

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

AIRPORT METRO CONNECTOR 96th STREET TRANSIT STATION

1.	Contract Number: PS298340011486 (RFP No. PS11486)	
2.	Recommended Vendor: Gruen Associates	
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: February 2, 2015	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: February 2, 2015	
	C. Pre-proposal Conference: February 10, 2015	
	D. Proposals Due: March 13, 2015	
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: May 20, 2015	
	F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics: March 18, 2015	
	G. Protest Period End Date: July 22, 2015	
5.	Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded: 191	Proposals Received: 7
6.	Contract Administrator: Lily Lopez	Telephone Number: (213) 922-4639
7.	Project Manager: Cory Zelmer	Telephone Number: (213) 922-1079

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. PS298340011486 (RFP No. PS11486) for Architectural and Engineering (A&E) services to design the Airport Metro Connector (AMC) 96th Street Transit Station. The project will be implemented in three (3) phases for a term of seven (7) years as follows:

- Phase 1: Conceptual Design and Schematic Design (approximately 18 months).
- Phase 2: Design Development and Construction Documents (approximately 24 months).
- Phase 3: Bid and Design Support during Construction (approximately 42 months).

The RFP was issued in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and Procedure Manual and the contract type is cost plus fixed fee. This solicitation is exempt from the Small Business Set-Aside Program guidelines. Therefore, the contract may be awarded to a non-SBE firm.

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

- Amendment No. 1, issued on February 17, 2015, provided documents related to the Pre-Proposal conference convened on February 10, 2015, revisions to the evaluation criteria, responses to questions received and extended the proposal due date;

- Amendment No. 2, issued on February 20, 2015, provided responses to questions received and supplemental reference material;
- Amendment No. 3, issued on March 2, 2015, provided responses to questions received.

A pre-proposal conference was held on February 10, 2015, attended by one hundred and ten (110) participants representing sixty-six (66) firms. Thirty (35) questions were asked during the pre-proposal conference and an additional twenty-six (26) questions were asked during the solicitation phase.

One hundred ninety-one (191) firms downloaded the RFP and were included in the planholders list. A total of seven (7) proposals were received on March 13, 2015.

B. Evaluation of Proposals

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Metro’s Countywide Planning and Development, Metro’s Engineering and Construction and LAWA 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 Team | 25% |
| • Experience and Capabilities of Personnel of the Team | 20% |
| • Effectiveness of Team Management Plan | 20% |
| • Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation | 35% |

The evaluation criteria are appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for similar A&E procurements. Several factors were considered when developing these weights, giving the greatest importance to the understanding of work and appropriateness of approach for implementation. The PET evaluated the proposals according to the pre-established evaluation criteria.

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

During the week of April 2, 2015, the PET completed its independent evaluation of the seven (7) proposals received and determined that four (4) were deemed the most highly qualified to provide the services required. The four (4) firms within the competitive range are listed below in alphabetical order:

1. Gensler
2. Gruen Associates (Gruen)
3. Hellmuth, Obata, & Kassabaum, Inc. (HOK)
4. RNL Interplan, Inc. (RNL)

Three (3) firms, Anil Verma Associates, Inc., Michael Maltzan Architecture and McKissack & McKissack Midwest, Inc. were determined to be outside the

competitive range and were not included for further consideration as proposals did not demonstrate having the required experience on transit/multi-modal projects similar in scale.

After evaluations of the written proposals, the PET determined that oral presentations by the four firms deemed to be the most qualified were required. During the week of April 6, 2015, the firms were scheduled for oral presentations. The firms' project managers and key team members had an opportunity to present each team's qualifications and respond to the PET's questions. In general, each team addressed the requirements of the RFP, experience with all aspects of the required scope, and stressed each firm's commitment to the success of the project. Each team was asked questions relative to each firm's proposed staffing plans, perceived project issues, implementation of similar projects and previous experience.

The final scoring, after the oral presentations, determined Gruen to be the most qualified firm.

Qualifications of the Recommended Firm

Gruen has experience in designing transportation facilities in Los Angeles and is partnered with Grimshaw, an architectural firm with extensive experience in designing complex multi-modal transportation centers throughout the world. The team demonstrated a strong understanding of the Statement of Work and their team's ability to perform. Gruen offered strong project management with widespread experience in managing complex design assignments with sub-consultants.

