PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

METRO EMERGENCY SECURITY OPERATIONS CENTER ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICES / AE451150019779

1.	**Contract Number**: AE451150019779	
2.	**Recommended Vendor**: HDR Engineering, Inc.	
3.	**Type of Procurement (check one):** ☐ **IFB** ☐ **RFP** ☒ **RFP–A&E** ☐ **Non-Competitive** ☐ **Modification** ☐ **Task Order**	
4.	**Procurement Dates**:	
	A. Issued: September 28, 2015	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: September 28, 2015	
	C. Pre-Proposal/Pre-Bid Conference: October 13, 2015	
	D. Proposals/Bids Due: December 14, 2015	
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: March 1, 2016	
	F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics: January 21, 2016	
	G. Protest Period End Date: March 22, 2016	
5.	**Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded**: 54	**Proposals Received**: 3
6.	**Contract Administrator**: Erika Estrada	**Telephone Number**: (213) 922-1102
7.	**Project Manager**: Jeanet Owens	**Telephone Number**: (213) 922-6877

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. AE451150019779 for Architectural and Engineering (A&E) design services for Metro's new Emergency Security Operations Center (ESOC). The intent of this contract is to establish a central location to house emergency, security, rail and bus operations centers to allow centralized communications, coordination, and to improve business continuity in day-to-day operations as well as enhancing Metro's disaster and terrorism response capabilities.

This is an A&E qualifications based Request for Proposal (RFP) issued in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and Procedure Manual and the contract type is a firm fixed price. This solicitation includes an SBE/DVBE goal of 20% (SBE 17% and DVBE 3%).

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

- Amendment No. 1, issued on October 15, 2015, provided responses to questions received, updated the Good Faith Efforts (GFE) provisions and required forms by eliminating GFE in the solicitation, and provided documents related to the Pre-Proposal Conference held on October 13, 2015;
- Amendment No. 2, issued on October 22, 2015, extended the RFP due date to November 2, 2015;

- Amendment No. 3, issued on October 23, 2015, updated the letter of invitation supplement to include the 20% goal of the total contract price (SBE goal of 17% and DVBE goal of 3%), incorporated the Metro Threat and Risk Assessment Operation Control Center report into the Statement of Work, and provided responses to questions received;
- Amendment No. 4, issued on October 30, 2015, extended the RFP due date to November 16, 2015;
- Amendment No. 5, issued on November 12, 2015, extended the RFP due date to November 30, 2015;
- Amendment No. 6, issued on November 24, 2015, extended the RFP due date to December 14, 2015;
- Amendment No. 7, issued on November 30, 2015, deleted and replaced in its entirety the Statement of Work to include 30 percent Preliminary Engineering (PE) Design and 60 percent Advanced PE Systems Design; and
- Amendment No. 8, issued on December 4, 2015, provided responses to questions received, and revised the advanced preliminary engineering design plans subtask outlined in the Statement of Work, Task 4 Design Development Documents.

Two non-mandatory site visits and the pre-proposal conference were all held on October 13, 2015. The non-mandatory site visits were conducted at the Metro Rail Operations Center, Metro Bus Operations Center, Emergency Operations Center and Security Dispatch Center, and attended by 23 participants representing 19 firms. The pre-proposal conference was attended by 23 participants representing 18 firms. There were 28 questions asked and responses were released prior to the proposal due date.

A total of 54 firms downloaded the RFP and were included in the planholders' list. A total of three proposals were received on December 14, 2015.

B. Evaluation of Proposals/Bids

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Metro's Program Management, Rail Operations, Project Control and Administration, and Systems 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:

• Degree of Skills and Experience of Team	25%
• Experience and Capabilities of Personnel on the Contractor's Team	20%
• Effectiveness of Team Management Plan	20%
• Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of approach for implementation	35%

The evaluation criteria are appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other, similar A&E design procurements. Several factors were considered when developing these weights, giving the greatest importance to the understanding of the work and project approach. The PET evaluated the proposals according to the pre-established evaluation criteria.

