

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

**SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSIS OF SYLMAR/SAN FERNANDO TO
VAN NUYS BOULEVARD SHARED RAILROAD RIGHT-OF WAY
(PHASE 1 AND PHASE 2)/PS80628-5433000**

1.	Contract Number: Task Order No. PS80628-5433000, under Contract No. PS54330021	
2.	Recommended Vendor: Mott MacDonald Group, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Task Order	
4.	Procurement Dates:	
	A. Issued: September 8, 2021	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: N/A	
	C. Pre-Proposal Conference: N/A	
	D. Proposals Due: October 6, 2021	
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: October 7, 2021	
	F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics: November 3, 2021	
	G. Protest Period End Date: March 24, 2022	
5.	Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded: 12	Bids/Proposals Received: 4
6.	Contract Administrator: Lily Lopez	Telephone Number: (213) 922-4639
7.	Project Manager: Ivan Gonzalez	Telephone Number: (213) 922-7506

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve Task Order No. PS80628-5433000 for the Supplemental Analysis of Sylmar/San Fernando to Van Nuys Boulevard Shared Railroad Right-of Way (Phase 1 & Phase 2) issued under the Countywide Planning and Development Bench Contract No. PS54330021. The Contractor shall complete supplemental studies along the San Fernando/Antelope Valley Line (AVL) railroad right-of-way (ROW), which extends from the intersection of Van Nuys Boulevard and San Fernando Road, north/west 2.5-miles to the Sylmar/San Fernando Metrolink Station. As the alignment passes through the City of San Fernando, the Study Area shall extend south-west to Truman Street and north-west to 1st Street. Board approval of task order awards are subject to resolution of all properly submitted protest(s).

The Task Order Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and the contract type is firm fixed price. The Task Order RFP was issued with an SBE goal of 22% and a 3% DVBE goal.

There were no amendments issued during the solicitation phase of this Task Order RFP.

A pre-proposal conference was not held since this was issued to qualified members of the Countywide Planning Bench under Discipline No. 1 – Transportation Planning.

No questions were asked by Proposers prior to the proposal due date.

The 12 qualified members under Discipline No. 1 – Transportation received the Task Order RFP and were included in the planholders list. A total of four proposals were received on October 6, 2021 from the following firms:

- Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.
- Mott MacDonald Group, Inc. (Mott MacDonald)
- STV Incorporated (STV)
- WSP USA (WSP)

B. Evaluation of Proposals

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Metro’s Countywide Planning, Program Management and Metrolink 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 the Firms on the Team (includes Prime Contractor and Subcontractors) 20%
- Experience and Capabilities of Key Personnel of the Team (includes Prime Contractor and Subcontractors) 25%
- Effectiveness of Team Management Plan 15%
- Understanding of Work and Approach for Implementation 20%
- Innovation 5%
- Cost 15%

The evaluation criteria are appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other, similar supplemental analysis study procurements. Several factors were considered when developing these weights, giving the greatest importance to the experience and capabilities of key personnel of the team (includes Prime Contractor and Subcontractors). The PET evaluated the proposals according to the pre-established evaluation criteria.

During the period of October 7, 2021 to October 21, 2021, the PET members independently evaluated and scored the technical proposals. Two firms were determined to be within the competitive range and are listed below in alphabetical order.

- Mott MacDonald
- STV

Two firms were determined to be outside the competitive range and were not included for further consideration as their proposals were not clear in addressing the requirements.

On November 1, 2021, the two firms were invited for oral presentations, which provided each firm the opportunity to present their team's qualifications, and to respond to the PET's questions.

Following the interviews, the PET finalized technical scores based on both written proposals and oral presentations. On November 4, 2021, the PET agreed that the final ranking of proposals scored Mott MacDonald's proposal as the highest ranked. The PET concluded that Mott MacDonald's proposal presented the highest level of skill, achievable management plan, and demonstrated the best understanding of the project.

Qualifications Summary of Firms within the Competitive Range:

Mott MacDonald

Mott MacDonald featured a strong project team, led by a Project Manager who has direct experience working within the Antelope Valley Shared ROW on a similar Planning-level study/project. The Mott MacDonald team performed well in their knowledge of the corridor, including stakeholders, institutional, and technical issues within the ROW. Key team members also have relevant design and Planning-level experience on related Metro projects and the team has a strong depth of resources to handle this assignment. The team provided a detailed approach to conducting the work, backed by a group of key staff and technical leads that appeared well organized and experienced.

The proposal also stood out by referencing their commitment to go beyond the technical requirements of this study by approaching it holistically and promoting inclusive and equitable social outcomes.

STV

STV also included a strong team in their proposal, with key staff and subcontractors possessing strong relevant experience on similar projects and within a similar geographical area. As part of their proposal, the team included a detailed approach to the scope of services and referenced their extensive engineering and Planning experience on the Antelope Valley Line and on ESFV. Their staffing plan appeared well organized to perform the requested work. However, STV did not tie their understanding of the corridor's issues and dynamics well in a narrative form in their proposal, which leaned strongly toward their technical expertise and experience.

A summary of the PET scores is provided below:

1	Firm	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
2	Mott MacDonald				
3	Degree of Skills and Experience of the Firms on the Team (includes Prime Contractor and Subcontractors)	85.30	20.00%	17.06	
4	Experience and Capabilities of Key Personnel of the Team (includes Prime Contractor and Subcontractors)	82.48	25.00%	20.62	
5	Effectiveness of Team Management Plan	84.20	15.00%	12.63	
6	Understanding of Work and Approach for Implementation	86.25	20.00%	17.25	
7	Innovation	84.40	5.00%	4.22	
8	Cost	91.40	15.00%	13.71	
9	Total		100.00%	85.49	1
10	STV				
11	Degree of Skills and Experience of the Firms on the Team (includes Prime Contractor and Subcontractors)	82.20	20.00%	16.44	
12	Experience and Capabilities of Key Personnel of the Team (includes Prime Contractor and Subcontractors)	79.36	25.00%	19.84	
13	Effectiveness of Team Management Plan	80.20	15.00%	12.03	
14	Understanding of Work and Approach for Implementation	82.20	20.00%	16.44	
15	Innovation	78.80	5.00%	3.94	
16	Cost	100.00	15.00%	15.00	
17	Total		100.00%	83.69	2

C. Cost Analysis

The recommended price of \$1,806,223 has been determined to be fair and reasonable based upon the independent cost estimate (ICE), the Project Manager’s technical analysis, cost analysis, fact finding, and negotiations.

Mott MacDonald’s negotiated amount increased from the proposal amount because the initial level of effort was not consistent with the work identified in the Task Order RFP. The discrepancy between the ICE and negotiated price was due to Metro taking a conservative approach on the ICE and the contractor identifying efficiencies on certain tasks.

	Proposer Name	Proposal Amount	Metro ICE	Negotiated amount
1.	Mott MacDonald	\$1,626,810.86	\$2,661,945	\$1,806,223
2.	STV	\$1,486,624.86	\$2,661,945	N/A

D. Background on Recommended Contractor

Mott MacDonald, headquartered in the United Kingdom with a local Los Angeles office. Mott MacDonald was formed in 1989 and has worked on several Metro projects and has performed satisfactorily.

The proposed team is comprised of staff from Mott MacDonald and three subcontractors, of which two are Metro certified SBEs and one is a DVBE.