

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

**CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT SERVICES
CONTRACT NUMBER AE71435MC080**

1.	Contract Number: AE71435MC080	
2.	Recommended Vendor: Ramos Consulting Services, 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: September 11, 2020	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: October 9, 2020	
	C. Pre-Proposal Conference: October 7 and 23, 2020	
	D. Proposals Due: December 9, 2020	
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: April 21, 2021	
	F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics: December 10, 2020	
	G. Protest Period End Date: May 21, 2021	
5.	Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded: 325	Proposals Received: 13
6.	Contract Administrator: Vanessa Vingno	Telephone Number: 213-922-7574
7.	Project Manager: Sapana Shah	Telephone Number: 818-435-7759

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. AE71435MC080, Construction Management Support Services Contract, for Active Transportation projects that involves design review, construction management, and administration of construction contracts for Rail to Rail Active Transportation Corridor Segment A, Eastside Access Improvement Project, and Los Angeles Union Station Forecourt and Esplanade Improvements.

The recommended consultant will furnish all of the labor, materials, and other related items required to perform the services on a Contract Work Order basis for a project, under which specific Task Orders will be issued for specific Scopes of Services and Period of Performance.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) was an Architecture and Engineer (A&E), qualifications based procurement process performed in accordance with Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Procurement Policies and Procedures, and California Government Code §4525-4529.5 for Architectural and Engineering services. The contract type is a Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) for a term of three (3) years plus 2 one year options. A virtual pre-proposal conference was held on October 7, 2020, in accordance to the California Governor Executive Order N-33-20 related to COVID-19. Another virtual pre-proposal conference was held on October 23, 2020, because of the delayed release of the newspaper

advertisement. Three hundred twenty five (325) individuals from various firms picked up or downloaded the RFP Package.

Four (4) Amendments were issued during the Solicitation phase of this RFP:

- Amendment No. 1, issued on September 16, 2020, to extend the due date and update the contact information for DEOD
- Amendment No. 2, issued on September 22, 2020, to revise the letter of invitation to reflect the contract duration instead of an exact date, and add Exhibit 16 Experience questionnaire form.
- Amendment No. 3, issued on October 6, 2020, to revise the scope of services and add Exhibits 11 and 13 forms.
- Amendment No. 4, issued October 13, 2020, to extend the due date to December 9, 2020, Add the date of the second pre-proposal conference, and update the critical dates.

A total of thirteen (13) proposals were received on December 9, 2020, from the following firms, in alphabetical order:

1. ABA Global, Inc.
2. Alex San Andres
3. Cordoba Corporation
4. Destination Enterprises
5. Ghirardelli Associates, Inc.
6. KDG Construction Consulting
7. MARRS Services, Inc.
8. Morgner-Valle, JV
9. PMCS Group, Inc.
10. PPM Group, Inc.
11. PreScience Corporation
12. Ramos Consulting Services, Inc.
13. Vanir Construction Management, Inc.

B. Evaluation of Proposals

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Transportation Planning, Program Management and Program Control 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 Firms on the Team..... (20%)
- Experience and Capabilities of Individuals in The Team (20%)

- Effectiveness of Management Plan..... (25%)
- Project Understanding and Approach..... (35%)

Total 100%

The evaluation criteria are appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other A & E procurements. Several factors were considered when developing the weightings, giving the greatest importance to Project Understanding and Approach.

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

During the months of December 2020 thru April 2021, the PET evaluated twelve (12) written proposals. Of the thirteen (13) proposals received, one (1) was determined to be non-responsive. On March 31, 2021 through April 1, 2021, Metro held a virtual Oral Presentation with each of five (5) proposing firms.

1. Destination Enterprises
2. MARRS Services, Inc.
3. Morgner-Valle, JV
4. PMCS Group, Inc.
5. Ramos Consulting Services, Inc.

The proposing firms had the opportunity to present their key personnel as well as respond to the PET’s questions. In general, each proposer’s presentation addressed the requirements of the RFP, experience with all aspects of the required and anticipated tasks and stressed each proposer’s commitment to the success of the contract. Each proposing team was asked questions relative to each firm’s previous experience performing work of a similar nature to the SOS presented in the RFP. Sealed cost proposals were received from the five proposers at the time of oral presentations.

The proposal for Alex San Andres was determined to be non-responsive to the requirements of the RFP Documents. Alex San Andres was not registered with the Department of Industrial Relations as required in IP-02 of the RFP stating that no contractor or subcontractor may be listed on a proposal for a public works project unless registered with the Department of Industrial Relations. Alex San Andres was excluded from further evaluation.