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

During December 16 through December 23, 2015, the PET completed its independent evaluation of the three proposals received. All three proposals were determined to be within the competitive range and are listed below in alphabetical order:

1. Anil Verma Associates, Inc.
2. HDR Engineering, Inc.
3. STV Incorporated

During the interviews, the firms' project managers and key team members had an opportunity to present each team's qualifications and respond to the PET's questions. In general, each team addressed the team's experience with at least one Emergency Operations Center (EOC), Rail Operations Center (ROC), Bus Operations Center (BOC), and/or Security Operations Center (SOC) in an urban setting particularly focused on the U.S. transportation agencies, and experience in designing transit facilities, particularly focused on transit operational characteristics. Each team was asked to explain their understanding of concept of operations of EOC, ROC, BOC and/or SOC in design and engineering of similar projects and the approach to designing the ESOC within timeframe identified in the Statement of Work.

The final scoring, after interviews, determined HDR to be the most technically qualified firm.

Qualifications Summary of Recommended Firm:

HDR Engineering, Inc. (HDR) offers architecture, interiors, structural engineering, electrical engineering, systems design, and project management services. The proposed team demonstrated several years of significant experience on similar projects, including Intelligence and Operations Coordination Center for Tucson Border Patrol Sector Headquarters, Command Center for the Pentagon National Military, Norfolk Operations Center Facility design, the City of Los Angeles EOC, LAX Airport Response Coordination Center and Department of Operations Center, and Metro's BOC and ROC assessment.

HDR's proposed approach included a three-core strategy: Programming, Systems and Technology, and A&E design services to meet the design needs for the ESOC. The work plan discussed a responsive design that met the ESOC project schedule,

provided the required stakeholder approval, operations concepts, and a design that was adaptable to Metro's changing needs over time. The proposal provided innovative ESOC facility designs that plan for growth and seamless integration with Metro's current centers and future facility operations.

The following is a summary of the PET scores:

	FIRM	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
1	**HDR Engineering, Inc.**				
2	Degree of Skills and Experience of Team	88.20	25.00%	22.05	
3	Experience and Capabilities of Personnel on the Contractor's Team	90.55	20.00%	18.11	
4	Effectiveness of Team Management Plan	86.75	20.00%	17.35	
5	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of approach for implementation	86.38	35.00%	30.23	
6	Total		**100.00%**	**87.74**	**1**
7	**STV Incorporated**				
8	Degree of Skills and Experience of Team	85.76	25.00%	21.44	
9	Experience and Capabilities of Personnel on the Contractor's Team	85.30	20.00%	17.06	
10	Effectiveness of Team Management Plan	83.55	20.00%	16.71	
11	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of approach for implementation	81.96	35.00%	28.69	
12	Total		**100.00%**	**83.90**	**2**
13	**Anil Verma Associates, Inc.**				
14	Degree of Skills and Experience of Team	79.36	25.00%	19.84	
15	Experience and Capabilities of Personnel on the Contractor's Team	79.30	20.00%	15.86	
16	Effectiveness of Team Management Plan	80.90	20.00%	16.18	
17	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of approach for implementation	69.99	35.00%	24.50	
18	Total		**100.00%**	**76.38**	**3**

C. Cost Analysis

The recommended price of $5,936,638 has been determined to be fair and reasonable based upon Metro's Management and Audit Services audit findings, an independent cost estimate, cost analysis, technical analysis, fact finding and negotiations.

During the course of negotiations, clarifications to interagency coordination, site visits, request for information responses, preliminary engineering plans and advanced preliminary systems design resulted in additional hours applied to the project that were not originally included in the independent cost estimate. Metro staff successfully negotiated a cost savings of $62,826 from the firm's proposed price.

Proposer Name	Proposal Amount	Metro ICE	Negotiated Amount
HDR Engineering, Inc.	$5,999,464	$5,492,000	$5,936,638

D. Background on Recommended Contractor

The recommended firm, HDR, founded in 1917 and located in Los Angeles, California, has been in business in the southern California region for 43 years. HDR is an architecture, engineering, and consulting firm. HDR has the knowledge of operation control centers spanning across transportation, security and energy markets.

The proposed team is comprised of staff from HDR and 18 subcontractors (10 SBE, 2 DVBE and 6 non-SBE firms). The proposed team has significant experience with Emergency Operations, Rail Operations, Bus Operations, and Security Operations Centers design and implementation. The proposed project manager has more than 24 years of experience. The project manager has extensive knowledge and experience in planning, design and construction of complex transportation facility projects. Overall, HDR's proposal strongly demonstrated project understanding, the required coordination and presented a complete, technically qualified team that would be able to successfully deliver the design documents.