

## PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

NORTH SAN FERNANDO VALLEY BUS RAPID TRANSIT CORRIDOR PLANNING  
AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY/AE49337000

1.	<b>Contract Number:</b> AE49337000	
2.	<b>Recommended Vendor:</b> IBI Group	
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> December 21, 2017	
	<b>B. Advertised/Publicized:</b> December 21, 2017	
	<b>C. Pre-Proposal Conference:</b> January 11, 2018	
	<b>D. Proposals Due:</b> February 5, 2018	
	<b>E. Pre-Qualification Completed:</b> In process	
	<b>F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics:</b> February 6, 2018	
	<b>G. Protest Period End Date:</b> May 18, 2018	
5.	<b>Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded:</b> 131	<b>Proposals Received:</b> 3
6.	<b>Contract Administrator:</b> Gina Romo	<b>Telephone Number:</b> (213) 922-7558
7.	<b>Project Manager:</b> Sarah Syed	<b>Telephone Number:</b> (213) 418-3312

**A. Procurement Background**

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. AE49337000 issued in support of the North San Fernando Valley Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Corridor Planning and Environmental Study and one of two optional tasks to advance the design through either i) Advanced Conceptual Engineering or ii) Preliminary Engineering. Board approval of contract awards are subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and the contract type is a firm fixed price. The RFP was issued with an SBE goal of 20% and a 3% DVBE goal.

One amendment was issued during the solicitation phase of this RFP:

- Amendment No. 1, issued on December 22, 2017, corrected the period of performance to 40 months instead of 48 months.

A pre-proposal conference was held on January 11, 2018, and was attended by 59 individuals, representing 43 firms. There were 24 questions asked and responses were released prior to the proposal due date.

A total of 131 firms downloaded the RFP and were included in the planholder's list. A total of three proposals were received on February 5, 2018.

## **B. Evaluation of Proposals**

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Metro Transportation, Countywide Planning, and Project Engineering, and Los Angeles County Department of Transportation 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 Qualifications of the Team                   | 25 percent |
| • Experience and Qualifications of the Proposed Key Personnel | 30 percent |
| • Effectiveness of Management Plan                            | 15 percent |
| • Work Plan/Project Approach                                  | 30 percent |

The evaluation criteria is appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other, similar Architectural and Engineering (A&E) projects. Several factors were considered when developing these weights, giving the greatest importance to experience and qualifications of the proposed key personnel and the work plan/project approach.

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

All three proposals received were determined to be within the competitive range and are listed below in alphabetical order:

1. IBI Group (IBI)
2. Iteris, Inc. (Iteris)
3. KOA Corporation (KOA)

The PET independently evaluated and scored the technical proposals during the period of February 6 through February 21, 2018.

The PET interviewed all three firms the week of February 26, 2018. The firms had an opportunity to present their proposed project manager, the team's qualifications and respond to questions from the PET. In general, each team's presentation addressed the requirements of the RFP, experience with all aspects of the required tasks, and stressed each firm's commitment to the success of the project. Also highlighted were staffing plans, work plans, and perceived project issues. Each team was asked questions relative to the firm's proposed alternatives, staffing plans relative to Measure M mandated timeline, and approach in addressing the diversity of the corridor.

The final scoring, after the oral presentations, determined IBI to be the highest technically qualified firm.

**Qualifications Summary of Recommended Firm:**

IBI is an international architectural and engineering firm with a local office in downtown Los Angeles. The team that IBI has put together includes environmental specialists, along with quality control, surveying, modeling, and right of way experts. Subcontractor, Oschin Partners, provides key stakeholder engagement and unique liaison opportunities through well established and proven community ties with community groups and local government offices throughout the BRT corridor.

IBI's team provides a diverse mix of recent and relevant experience in national and international BRT projects. IBI understands the overview of the project area and is familiar with the opportunities and constraints of planning, designing and environmentally clearing BRT projects. The proposal showed contextual awareness of transportation and land use and clearly articulated outcomes in a concise and compelling manner.

The organization and responsibility of key project leads is proportional to the professional experience in planning, designing and environmentally clearing BRT projects. The team provides strong support on core elements of the project including transit supportive planning toolkit and first and last mile experience.