The seven other proposals were determined to be outside the possibility of an award, therefore, excluded from further consideration.

Qualifications Summary of the responsive firm within the Competitive Range:

Ramos Consulting Services, Inc – Strengths

- Proposal demonstrated extensive experience with Metro and the City of LA on transit and Active Transportation Projects.
- Proposed team had experience in all areas of the Scope Of Services (SOS), including rail Right of Way.
- Proposal identified various specific lessons learned regarding unknown utility impacts, specifically, at intersections, establishing relations with 3rd party agencies and demonstrated successful completion of projects on time and within budget.
- Key personnel possessed experience presented and 100% availability through 2023; except for, environmental specialist
- Proposal identified deep pool of qualified staff to cover peak periods. Most members exceeded minimum requirements and some personnel had experience on EATP projects.
- Proposal demonstrated experience in managing multiple Metro projects with methods enabling cost savings
- Proposal provided a 100 days and 60 days action plan demonstrating a staffing plan that significantly exceed the RFP minimum requirements.
- Proposal demonstrated a thorough and comprehensive understanding of the SOS, including areas with long lead times, focusing on early completion resulting in lessening impacts to project schedule.

Ramos Consulting Services, Inc – Weaknesses

- The Proposal has no significant weaknesses or deficiencies.

MARRS Services, Inc. – Strengths

- Experience of key personnel exceeded minimum requirements. The Resident Engineers proposed for this project demonstrated experience in all task related to their role described in the SOS. One Resident Engineer had previous experience as a Resident Engineer for LA River bikeway project, recent projects involving approvals thru Los Angeles Department of Transportation, coordination of utility, and curb ramps construction in City of LA. Proposed Office Engineer supported Expo segment bike path.

- The proposed approach demonstrated a thorough understanding of the level of effort and unique challenges for projects of similar type and magnitude.
- The proposal demonstrate that the firm has a significant workforce capacity and suggested 24/7 availability.

MARRS Services, Inc. - Weaknesses

- The Proposal had no significant weaknesses or deficiencies.

Morgner-Valle, JV – Strengths

- Proposal demonstrated their technical knowledge. The proposed Resident Engineer had experience in managing and designing road improvements, pedestrian, and bikeway paths.
- Proposal subconsultants had strong track record with hands on experience expediting traffic control plan and other permitting activities from multiple local agencies.
- Proposal included a 30-60-90 day plan that demonstrated the level of effort and identified percent of staff needed throughout the ATP projects, including additional staff required during peak need. Proposal identified a detailed list of monthly project status reports which identified key aspects of the project that demonstrated sound understanding of Metro’s PMIS function, mobilization challenges and monthly reporting expectations.
- Proposal emphasized the support of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises and suggested creative ways of engaging the community that substantially met the RFP requirements.

Morgner-Valle, JV - Weaknesses

- The Proposal had no significant weaknesses or deficiencies.

Destination Enterprises – Strengths

- The Proposal referenced challenges on their project and were able to overcome those challenges while ensuring minimum impacts to schedule and budget.
- The Proposal demonstrated that firms on the team had experience administering multiple projects at once, as well as experience in local construction, similar projects, and Metro projects.

- Proposed approach indicated a thorough understanding of the project goals and methods essential to the performance of the project, such as change control, timely response to compliance, and a thorough explanation of how the SOS would be implemented.

Destination Enterprises - Weaknesses

- The Proposal had no significant weaknesses or deficiencies.

PMCS Group, Inc. – Strengths

- Proposal demonstrated successful record of completion of projects, identified various lessons learned for each of their projects that may be of value to Metro projects.
- Proposal identified key personnel with local city agencies and federally funded project. Proposed Resident Engineers had experience in multiple Metro projects.
- Proposal discussed roles and specific experience relevant for each project and 100% availability of staff to perform on all projects.
- Proposal demonstrated detailed description to implement various plans, such as, third party management, regular schedule updates, risk management, lessons learned and claims avoidance using specific technology.
- Identified strategy to keep communication as open as possible between stakeholders on project.

PMCS Group, Inc. – Weaknesses

- The Proposal had no significant weaknesses or deficiencies.

The Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) ranked the five proposals invited to make oral presentations and assessed major strengths, weaknesses and associated risks of each of the proposers to determine the most qualified firm. The final scoring was based on evaluation of the written proposals, as supported by oral presentations, and clarifications received from the Proposers. The results of the final scoring are shown below:

1	Firm	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
2	<u>Ramos Consulting Services, Inc.</u>				
3	Experience and Capabilities of Firms on the Team	94.40	20%	18.88	
4	Experience and Capabilities of Individuals on the Team	94.60	20%	18.92	
5	Effectiveness of Management Plan	94.32	25%	23.58	
6	Project Understanding and Approach	93.57	35%	32.75	
7	Total		100.00%	94.13	1
8	<u>MARRS Services, Inc.</u>				
9	Experience and Capabilities of Firms on the Team	93.40	20%	18.68	
10	Experience and Capabilities of Individuals on the Team	95.00	20%	19.00	
11	Effectiveness of Management Plan	95.60	25%	23.90	
12	Project Understanding and Approach	90.94	35%	31.83	
13	Total		100.00%	93.41	2
14	<u>Morgner-Valle, JV</u>				
15	Experience and Capabilities of Firms on	92.90	20%	18.58	

	the Team				
16	Experience and Capabilities of Individuals on the Team	93.75	20%	18.75	
17	Effectiveness of Management Plan	91.80	25%	22.95	
18	Project Understanding and Approach	93.34	35%	32.67	
19	Total		100.00%	92.95	3
20	<u>Destination Enterprises</u>				
21	Experience and Capabilities of Firms on the Team	92.00	20%	18.40	
22	Experience and Capabilities of Individuals on the Team	92.50	20%	18.50	
23	Effectiveness of Management Plan	92.48	25%	23.12	
24	Project Understanding and Approach	89.49	35%	31.32	
25	Total		100.00%	91.34	4
26	<u>PMCS Group, Inc.</u>				
27	Experience and Capabilities of Firms on the Team	91.25	20%	18.25	
28	Experience and Capabilities of Individuals on the Team	88.65	20%	17.73	

29	Effectiveness of Management Plan	90.28	25%	22.57	
30	Project Understanding and Approach	89.00	35%	31.15	
31	Total		100.00%	89.70	5

Note: All Scores rounded to the second decimal.

C. Cost Analysis

Metro will complete the negotiations to determine that the recommended estimated costs are fair and reasonable, based on cost analyses of labor rates, indirect rates and other direct costs in accordance with Metro's Procurement Policies and Procedures. Metro will complete negotiations to establish indirect cost rates and as appropriate provisional indirect (overhead) rates, plus a fixed fee factor to establish a fixed fee amount based on the total estimated cost for task orders, during the contract term to compensate the consultant.

Proposer:			
Contract Duration	Proposal Amount	CMSS Staffing Plan	NTE Funding Amount
Base Period – 3 Years	\$11,587,413.75 ⁽¹⁾	\$8,933,600 ⁽²⁾	\$15,896,000
Option Year 1	\$3,0460,45.23.00 ⁽¹⁾	\$2,508,000 ⁽³⁾	\$1,987,000
Option Year 2	\$888,637.82 ⁽¹⁾	\$710,400 ⁽⁴⁾	\$1,987,000

- (1) The proposal amount is based on the Metro established staffing plan.
- (2) The amount \$8,933,600 is the Level of Effort for 3-year base Period of the Contract.
- (3) The amount \$2,508,000 is the Level of Effort for Option Year 1 Period of the Contract.
- (4) The amount \$710,400 is the level of Effort for Option Year 2 Period of the Contract.

The CMSS Staffing plan was established based on the SOS developed for the Contract. The probable costs are based on the anticipated level of effort estimated for each year that will be required to perform the SOS by the Consultant and sub-consultants.

D. Background on Recommended Contractor

Ramos Consulting Services, Inc. is a California based Corporation located at Pasadena, CA, and was established 2010. A certified Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Ramos Consulting Services, Inc. has coordinated and managed similar projects of more than \$10 million in public works and active transportation projects over the past five years. The firm provides quality infrastructure consulting services with a particular emphasis on public related projects including active transportation, bus transit, local rail transit, rapid transit, transit systems, bridge, highway, and roads. Ramos Consulting Services Inc recently received an award

from the American Council of Engineering Companies for “Firm of the Year” award, the company was recognized for its successful participation and contributions to local transit projects in Los Angeles County.

Most of Ramos Consulting Services Inc.’s key personnel have over two decades in experience in construction Management support with experience in Active Transportation in Los Angeles County. A number of these projects being similar in scope to the Active Transportation projects includes: Expo Bike Path, West Purple Line Extension, Regional Connector Transit Corridor and Patsaouras Plaza Busway Ramos Consulting Services Inc.’ staff has an excellent understanding of the Los Angeles and local cities, agencies and Metro requirements, personnel and practices.