

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

**CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT SERVICES
CONTRACT NUMBER PS66383MC077**

1.	Contract Number: PS66383MC077	
2.	Recommended Vendor: PreScience Corporation	
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 type="checkbox"/> Task Order	
4.	Procurement Dates:	
	A. Issued: November 20, 2019	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: November 19, 2019	
	C. Pre-Proposal Conference: December 3, 2019	
	D. Proposals Due: February 3, 2020	
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: May 4, 2020	
	F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics: February 11, 2020	
	G. Protest Period End Date: December 2, 2020	
5.	Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded: 140	Proposals Received: 9
6.	Contract Administrator: Laura Barrera/Wonder E. Van Twist	Telephone Number: 213-922-4365
7.	Project Manager: Dan Mahgrefteh	Telephone Number: 213.418.3219

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. PS66383MC077 Rosecrans/Marquardt Grade Separation Construction Support Services Consultant (CSSC) to provide construction support services that will assist and support Metro in the performance of Metro's responsibilities managing the Construction of the Rosecrans/Marquardt Grade Separation Project. Services will be provided from final design through pre-construction activities (early demolition and environmental work, advanced utility relocation work), construction, and contract closeout. Board approval of contract awards are subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) was a competitively negotiated procurement process, performed in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policies and Procedures. This process required each of the proposals and qualifications to be evaluated based on the evaluation criteria set forth in the RFP. The evaluation criteria were weighted in order of importance, including the cost proposal. The proposals were evaluated and rated accordingly, and the results are shown in the table below. The RFP was issued with an SBE goal of 17% and a DVBE goal of 3%. The contract type is a Cost-Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF). The Contract is for a base term of four (4) years plus a one (1) year option.

Four amendments were issued during the solicitation phase of this RFP:

- Amendment No. 1, issued on December 19, 2019, revised the Letter of Invitation and extended the Proposal due date to January 20,2020.
- Amendment No. 2, issued on January 9, 2020, extended the Proposals due date to February 3, 2020, modified the Scope of Services, Submittal Requirements, and Evaluation Criteria, issued a CSSC STAFFING PLAN with a standardized level of effort (labor of hours) for Proposers to use in preparing their Cost and Fee Proposal, and added Metro Professional Form 60 (Pro Form 60 or “Form 60”) in Excel Format for convenience.
- Amendment No. 3, issued on January 15, 2020, to correct typographical error in Cost Proposal Submittal-Volume III.
- Amendment No. 4, issued January 28, 2020, modified and finalized the Scope of Services, Submittal Requirements, and the CSSC Staffing Plan was referenced as Attachment B in Section 3- Proposal Documents.

A total of nine (9) proposals were received on February 3, 2020, from the following firms, in alphabetical order:

1. ABA Global, Inc.
2. AECOM
3. Berg & Associates, Inc.
4. Falcon & MARRS (Join-Venture Team)
5. Integrated Engineering Management, dba IEM
6. Jacobs
7. PreScience Corporation
8. Santa Fe Partners (Joint-Venture)
9. T.Y. Lin International

B. Evaluation of Proposals

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Metro Regional Rail Department, California Department of Transportation, California High-Speed Rail Authority, and City of Santa Fe Springs 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 Qualifications of Firms on the Team..... (20%)
- Key Personnel’s Skills and Experience..... (25%)
- Project Understanding and Approach..... (35%)

- Cost Proposal..... (20%)

Total 100%

The evaluation criteria are appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other professional services procurements. Several factors were considered when developing the weightings, giving the greatest importance to the Project Understanding, and Approach and Key Personnel’s Skills and Experiences.

The PET evaluated all nine (9) written qualification proposals from February 4, 2020 through February 7, 2020. From March 2, 2020 thru March 3, 2020, the PET held oral presentations with the seven (7) firms within the competitive range. The firms were given the opportunity to present on: Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant’s Project Team and Project Understanding and Approach.

The proposing firms had the opportunity to present their proposed key personnel in the context of their presentation of the two Evaluation Criteria specified above as well as respond to the PET’s clarifying questions. In general, each Proposer’s presentation addressed the requirements of the RFP, experience with all aspects of the required and anticipated task and stressed each proposer’s commitment to the success of the contract.

Of the nine (9) proposals received, seven (7) were determined to be within the competitive range. The seven firms are listed below in alphabetical order:

1. AECOM.
2. Falcon & MARRS (Joint-Venture Team)
3. Integrated Engineering Management, dba IEM
4. Jacobs
5. PreScience Corporation
6. Santa Fe Partners (Join-Venture)
7. T.Y. Lin International

The following Proposals from ABA Global, Inc. and Berg & Associates, Inc.; were outside of the competitive range and excluded from further consideration due to their lower overall scoring. Both firms were notified of Metro’s determination.

ABA Global, Inc.
Berg & Associates, Inc.

Qualifications Summary of the responsive firms within the Competitive Range:

AECOM

- Response generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the area of Experience and Qualification of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team.
- Response lack information in demonstrating coordination with adjacent projects in details.

Falcon & MARRS (Joint-Venture Team)

- Response generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the area of Experience and Qualification of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team.
- Response lacks information in demonstrating responsiveness the Project Understanding.

Integrated Engineering Management, dba IEM

- Response generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the area of Experience and Qualification of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team.
- Response substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements and exceeds the requirements in the Project Understanding and Approach.

Jacobs

- Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements and exceeds the requirements in the are of the Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team.
- Proposal significantly exceeds the RFP minimum requirements in the area of Project Understanding and Approach.

