

## PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

SUPPLEMENTAL ENGINEERING SERVICES (SES) / TRANSIT RAIL PROJECTS  
AE59600

1.	<b>Contract Number:</b> AE59600	
2.	<b>Recommended Vendor:</b> HDR Engineering, Inc.	
3.	<b>Type of Procurement (check one):</b> <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.	<b>Procurement Dates:</b>	
	<b>A. Issued:</b> February 5, 2019	
	<b>B. Advertised/Publicized:</b> February 7, 2019	
	<b>C. Pre-Proposal Conference:</b> February 15, 2019	
	<b>D. Proposals Due:</b> March 21, 2019	
	<b>E. Pre-Qualification Completed:</b> July 1, 2019	
	<b>F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics:</b> June 14, 2019	
	<b>G. Protest Period End Date:</b> Est. July 22, 2019	
5.	<b>Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded:</b> 163	<b>Proposals Received:</b> 4
6.	<b>Contract Administrator:</b> Robert Romanowski	<b>Telephone Number:</b> 213-922-2633
7.	<b>Project Manager:</b> Hamid Mahramzadeh	<b>Telephone Number:</b> 213-922-7227

**A. Procurement Background**

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. AE59600 for Supplemental Engineering Services in support of Metro Engineering. 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 §4525-4529.5 for Architectural and Engineering services. The contract type is a Cost Reimbursable, specifically a Cost Plus Fixed Fee.

Three (3) amendments were issued during the solicitation phase of this RFP:

- Amendment No. 1, issued on February 26, 2019 extended the Proposal Due Date;
- Amendment No. 2, issued on March 11, 2019 extended the Proposal Due Date; and
- Amendment No. 3, issued on March 13, 2019 clarified various Submittal Requirements and Evaluation Criteria.

A total of four (4) proposals were received on March 21, 2019. Metro held a pre-proposal conference on February 15, 2019, with a total of forty-two (42) firms in attendance. Metro had representations from Risk Management, Ethics, Pre-Qualification, Engineering, and DEOD, to highlight the main elements of the RFP including the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal of thirty percent (30%)

of the Total Estimated Cost. A total of thirty-five (35) questions were received between the issuance of the solicitation and the RFP due date. All questions were addressed by issuance of a Question and Answer memorandum and the Amendments listed above.

On April 26, 2019, Metro held Oral Presentations with all four (4) proposing firms, at which time Metro received four (4) sealed cost proposals that remained unopened.

## **B. Evaluation of Proposals**

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Executive Office, Transit Project Delivery; 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 30 percent
- Key Personnel's Skills and Experience 25 percent
- Effectiveness of Management Plan 25 percent
- Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation 20 percent

The evaluation criteria are appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other, similar Architect and Engineering (A&E) procurements. Several factors were considered when developing these weights, giving the greatest importance to the experience and capabilities of the firms on the consultant's project team, key personnel's skills and experience, and understanding of the work and appropriateness of the approach to implementing the work.

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

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. Each then completed and certified the Declaration of Confidentiality / No Conflict of Interest form.

After the PET completed an initial evaluation of the written proposals of the four (4) proposals received, all four (4) were determined to be within the competitive range.

All four proposers were invited to make oral presentations to the PET. The four (4) firms within the competitive range are listed below in alphabetical order:

1. HDR Engineering, Inc.
2. STV, Incorporated
3. Transit SES Partners (a Joint Venture of PacRim Engineering, Inc. and Mott MacDonald, LLC)
4. T.Y. Lin International

In general, each team's presentation addressed the requirements of the RFP, experience with all aspects of the required Scope of Work, and stressed each firm's commitment to the success of the project. Also highlighted were staffing plans, work plans, and perceived project issues.

The PET evaluated the capabilities of each proposer and its team of subconsultants, in accordance with the Evaluation Criteria in the RFP for the following subject areas and their relative importance: 1) experience and capabilities of the firms on the consultant's project team; 2) key personnel's skills and experience; 3) Effectiveness of Management Plan; and 4) Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation.

#### **Qualifications Summary of Recommended Firm:**

The PET scored and 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 HDR Engineering, Inc. as the most qualified firm to provide Supplemental Engineering Services / Transit Rail Projects, as provided in the RFP Scope of Work. What distinguished HDR Engineering, Inc. was they demonstrated, through their written proposal and oral presentation, their experience and capabilities are very good and exceeded the requirements of the RFP. HDR Engineering, Inc. also demonstrated an exceptionally thorough and comprehensive understanding of managing multiple task orders. The team is highly experienced in delivering similar projects with an excellent record in client satisfaction on similar projects around the U.S.

Furthermore, this team demonstrated that it is versed in providing the Scope of Work related to this contract, and has the capabilities to provide staffing for the type of work that is required under this contract. HDR Engineering Inc. significantly exceeds the requirements of the three highest weighted criteria.

	<b>Firm</b>	<b>Average Score</b>	<b>Factor Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>Rank</b>
	<b>HDR Engineering, Inc.</b>				
	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant's Project Team	91.06	30%	27.32	
	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	88.40	25%	22.10	
	Effectiveness of Management Plan	90.60	25%	22.65	
	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	90.25	20%	18.05	
	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>90.12</b>	<b>1</b>
	<b>Transit SES Partners (a Joint Venture of PacRim Engineering, Inc. and Mott MacDonald LLC)</b>				
	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant's Project Team	85.33	30%	25.60	
	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	85.56	25%	21.39	
	Effectiveness of Management Plan	84.08	25%	21.02	
	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	86.75	20%	17.35	
	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>85.36</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>STV, Incorporated</b>				
	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant's Project Team	84.83	30%	25.45	
	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	83.80	25%	20.95	
	Effectiveness of Management Plan	84.40	25%	21.10	
	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	87.25	20%	17.45	
	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>84.95</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>T.Y. Lin International</b>				
	Experience and Capabilities of the Firms on the Consultant's Project Team	81.30	30.00%	24.39	
	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	83.68	25.00%	20.92	
	Effectiveness of Management Plan	84.24	25.00%	21.06	
	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	85.75	20.00%	17.15	
	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>83.52</b>	<b>4</b>

### C. Cost Analysis

The costs have been determined to be fair and reasonable based upon a cost analysis of direct 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

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.

<b>Proposer Name</b>	<b>Proposal Amount</b>	<b>Metro ICE</b>	<b>Recommended NTE amount</b>
<u>HDR Engineering, Inc.</u>	N/A <sup>(1)</sup>	<b>\$69,291,681</b> <sup>(2)</sup>	<b>\$50,000,000</b> <sup>(3)</sup>

<sup>(1)</sup>A proposal amount is not applicable. This is a Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) Task Order Contract with no definable level of effort for the Scope of Work. Hourly labor rates, overhead rates, and fee were negotiated and determined to be fair and reasonable.

<sup>(2)</sup>Metro Independent Cost Estimate (ICE) for the three year base contract plus two one-year options.

<sup>(3)</sup>The amount of \$50,000,000 is V/CM's extraction from the Independent Cost Estimate (ICE) for the three year base contract period.

### D. Background on Recommended Contractor

The recommended firm, HDR Engineering, Inc., located in Los Angeles, has been in business for 46 years and is a leader in the delivery of rail transit projects.

The multidisciplinary team includes 29 subconsultants that have a vast knowledge and experience with Metro.

The Project Manager has managed engineering teams for 30 years. The Project Manager's commitment to this project will be 100% availability.