ATTACHMENT C

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

ZERO EMISSION BUS CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT FOR DIVISION 18 AND DIVISION 7 CONTRACT NO. PS130703000

1.	**Contract Number**: PS130703000	
2.	**Recommended Vendor**: Clark Construction Group – CA, LP	
3.	**Type of Procurement (check one):** ☐ **IFB** ☒ **RFP** ☐ **RFP–A&E** ☐ **Non-Competitive** ☐ **Modification** ☐ **Task Order**	
4.	**Procurement Dates**:	
	A. Issued: May 14, 2025	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: May 14, 2025	
	C. Pre-Proposal Conference: May 29, 2025	
	D. Proposals Due: July 16, 2025	
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: October 08, 2025	
	F. Ethics Declaration Forms Submitted to Ethics: July 16, 2025	
	G. Protest Period End Date: November 25, 2025	
5.	**Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded**: 153	**Bids/Proposals Received**: 3
6.	**Contract Administrator**: Yamil Ramirez Roman	**Telephone Number**: (213) 922-1064
7.	**Project Manager**: Ryan Chan	**Telephone Number**: (213) 518-8013

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. PS130703000 issued in support of Progressive Design-Build Operate and Maintain (PDBOM) project delivery method (as approved by the Board on March 27, 2025, Board Report File No. 2024-1073) for the Zero Emission Bus Charging Infrastructure Project for Division 18 and Division 7. Board approval of contract awards are subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest(s), if any.

Prior to the release of the solicitation, starting February 21, 2025, Metro conducted an Industry Review (IR) process by releasing the draft Request for Proposals (RFP) and Progressive Design-Build Operate and Maintain Contract (Contract) to the transportation construction industry. The IR process also included one-on-one meetings to solicit comments on the terms and conditions of the RFP and Contract and to discuss the proposed project delivery approach in an effort to increase the likelihood that Metro would receive proposals for this solicitation. Nine firms participated in the one-on-one meetings held virtually from March 11 through March 13, 2025. Metro responded to the 139 consolidated comments by posting the IR responses on the Vendor Portal on April 28, 2025.

The RFP was issued in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and the contract type for Phase 1 is firm fixed price. The Diversity & Economic Opportunity Department recommended a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal of 20% for Phase 1 Work and a 19% DBE goal for Phase 2 Work. However, the U.S.

Department of Transportation (USDOT) has issued an Interim Final Rule (IFR) that makes changes to the DBE Program, including suspension of goals and enforcement, effective October 3, 2025. Metro is currently reviewing the IFR to identify necessary program and procedural changes to ensure full compliance. As such, the DBE commitment is not a factor in this recommended action.

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

- Amendment No. 1, issued on May 30, 2025, updated the RFP Schedule, Appendices A and G, and provided a revised Form 70;

- Amendment No. 2, issued on June 6, 2025, revised DBE Phase 2 and Early Works Packages submittal requirements, Contracting Outreach and Mentoring Plan (COMP) Contract language, and provided a revised Form 70; and

- Amendment No. 3, issued on June 24, 2025, revised Attachment A of Exhibit 3 to clarify the defined term "Integrated Project Management Office (IPMO)", and provided revised Forms 60 and 70.

A total of 153 downloads of the RFP were included in the planholders list. A virtual pre-proposal conference was held on May 29, 2025, that was attended by 81 participants. 155 questions were received, and responses were provided prior to the proposal due date.

Three proposals were received by the due date of July 16, 2025.

B. <u>Evaluation of Proposals/Bids</u>

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Metro's Zero Emission Bus (ZEB) Infrastructure, Bus Acquisition, and Alternative Delivery/Construction Management Departments was convened and conducted a comprehensive technical evaluation of the proposals received.

The proposals were evaluated based on the following evaluation criteria and weights:

• Capability and Experience	375 points
• Project Understanding	75 points
• Project Approach*	275 points
• Community Benefits and Workforce Development	50 points
• Price	200 points

* Due to the IFR changes outlined in Section A above, the "Approach to Engagement and Outreach" sub-criterion (worth 25 points) under "Project Approach" was excluded from the final score calculation. As a result, the maximum points for the

“Project Approach” evaluation criterion was reduced from 300 to 275, and the overall total points available decreased from 1,000 to 975.

Several factors were considered when developing the weighting for the evaluation criteria, giving the greatest importance to Capability and Experience.

In addition, the price evaluation criteria consisted of the following price elements with pre-established parameters to reflect the phases of the project, designed to establish a level playing field and to arrive at one price formula that would be evaluated with the understanding that only the amount listed under Phase 1 Pre-Construction Lump Sum Fee would be used for the awarded Contract Value (subject to clarification and/or negotiations). The price elements stated in the RFP are as follows:

1. Phase 1 Pre-Construction Lump Sum Fee
2. Delay Compensation Rate (daily) for Phase 1 with an assumed estimated quantity of 50 days of Compensable Delay during Phase 1 (for evaluation purposes only)
3. Phase 2 Management Lump Sum Fee, assuming a 13-month period of performance for Phase 2 work (for evaluation purposes only)
4. Phase 2 Margin Percentage, assuming a construction cost of $135,000,000 (for evaluation purposes only)
5. Phase 3 Margin Percentage assuming operations and maintenance costs of $11,000,000 (for evaluation purposes only)

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

1. Clark Construction Group – CA, LP
2. Griffith Company
3. Shimmick Construction Company

During the period of July 29, 2025, to August 13, 2025, the PET independently evaluated and scored the technical proposals. On September 03, 2025, the PET met and received oral presentations from the three proposers. Each firm’s Project Managers and Key Personnel were asked to present each team’s capability and experience, their project understanding, and approach to completing the project. Each team was asked questions regarding their previous experience working with multiple stakeholders, minimizing impacts, and commitment to partnering with Metro to ensure the success of the Project. Following oral presentations, the PET completed consensus scoring.

