

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

**CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT SERVICES (CMSS) FOR LINK UNION
STATION CM/GC
CONTRACT NO. RFP AE83177E0130**

1.	Contract Number: AE83177E0130	
2.	Recommended Vendor: Lockwood, Andrews, & Newnam, Inc.	
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: June 28, 2022	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: June 28, 2022	
	C. Pre-Proposal Conference: July 21, 2022	
	D. Proposals Due: September 20, 2022	
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: November 21, 2022	
	F. Organizational Conflict of Interest Review Completed: May 16, 2023	
	G. Protest Period End Date: Est. June 23, 2023	
5.	Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded: Two hundred fifty-nine (259)	Proposals Received: Six (6)
6.	Contract Administrator: Diana Sogomonyan	Telephone Number: (213) 922 - 7243
7.	Project Manager: Scott McConnell	Telephone Number: (213) 922 - 4980

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve the award of Contract No. AE83177E0130 to provide Construction Management Support Services (CMSS) for Link Union Station CM/GC; subject to resolution of any properly submitted protest(s).

The CMSS Consultant will assist Metro in the management of the Link US Project by providing preconstruction and construction support services for Phase A and preconstruction services for Phase B (Phase B Construction Support Services is an optional scope of services). The Scope of Services for CMSS includes services critical to control the design to budget, assist in the negotiation of a construction contract with the Link US Construction Manager/General Contractor (to be selected under a separate procurement), and assist Metro in managing construction of Phase A to ensure completion within budget and on schedule. Work Plans for the CMSS Consultant will be negotiated annually, subject to availability of funds.

This was a qualification-based procurement performed in accordance with Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Procurement Policies and Procedures, and California Government Code §4525-4529.5 for Architectural and Engineering (A&E) services. Cost was not an evaluation factor. Metro will award a Cost Reimbursable-Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) type contract. The contract is subject to

available funds based on negotiated Annual Work Plans. The first Annual Work Plan covers required Construction Management (CM) support services during the remaining Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 and FY2024.

A Letter of Guarantee will be executed for the Project/Construction Manager, Lead Estimator, and Lead Facilitator for Phase A and the Vertical Construction Manager under Phase B, to ensure proposed personnel are actually available to support the project. The Contract includes a Special Provision that subjects the Contractor to Liquidated Damages should the Contractor fail to provide the proposed key personnel.

Metro issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) AE83177E0130, Construction Management Support Services for Link Union Station CM/GC, on June 28, 2022. Metro advertised the RFP in various newspapers in general circulation: LA Watts Times, Asian Week, Los Angeles Daily News, Riverside Press Enterprise, LA Opinion, Dodge Construction News, and Engineering News Record. Notifications were also sent to 3,498 firms and to an additional 880 SBE Certified firms and 247 DVBE Certified firms listed in Metro's Vendor database that had the applicable NAICS codes.

A virtual pre-proposal conference was held on July 21, 2022, in accordance with California Governor Executive Order N-33-20 related to COVID-19. One hundred and seventy-one (171) individuals including eighty-two (82) different firms attended the pre-proposal conference. Two hundred fifty-nine (259) individuals from various firms downloaded the RFP Package from Metro's Vendor Portal.

Five (5) Amendments were issued during the Solicitation phase of this RFP and included the following summary updates:

Amendment No. 1, issued on July 12, 2022, to revise Section III – Proposal Requirements/Forms as follows:

- Submittal Requirements Section 1.2: Revised to refer Proposers to the content summary in Exhibits (Solicitation) Exhibit 17 Submittal Requirements for each Volume of the Proposal Content.
- Exhibits (Solicitation) Exhibit 3 Evaluation Criteria: Other Evaluation Factors updated.
- Exhibits (Solicitation) Exhibit 14: Annual Work Plan Spreadsheet was replaced in its entirety.