Following is a summary of the PET evaluation scores:

1	Firm	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
2	<b>IBI</b>				
3	Experience and Qualification of the Team	82.00	25.00%	20.50	
4	Experience and Qualification of the Proposed Key Personnel	79.00	30.00%	23.70	
5	Effectiveness of Management Plan	72.00	15.00%	10.80	
6	Work Plan/Project Approach	71.00	30.00%	21.30	
7	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>76.30</b>	<b>1</b>
8	<b>KOA</b>				
9	Experience and Qualification of the Team	77.00	25.00%	19.25	
10	Experience and Qualification of the Proposed Key Personnel	71.00	30.00%	21.30	
11	Effectiveness of Management Plan	67.00	15.00%	10.05	
12	Work Plan/Project Approach	72.00	30.00%	21.60	
13	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>72.20</b>	<b>2</b>

	<b>Firm</b>	<b>Average Score</b>	<b>Factor Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Average Score</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Iteris</b>				
<b>15</b>	Experience and Qualification of the Team	76.00	25.00%	19.00	
<b>16</b>	Experience and Qualification of the Proposed Key Personnel	72.00	30.00%	21.60	
<b>17</b>	Effectiveness of Management Plan	64.00	15.00%	9.60	
<b>18</b>	Work Plan/Project Approach	64.00	30.00%	19.20	
<b>19</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>69.40</b>	<b>3</b>

### **C. Cost Analysis**

The recommended price has been determined to be fair and reasonable based upon an independent cost estimate, cost analysis, technical analysis, fact finding, and negotiations.

<b>Proposer Name</b>	<b>Proposal Amount</b>	<b>Metro ICE</b>	<b>Negotiated Amount</b>
IBI Group	\$10,079,041	\$4,434,805	\$8,759,514

The proposed level of effort significantly exceeded the level of effort identified in the ICE for all tasks included in the scope of services. Multiple factors led to the discrepancy between the ICE and the recommended price.

The difference between the ICE and the negotiated amount is due, in part, to a lower level of effort originally projected for (1) conceptual engineering and urban design and (2) environmental analysis and documentation. Given that the proposed study area and the initial BRT concepts have not been vetted with the general public, after further scope of work and level of effort clarifications and fact finding discussions, it was determined that a higher level of effort is needed to address project uncertainties to successfully complete the scope of services.

### **D. Background on Recommended Contractor**

The recommended firm, IBI, is an international firm with 25 offices in the U.S., including three in California: Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco. IBI has been in business for over 25 years in the field of innovative transportation solutions. Among their recent projects, IBI has either led as prime or in a joint venture on York Viva BRT, San Diego SR15 Mid-city BRT, Escondido BRT, Vancouver 95, 98, and 99 B Lines, Ottawa BRT. Other BRT projects that IBI has participated in recent years include: Alum Rock/Santa Clara BRT, Las Vegas Boulder Highway BRT,

Boston Silver Line, Snohomish County WA Sift Bus BRT, Hartford New Britain CT Busway, Toronto Highway 407 BRT, and Albany NY Route 5 BRT.

IBI's Project Manager has over 29 years transit and transportation experience and the planning lead has over 14 years of experience with alternatives analysis and BRT. The team assembled by IBI consists of 14 subcontractors, who bring specific and relevant expertise to the project. The team includes CH2M Hill, now Jacobs Engineering, (Engineering and Environmental), Eyestone Environmental (Environmental), GPA Consulting (Environmental) RSG (Travel Demand Modeling), Oschin Partners, Inc. (Stakeholder Engagement), GCM Consulting, Inc. (QA/QC), Connetics Transportation Group (Transit Finance), Epic Land Solutions, Inc. (R.O.W.), Wagner Engineering & Surveying, Inc. (Surveying), FPL & Associates, Inc. (Engineering Support), Wiltec (Traffic Counts), BAE Urban Economics (Market Assessment), MA Engineering Consultants (Civil Engineering), Virtek (Environmental). Eleven of the subcontractors are SBEs and one subcontractor is a DVBE.