Following is a summary of the PET scores:

1	Firm	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
2	Gruen				
3	Degree of Skills and Experience of Team	93.00	25.00%	23.25	
4	Experience and Capabilities of Personnel of the Team	92.44	20.00%	18.49	
5	Effectiveness of Team Management Plan	85.20	20.00%	17.04	
6	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	91.60	35.00%	32.06	
7	Total		100.00%	90.84	1
8	HOK				
9	Degree of Skills and Experience of Team	90.40	25.00%	22.60	
10	Experience and Capabilities of Personnel of the Team	90.40	20.00%	18.08	

11	Effectiveness of Team Management Plan	88.80	20.00%	17.76	
12	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	89.80	35.00%	31.43	
13	Total		100.00%	89.87	2
14	Gensler				
15	Degree of Skills and Experience of Team	90.20	25.00%	22.55	
16	Experience and Capabilities of Personnel of the Team	84.60	20.00%	16.92	
17	Effectiveness of Team Management Plan	91.20	20.00%	18.24	
18	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	90.20	35.00%	31.57	
19	Total		100.00%	89.28	3
20	RNL				
21	Degree of Skills and Experience of Team	85.00	25.00%	21.25	
22	Experience and Capabilities of Personnel of the Team	84.20	20.00%	16.84	
23	Effectiveness of Team Management Plan	85.40	20.00%	17.08	
24	Understanding of Work and Appropriateness of Approach for Implementation	88.80	35.00%	31.08	
25	Total		100.00%	86.25	4

C. Cost Analysis

The recommended price of \$17,789,897 has been determined to be fair and reasonable based upon Metro’s Management and Audit Services Department (MASD) audit findings, an independent cost estimate (ICE), a Project Manager’s technical analysis, a cost analysis, fact finding, and negotiations.

	Proposer Name	Proposal Amount	Metro ICE	Negotiated
1.	Gruen	\$35,327,410	\$24,548,141	\$17,789,897

D. Background on Recommended Contractor

The recommended firm, Gruen, headquartered in Los Angeles, has been in business since 1946 and is a planning and architecture firm. Gruen will be the prime contractor for the design the AMC 96th Street Transit Station in collaboration with Grimshaw Architects (Grimshaw). Gruen will be the project manager and contractual leader for the team. Gruen’s Metro key projects include: Union Station

Master Plan, Mid-City Exposition Corridor Light Rail Transit Project, and Metro Canoga Orange Line Extension.

Gruen will subcontract the architectural design lead tasks to Grimshaw as the firm has experience in providing complete architectural service, from master planning, feasibility studies, and planning applications through construction and inspections on site. The firm's specialty is designing urban intermodal transit projects through the undertaking of strategic studies, comprehensive transit oriented master planning, and the execution of award-winning transit buildings. Their designs are characterized by structural legibility, innovation and rigorous approach to detailing. Grimshaw, founded in London in 1980, operates from four offices worldwide and will draw from an international base of research and project experience.

E. Small Business Participation

The Diversity & Economic Opportunity Department (DEOD) established a 20% Race Conscious Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal for this solicitation. Gruen Associates exceeded the goal by making a 22.71% RC DBE commitment and a 4.0% Race Neutral (RN) DBE commitment.

	DBE	20% DBE	DBE	22.71% DBE
	DBE Subcontractors		Ethnicity	% Commitment
1.	JC Engineering		Hispanic	1.64% 2.70%
2.	Innovative Engineering Group		Asian Pacific	5.01% 7.90%
3.	BA , Inc		African American	1.74% 3.20%
4.	DRC		Hispanic	1.31% 2.20%
5.	FLP		Asian Pacific	0.68% 1.21%
6.	Bobby Knox Architects		African American	0.29% 0.40%
7.	Diaz Yourman Associates		Hispanic	0.41% 0.70%
8.	Coast Survey		Hispanic	0.20% 0.40%
9.	SKA Design		Hispanic	0.18% 0.40%
10.	The Robert Group		African American	1.16% 1.70%
11.	Soteria		Hispanic	1.24% 1.70%
12.	Land Econ Group		Asian Pacific	0.14% 0.20%
	Total Commitment			22.71%

	Race Neutral DBE Commitment	4.00% RN DBE	
	DBE Subcontractor	Ethnicity	% Commitment
1.	Lenax	Non- Minority Female	4.00%
	Total Commitment		4.00%

F. Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy Applicability

The Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy is not applicable to this contract.

G. Prevailing Wages

Prevailing wage is applicable to portions of this contract.

H. All Subcontractors Included with Recommended Contractor's Proposal

	Subcontractor	Services Provided
1.	Arup North America, Ltd.	Structural Engineering, Pedestrian Flow Modeling (Building), Fire/Life Safety, Lighting, Acoustics, Façades, Communications, Security, LEED/Sustainability/Energy Modeling
2.	BA, Inc.	Drainage and Grading/SWPPP
3.	Bobby Knox Architects	Develop Specifications
4.	Coast Surveying, Inc.	Survey
5.	Diaz Yourman Associates	Geotechnical
6.	DR Consultants & Designers	Dry Utilities
7.	Fehr & Peers	Transportation Planning/Modeling
8.	FPL and Associates, Inc.	Off-Site Civil
9.	Grimshaw Architects	Design Architect
10.	Hatch Mott MacDonald	Rail Engineering, Site Civil, Site Utilities
11.	Innovative Engineering Group	MEP Engineers
12.	JCE Structural Engineering Group, Inc.	Associate Structural
13.	Land Econ Group	Economic Consultant
14.	Lenax Construction Services, Inc.	Cost Estimating
15.	SKA Design	Environmental Graphics
16.	Solteria	Safety Certification Plan
17.	Syska Hennessy Group, Inc.	Vertical Transportation
18.	The Robert Group	Outreach