Amendment No. 2, issued on July 15, 2022, to revise Section II – Proposal Instructions and Section IV – Contract Documents (Sample) as follows:

- All reference to Local Small Business Enterprise (LSBE) Preference was deleted from Diversity & Economic Opportunity Department (DEOD) Instructions since it was not adopted at the time: DI-01 – Instructions to Bidders/Proposers AND Exhibit D DEOD SBE/DVBE Contract Compliance Manual (Non-Federal); and DI-01 clarified to include reference to CA Department of General Services (DGS).

Amendment No. 3, issued on August 3, 2022, to revise Section I – Letter of Invitation, Section II – Proposal Instructions, Section III – Proposal Requirements/Forms, and Section IV – Contract Documents (Sample) as follows:

- LOI-01 Notice and Invitation: Proposal Due Date was extended for an additional two weeks.
- LOI-07 Basis of Award clarified.
- Exhibits (Solicitation) Exhibit 5 Proposal Letter: Validity period of Proposals was updated.
- Exhibit A Scope of Services Attachment 1: Description of Positions: position qualifications for two positions were clarified.
- Exhibit J. Construction Safety and Security Manual was replaced with new version - Revision 5.0: January 2022.

Amendment No. 4, issued on August 19, 2022, to revise Section III – Proposal Requirements/Forms, and Section IV – Contract Documents (Sample) as follows:

- Exhibit 14 Annual Work Plan: was replaced in its entirety.
- Exhibit A Scope of Services - Attachment 5 Phase A Cost Estimate Templates on an Open Book Basis PDF was replaced in its entirety.

Amendment No. 5, issued on September 2, 2022, to revise Section I – Letter of Invitation, Section III – Proposal Requirements/Forms, and Section IV – Contract Documents (Sample) as follows:

- LOI-01 Notice and Invitation: Period of Performance of the Contract was revised to 11 Years and Proposal Due Date was revised to Tuesday, September 20, 2022.
- Submittal Requirements Section 1.1: 100-page proposal limit clarified.
- Exhibit 13 Staffing Plan: PDF Spreadsheet was replaced in its entirety.
- Exhibit 14 Annual Work Plan: Excel and PDF Spreadsheet was replaced in its entirety.
- Exhibit 15 Link US:List of Quantities Based Phase A 35% Design, items 329 thru 337 were deleted.
- Exhibit A Scope of Services Attachment 5 Phase A Cost Estimate Templates on an Open Book Basis: Link Union Station Project Construction Cost Estimate Summary page and Calculations were replaced in its entirety.

A total of six (6) proposals were received on the proposal due date, September 20, 2022, from the following firms listed below in alphabetical order:

1. ABA Global, Inc.
2. Jacobs Project Management Company
3. Lockwood, Andrews, & Newnam, Inc.
4. Parsons / Mott McDonald (Joint Venture)
5. Psomas
6. Stantec Consulting Services Inc.

B. Evaluation of Proposals

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of Metro staff from Highway Programs, Quality Assurance / Compliance, and Regional Rail departments was convened to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the proposals received.

The recommendation of the most qualified Proposer is based on the PET's assessment of the written proposals and oral presentations. Pursuant to the RFP, the PET scored the proposals in accordance with the Evaluation Criteria and Points set forth in the RFP. The most qualified Proposer was determined to be the Proposer that submitted the highest scored proposal.

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

I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A	1000 Points
A. Proposer's Project Team and CM/GC Experience	300 Points
B. Project Management Approach to Preconstruction Support Services	105 Points
C. Successful Negotiation Approach to a Firm Fixed Price Proposal	175 Points
D. Construction Management	220 Points
E. Third-Party Coordination and Approval	100 Points
F. Cost Management and Value Engineering	100 Points
II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B	350 Points
A. Proposer's Project Team and CM/GC Experience	140 Points
B. Successful Negotiation Approach to a Firm Fixed Price Proposal	55 Points
C. Construction Management	110 Points
D. Cost/Schedule Management and Value Engineering	45 Points
Total Available Points (Phase A and B)	1350 Points

The PET evaluated and scored the proposals and based on the initial scoring determined the Proposal submitted by ABA Global, Inc. was not within the competitive range and eliminated from further consideration. The competitive range included all of the other five proposals.

