

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

**I-605 CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT SERVICES
CONTRACT NUMBER PS68033**

1.	Contract Number: PS68033	
2.	Recommended Vendor: Ghirardelli Associates, Inc.	
3.	Type of Procurement (check one): <input type="checkbox"/> IFB <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RFP <input type="checkbox"/> RFP-A&E <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Competitive <input type="checkbox"/> Modification <input type="checkbox"/> Task Order	
4.	Procurement Dates:	
	A. Issued: Feb 18, 2020	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: February 15, 2020	
	C. Pre-Proposal Conference: February 25, 2020	
	D. Proposals Due: April 2, 2020	
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: September 10, 2020	
	F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics: April 8, 2020	
	G. Protest Period End Date: January 25, 2020	
5.	Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded: 102	Proposals Received: 6
6.	Contract Administrator: Rafael Vasquez	Telephone Number: 213-418-3036
7.	Project Manager: Sapana Shah	Telephone Number: 818-435-7759

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve the award of Contract No. PS68033, I-605 Construction Support Services Consultant (CSSC) to provide construction support services that will assist and support Metro in the performance of Metro's responsibilities directly managing the Construction of the I-605 Improvements Project. Services will be provided from final design through pre-construction activities (early demolition and environmental work, advanced utility relocation work), construction, and contract closeout. Board approval of contract awards are subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) was a competitively negotiated procurement process, performed in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policies and Procedures. This process required each of the proposals and qualifications to be evaluated based on the evaluation criteria set forth in the RFP. The evaluation criteria were weighted in order of importance, including the cost proposal. The proposals were evaluated and rated accordingly, and the results are shown in the table below. The RFP was issued with an SBE goal of 27% and a DVBE goal of 3%. The contract type is a Cost-Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF). The Contract is for a base term of three (3) years plus two (2) one year (1) options.

A pre-proposal conference was scheduled on February 25, 2020. One hundred and two (102) individuals from various firms picked up or downloaded the RFP Package.

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

- Amendment 1: issued on February 28, 2020; revised Scope of Services, Evaluation Criteria and Form of Contract-Article 1 Contract Documents Order of Precedence.
- Amendment 2: issued on March 4, 2020; added CSSC staffing plan sheet to Proposal Content under Volume III, Cost Proposal.
- Amendment 3: issued on March 17, 2020; revised and extended Proposal due date to April 2, 2026.
- Amendment 4: issued on March 27, 2020; revised and clarified Proposal submittal information.

A total of six (6) proposals were received on April 2, 2020, from the following firms, in alphabetical order:

1. Fountainhead Consulting Corporation.
2. Ghirardelli Associates, Inc.
3. MARRS Services, Inc.
4. PPM Group, Inc.
5. PreScience Corporation.
6. RT Engineering & Associates, Inc.

B. Evaluation of Proposals

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Metro Construction and Program Management was convened and conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the proposals received.

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

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| • Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Team | (20%) |
| • Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel | (20%) |
| • Effectiveness of Management Plan | (20%) |
| • Project Understanding and Approach | (25%) |
| • Cost Proposal | (15%) |
| Total | 100% |

The evaluation criteria are appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other professional services procurements. Several factors were considered when

developing the weightings, giving the greatest importance to the Project Understanding and Approach.

The PET evaluated all six (6) written proposals during April 12, 2020 through April 22, 2020. All six (6) proposals received were determined to be within the competitive range.

Oral Presentations were not held due to COVID-19 as a safety response for proposers and staff.

Qualifications Summary of the responsive firm within the Competitive Range:

Ghirardelli Associates, Inc.

- The Proposal significantly exceeds the RFP minimum requirements in the Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Team criteria. The proposed firms on the team demonstrated a thorough understanding of the project scope, schedule, and staffing requirements. The proposed team has demonstrated past-experience on projects of similar size, scope and complexity under Metro and Caltrans.
- The team demonstrated an exceptional understanding of the challenges and clear path to overcome them; among the proposed critical elements and approaches the team will utilize: communication and coordination with Caltrans oversight, partnering with other third-party entities, resourcing and inspection support and scheduling, traffic control (California Highway Patrol) construction zone enhanced enforcement program and overall quality/safety on the project.
- The proposed team's organizational chart explained roles of key personnel accurately and effectively identifies available personnel resources.
- The Proposal significantly exceeds the RFP minimum requirements in the Key Personnel's Skill and Experience criteria. The Proposal demonstrated the team's experience with project of similar size, scope and complexity and included several projects that are comparable to the I-605 Statement of Services (SOS). In addition, all key personnel have demonstrated Caltrans Highway and previous Metro work experience.
- The proposed team has good experience with highway projects and applicable guidelines and agency standards, some previous projects include sound-walls installation, roadway/bridge widening, and retaining walls among others.
- The proposed Resident Engineer and Sr. Inspector demonstrated strong background in project delivery of design/bid/build projects and the involvement of stakeholders.
- Implementation of SOS is clearly described, the Proposal demonstrated a strong emphasis on staff utilization and management/project control tools application.
- Proposed team staff is crossed-trained and familiar with schedule rotation, and has shown awareness of night work.
- The Proposal demonstrated understanding of the urgency in replacing and providing staff personnel on short notice.