Qualifications Summary of Firms within the Competitive Range:

Clark Construction Group – CA, LP (Clark)

Clark demonstrated through its proposal the strongest overall qualifications to deliver the Zero Emission Bus Charging Infrastructure for Division 18 and Division 7 under a PDBOM model. The Clark team presented extensive experience in the design and construction of transit electrification projects, technical expertise in bus charging infrastructure, and a strong record in alternative project delivery.

Clark's proposal demonstrated key staff with direct, relevant experience in delivering large depot electrification projects such as WMATA Northern Bus Garage, SamTrans South Base Battery Electric Bus Charging Infrastructure, and NYPA/NY MTA Electric Bus Charging Infrastructure. Clark's project approach emphasized transparent, collaborative partnering to ensure the Project can be delivered with either a Guaranteed Maximum Price or Firm Fixed Price.

Clark's proposal received the highest technical score, reflecting extensive alternative delivery experience and technical capabilities across design and construction disciplines. Clark's proposed cost was the second-highest among the three proposers; however, the firm's technical proposal earned Clark the highest overall score.

Griffith Company (Griffith)

Griffith demonstrated strong qualifications and experience in their proposal, earning the second-highest technical score. Griffith's proposed cost was the highest among the three proposers, which combined with their technical score, placed Griffith second in the competitive range.

Shimmick Construction Company (Shimmick)

Shimmick's proposed cost was the lowest of the three proposers, receiving the highest price score. However, Shimmick's proposal received the lowest technical score, placing them third in the competitive range.

A summary of the PET scores is provided below:

1	Firm	Maximum Points	Earned Points	Total Points	Rank
2	**Clark Construction Group – CA, LP**				
3	Capability and Experience	375.00	310.63		
4	Project Understanding	75.00	50.63		
5	Project Approach	275.00	205.00		
6	Community Benefits and Workforce Development	50.00	29.38		
7	Price	200.00	184.85		
8	**Total**	**975**		**780.49**	**1**
9	**Griffith Company**				
10	Capability and Experience	375.00	262.19		
11	Project Understanding	75.00	55.31		
12	Project Approach	275.00	193.13		
13	Community Benefits and Workforce Development	50.00	31.25		
14	Price	200.00	175.91		
15	**Total**	**975**		**717.79**	**2**
16	**Shimmick Construction Company**				
17	Capability and Experience	375.00	241.25		
18	Project Understanding	75.00	60.94		
19	Project Approach	275.00	161.88		
20	Community Benefits and Workforce Development	50.00	40.00		
21	Price	200.00	200.00		
22	**Total**	**975**		**704.07**	**3**

C. Cost/Price Analysis

The recommended Award Amount has been determined to be fair and reasonable based upon fact finding, comparison with the independent cost estimate (ICE), and cost and price analysis. Staff successfully negotiated cost savings of $545,172.

Proposer Name	Proposal Amount	Metro ICE	Award Amount
Clark Construction Group – CA, LP	$16,489,069 (Phase 1 Preconstruction Lump Sum Fee)	$12,416,827	$15,943,897 (Phase 1 Preconstruction Lump Sum Fee)
	$12,600.00/day (Delay Compensation for Phase 1)		$12,600.00/day (Delay Compensation for Phase 1)
	$104,232/month (Phase 2 Management Lump Sum Fee)		$104,232/month (Phase 2 Management Lump Sum Fee)
	7.8% (Phase 2 Margin Percentage)		7.8% (Phase 2 Margin Percentage)
	8.0% (Phase 3 Margin Percentage)		8.0% (Phase 3 Margin Percentage)
Griffith Company	$15,527,238 (Phase 1 Preconstruction Lump Sum Fee)		
	$10,462.45/day (Delay Compensation for Phase 1)		
	$133,889.29/month (Phase 2 Management Lump Sum Fee)		
	8.9% (Phase 2 Margin Percentage)		
	12% (Phase 3 Margin Percentage)		
Shimmick Construction Company	$15,359,423 (Phase 1 Preconstruction Lump Sum Fee)		
	$14,000.00/day (Delay Compensation for Phase 1)		
	$90,003.34/month (Phase 2 Management Lump Sum Fee)		

	7.0% (Phase 2 Margin Percentage)		
	10% (Phase 3 Margin Percentage)		

D. Background on Recommended Contractor

The recommended proposer, Clark, located in Los Angeles, CA, has been in business for 120 years and provides construction services for mass transit, heavy civil and utility substation projects, among others. The firm has extensive experience working with other public agencies such as Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA), Union City, CA, City of Long Beach, and the U.S General Services Administration.

The proposed team includes twelve subcontractors. The team's clients include Coachella Valley Association of Governments, City of Dublin, Orange County Transportation Authority, California Department of Transportation, New Jersey Transit, and City of Inglewood. Clark's proposed Project Manager has 13 years of experience managing large infrastructure projects.