PreScience Corporation

- Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements and exceeds in the Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team criteria.
- Proposal has an excellent listing of similar projects that demonstrate assistance and support in construction management, inspection, project management and grade separation.
- Proposal significantly exceeds the RFP minimum requirements in the Key Personnel's Skill and Experience criteria.
- The Prime consultant and Subconsultants have a wide range of construction management experience on Caltrans projects. Each firm demonstrates a thorough understanding and knowledge of the complexity of similar projects.
- Proposal significantly exceeds the RFP minimum requirements in the area of Understanding and Approach. The CSP Team demonstrated an exceptional project understating and approach of the CSSC requirements, staffing needs.

Santa Fe Partners (Joint-Venture)

- Response generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the area of Experience and Qualification of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team.
- Response substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements and exceeds the requirements in the are of Project Understanding and Approach.

T.Y. Lin International

- Response generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the area of Experience and Qualification of Firms on the Consultant's Project Team.

The Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) evaluated and scored all nine (9) proposals. The seven (7) proposals within the competitive range ranked as follows, based on the evaluation criteria in the RFP. The PET assessed major strengths, weaknesses and associated risks of each of the proposers to determine the most advantageous firm. The most advantageous Proposer was determined to be PreScience Corporation. The final scoring was based on evaluation of the written proposals, as supported by oral presentations, clarifications received from the Proposers, and Cost. The results of the final scoring are shown below:

1	Firm	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score (1)	Rank (2)
2	PreScience Corporation				
3	Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team	86.80	20%	17.36	
4	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	86.80	25%	21.70	
5	Project Understanding and Approach	90.91	35%	31.82	
6	Cost Proposal	83.80	20%	16.76	
7	Total		100.00%	87.64	1
8	Jacobs				
9	Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team	82.00	20%	16.40	
10	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	80.20	25%	20.05	

11	Project Understanding and Approach	83.54	35%	29.24	
12	Cost Proposal	100.00	20%	20.00	
13	Total		100.00%	85.69	2
14	Integrated Engineering Management, dba IEM				
15	Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team	82.20	20%	16.44	
16	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	81.04	25%	20.26	
17	Project Understanding and Approach	980.03	35%	28.01	
18	Cost Proposal	95.20	20%	19.04	
19	Total		100.00%	83.75	3
20	Santa Fe Partners (Joint- Venture)				
21	Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team	81.30	20%	16.26	
22	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	77.76	25%	19.44	
23	Project Understanding and Approach	88.34	35%	30.92	
24	Cost Proposal	77.45	20%	15.49	
25	Total		100.00%	82.11	4
26	TY Lin International				
27	Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team	79.45	20%	15.89	
28	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	75.36	25%	18.84	
29	Project Understanding and Approach	79.88	35%	27.96	
30	Cost Proposal	96.10	20%	19.22	
31	Total		100.00%	81.91	5
32	AECOM				
33	Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team	85.6970	20%	17.14	

34	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	78.84	25%	19.71	
35	Project Understanding and Approach	81.14	35%	28.04	
36	Cost Proposal	76.95	20%	15.39	
37	Total		100.00%	80.28	6
38	Falcon & MAARS (Joint-Venture Team)				
39	Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team	77.5	20%	15.59	
40	Key Personnel's Skills and Experience	77.00	25%	19.25	
41	Project Understanding and Approach	74.88	35%	26.21	
42	Cost Proposal	94.95	20%	18.99	
43	Total		100.00%	80.04	7

- 1) Weighted scores are rounded to the nearest second decimal point.
- 2) Cost proposals were based on the Proposers' rates for the provided level of effort of 23,190 hours. Scores shown above for the cost proposals are based on formula in the RFP highest score going to the lowest cost proposal.

C. Cost/Price Analysis

Metro performed a price analysis of labor rates and comparing the seven (7) proposals in the competitive range with one another as well as Metro's estimate. All proposals were based on direct labor rates, overhead rates, other direct cost, sub-consultant costs, and fixed fee. The proposed cost rates for the recommended firm were determined to be fair and reasonable. The final negotiated amounts complied with all requirements of Metro Procurement Policies and Procedures, including fact-finding, clarifications and cost analysis. To prevent delay in contract award, provisional indirect cost rates will be established subject to retroactive adjustments upon completion of any necessary audits.

	Proposer Name	Proposal Amount	Metro ICE	Recommended Contract Amount ⁽¹⁾
1	Jacobs	\$4,689,505	\$5,175,360	\$4,397,321.75

2	T.Y. Lin International	\$4,870,279.01		
3	IEM	\$4,916,609.00		
4	Falcon- MARRS	\$4,927,374.38		
5	PreScience	\$5,584,238.34		
6	Santa Fe Partners	\$6,043,612.53		
7	AECOM	\$6,082,111.37		

Note¹: The recommended contract amount of \$4,397,321.75 is for base work only. The option year is \$838,461.74.

D. Background on Recommended Contractor

PreScience Corporation is located in Aliso Viejo, CA, and was established in 2013. A certified Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) and Small Business Enterprise (SBE), PreScience has coordinated and managed the construction of more than \$40 million in public works and capital improvement projects over the past five years. PreScience’s key personnel have over two decades of experience in construction support services and highway projects. A number of these projects being similar in scope includes: I-580 Corridor Widening, Edinger Bridge Replacement, SR-210: Segments 9, 10 and 11 (New 6-Lane Freeway Construction), I-10 EB Truck Lane and I-10 WB Median Lane Widening.