- The Proposal significantly exceeds the RFP minimum requirements in the Project Understanding and Approach. The Proposal demonstrated a thorough understanding of project duration and plan establishment. Furthermore, the team demonstrated the importance of getting long lead items, source inspections and quality assurance.

PreScience Corporation

- The Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Team criteria.
- The Proposed team of subconsultants have demonstrated extensive Caltrans highway experience.
- The Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel. Proposed Project Manager, Resident Engineer and Quality personnel are highly qualified and met the requirements of the RFP experience qualifications. The Proposer has demonstrated that can handle fluctuating demands and proposed a cost savings approach and presented crossed-trained personnel.
- The Proposer demonstrated an understanding of cost control methodology, schedule requirements and familiarity with Caltrans quantities, and risks mitigation for overall implementation of SOS.
- The Proposal identified key project elements and challenges associated with the SOS, along with the team's corresponding project goals and mitigation measures. Safety, third party coordination, utility relocation, staging and project phasing are amongst the key challenges addressed.
- The Prime and subconsultants have demonstrated to have excellent knowledge and experience working with other stakeholders.

MARRS Services, Inc.

- The Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team criteria. The Proposer included multiple project examples relative to the SOS that convey the level of experience required for projects of similar, in size, scope and complexity for both the Prime and subconsultants on the team.
- The Resident Engineer, Project Manager, Sr. Construction Inspector and Quality personnel substantially meet all qualifications as required in the SOS. The organizational chart clearly identifies all key personnel and their specific responsibilities on this project.
- The Proposal demonstrates the key personnel's knowledge and experience with agency standards based on experience on Metro and Caltrans projects.
- The Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Effectiveness of Management Plan criteria. The Proposer demonstrated a thorough understanding of the work expected and proposed experienced staff. The Proposer proposed a streamlined process for contract work orders due to extensive experience on Metro projects.

- The Proposer’s project controls methodology and implementation strategy includes an emphasis on scheduling aspects, safety and quality.
- The Proposal highlights utility coordination as a significant project risk and includes language on how the Team intends to address them, specific to the project.
- The Proposal included relevant projects, safety, environmental studies, green construction policy, watch manual and sustainability plan.

PPM Group, Inc.

- The Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel. The Proposer’s planned team, specifically the proposed Project Manager and Resident Engineer appear to have the Caltrans knowledge, skills and experience that would be beneficial to the Project. The proposed staff is flexible and can accommodate Metro’s work demand.
- Organization chart clearly identifies all key personnel. The Proposer presented a very good staff experience matrix.
- The Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Effectiveness of Management Plan. The Proposal provides a detailed summary of the team’s project controls methodology and implementation, with an emphasis on scheduled/budget control and dispute resolution.
- The Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Project Understanding and Approach. This section in the Proposal demonstrates a thorough understanding of the SOS and how it will be implemented. It highlights potential utility impacts, traffic control measures, third party coordination, and other key coordination items that are essential to the success of the Project.
- The Proposal identifies potential challenges specific to the project and innovative solutions that would result in more efficient or better-quality outcomes while meeting the overall requirements.
- The Proposer included the project challenges with Caltrans, homeless encampments, ADA ramps easements, survey-lines, long lead items, and BMPS.
- The Proposer has excellent safety culture and standards.

Fountainhead, Inc. – Strengths

- Relevant project experience shows that the Proposer has extensive experience with engineering and construction services with Caltrans.
- The Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel. The Project Manager and Resident Engineer have a wide range of professional engineering experience on Caltrans projects and areas of expertise are applicable to this Project.
- The Proposal clearly explains the role and technical experience of each key personnel proposed. The organizational chart delineates the communication and reporting relationships clearly.

- The Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Effectiveness of Management Plan criteria. The organizational chart includes all necessary information in the RFP requirements, identifying key personnel' project roles, available resources, and capability to complete tasks outlined by the SOS.
- The Proposer's project controls methodology and implementation puts a strong emphasis on quality assurance/quality control and the steps taken to implement their review procedure.
- The Proposal generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the project Understanding and Approach. The proposer provides a thorough understanding of Metro's objectives for the Contract, as well as a plan on how intends to perform and satisfy the requirements of the SOS, broken down in the pre-construction, construction and close-out phases.

RT Engineering, Inc.

