kal Krishnan Consulting Services, Inc.	Document Control
15.	Nobel Insight, Inc.	Outreach
16.	PRR, Inc.	Outreach
17.	Redhill Group, Inc.	Market Research
18.	System Metrics Group, Inc.	Operational Analysis
19.	Terry Hayes & Associates, Inc.	Environmental
20.	Transportation Solutions	Governance

	Subcontractor	Services Provided
21.	VCS Environmental	Environmental
22.	VCM Management Strategies, Inc.	Value Engineering
23.	WKE, Inc.	Civil/Structural Engineering