- The Proposal generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team. The experience and qualifications described in the proposal demonstrate that the proposed firms on the team have experience with Caltrans and Metro with project of similar size, scope and complexity.
- The Proposal generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel. The Proposal demonstrated a team of subconsultants with depth in personnel for support and inspections for the project.
- The Proposed Project Manager has extensive Caltrans experience.
- The Proposal includes significant details on risk and delay mitigation.
- The Proposal generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Project Understanding and Approach.

The Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) evaluated and ranked the six proposals within the competitive range, based on the evaluation criteria in the RFP. The PET assessed major strengths, weaknesses and associated risks of each of the proposers to determine the most advantageous firm. The final scoring was based on evaluation of the written proposals and clarifications received from the Proposers. The results of the final scoring and ranking are shown below:

1	Firm	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score (1)	Rank
2	Ghirardelli Associates, Inc.				
3	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Team	94.00	20%	18.80	

4	Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel	92.83	20%	18.57	
5	Effectiveness of Management Plan	96.08	20%	19.22	
6	Project Understanding and Approach	95.53	25%	23.88	
7	Cost Proposal (2)	83.73	15%	12.56	
8	Total		100.00%	93.03	1
9	PreScience Corporation				
10	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Team	89.50	20%	17.90	
11	Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel	94.33	20%	18.87	
12	Effectiveness of Management Plan	89.92	20%	17.98	
13	Project Understanding and Approach	83.60	25%	20.90	
14	Cost Proposal (2)	100.00	15%	15.00	
15	Total		100.00%	90.65	2
16	MARRS SERVICES, INC.				
17	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Team	83.00	20%	16.60	
18	Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel	92.92	20%	18.58	
19	Effectiveness of Management Plan	92.25	20%	18.45	
20	Project Understanding and Approach	85.33	25%	21.33	
21	Cost Proposal (2)	73.6	15%	11.04	
22	Total		100.00%	86.00	3

23	PPM Group, Inc.				
24	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Team	84.42	20%	16.88	
25	Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel	84.83	20%	16.97	
26	Effectiveness of Management Plan	84.67	20%	16.93	
27	Project Understanding and Approach	93.00	25%	23.25	
28	Cost Proposal (2)	76.01	15%	11.40	
29	Total		100%	85.43	4
30	Fountainhead Consulting Corporation				
31	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Team	87.50	20%	17.50	
32	Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel	86.17	20%	17.23	
33	Effectiveness of Management Plan	82.83	20%	16.57	
34	Project Understanding and Approach	72.33	25%	18.08	
35	Cost Proposal(2)	90.20	15%	13.53	
36	Total		100%	82.91	5
37	RT Engineering & Associates, Inc.				
38	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Team	77.17	20%	15.43	
39	Experience and Capabilities of the Key Personnel	72.00	20%	14.40	

40	Effectiveness of Management Plan	72.00	20%	14.40	
41	Project Understanding and Approach	76.87	25%	19.22	
42	Cost Proposal (2)	83.67	15%	12.55	
43	Total		100%	76.00	6

Note:

- 1) Weighted scores are rounded up to the nearest second decimal point.
- 2) Cost proposals were based on the Proposers' rates for the provided level of effort of 64,690 hours. Scores shown above for the cost proposals are based on formula in the RFP highest score going to the lowest cost proposal.

C. Cost/Price Analysis

Metro staff performed a cost analysis on all six proposals in the competitive range and established a negotiation plan and commenced with negotiations. The final negotiated amounts complied with all requirements of Metro Procurement Policies and Procedures, including fact-finding, clarifications and cost analysis. To prevent delay in contract award, provisional indirect cost rates were established subject to retroactive adjustments upon completion of any necessary audits. The negotiated costs were determined to be fair and reasonable.

	Proposer Name	Proposal Amount ⁽¹⁾	Metro ICE	Recommended Contract Amount ⁽²⁾
1	Ghirardelli Associates, Inc.	\$4,838,257.36	\$5,354,880.91	\$4,423,717.65
2	PreScience Corporation	\$4,049,766.00		
3	MARRS SERVICES, INC.	\$5,502,592.77		
4	PPM Group, Inc.	\$5,532,563.86		
5	Fountainhead Consulting Corporation	\$4,489,279.55		
6	RT Engineering & Associates, Inc	\$4,839,764.75		

Note¹: The Proposal Amount is based on revised level of effort and included the Base three (3) years plus two (2) years option.

Note ²: The Award Price includes the Base three (3) years, only.

D. Background on Recommended Contractor

The recommended firm, Ghirardelli Associates, Inc., located in Irvine, California, has been in business since 1999, providing construction management services to California cities, counties, regional transportation agencies, and Caltrans. A few of their regional clients include LACMTA, Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), Transportation Corridor Agencies (TCA), City of Anaheim, County of Los Angeles, and Caltrans Districts 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12.