Metro scheduled Oral Presentations with all five (5) Proposers in the competitive range.

Virtual Oral Presentations were held on January 25, 2023, and January 27, 2023. In general, each proposer's presentation addressed the requirements of the RFP, and experience with all aspects of the required scope for successful oversight of the Link US CMGC contract. The proposing firms had the opportunity to present their key personnel as well as respond to the PET's questions. Each proposing team was asked questions relative to each firm's previous experience performing work of a similar nature to the Scope of Services presented in the RFP.

The PET ranked the proposals and assessed major strengths and weaknesses of the Proposers to determine the most qualified firm. The evaluation performed by the PET originally ranked Jacobs Project Management Company (Jacobs) as the highest and Lockwood, Andrews, & Newnam (LAN), Inc. was the second highest ranked proposer. However, during the protest process Metro subsequently determined the Jacobs team had an organizational conflict of interest with access to confidential information resulting in a significant competitive advantage over other potential proposers making the Jacobs team ineligible to receive a Contract under this procurement. Consequently, Metro is recommending the CMSS Contract be awarded to LAN as the most qualified firm.

C. Qualifications Summary of Recommended Firm

LAN demonstrated thorough knowledge and understanding of the project and the potential constraints that may adversely impact the project. LAN proposed three very good Value Engineering (VE) and Constructability opportunities to save costs and reduce schedule. LAN illustrated an excellent use of Building Information Modeling (BIM) to enhance constructability reviews, including performing clash detection analysis, coordinating development of LOD 300 design BIM model and LOD 400 design BIM model.

LAN demonstrated substantial CM/GC and relevant experience on projects that were similar in scope and complexity as the Link US project. LAN proposed a team whose composition demonstrates a deep bench of expertise. Key personnel positions including the Project/Construction Manager, Lead Facilitator and Lead Estimator all have substantial CM/GC project delivery method experience.

The proposed Project / Construction Manager has 20 years senior-level project management experience in engineering and constructions projects, 10 years of transit CM/GC experience and supported 10 CM/GC transit projects. On Denton County Transportation Authority's (DCTA) A-Train Commuter Rail CM/GC project, he served in the CMSS role and oversaw the project from preconstruction through revenue service. Other experiences include the DART, Green Line Extension, Southeast 2 Line Section CM/GC Project, and Santa Clara Valley Transit Transportation Authority (VTA / BART) Silicon Valley Berryessa Extension Design-Build Project.

LAN's Third-party Liaison/Expeditor has 20 years of transportation project experience, including oversight and management of third-party issues on large projects and programs with the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, State of California, utility owners/agencies, and with other Stakeholders such as the CAHSR Authority, SCRRA, and Caltrans.

The results of the final scoring are shown below:

	Firm / Evaluation Factor	Max Factor Weight	Max Points for Criteria	Total Average Score	Rank
1					
2	Lockwood, Andrews, & Newnam, Inc.				
3	I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A (100% of total 1000 points, which is 74% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	1000.00	841.00	
4	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A) (30.00%)	30.00%	300.00	261.25	
5	B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%)	10.50%	105.00	76.17	
6	C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%)	17.50%	175.00	146.37	
7	D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE A) - (22.00%)	22.00%	220.00	181.72	
8	E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	90.00	
9	F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	85.50	
10	II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	350.00	287.03	
11	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%)	40.00%	140.00	119.92	

12	B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%)	15.71%	55.00	43.08	
13	C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE B OPTIONAL SCOPE) - (31.42%)	31.42%	110.00	90.20	
14	D. COST / SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) - (12.86%)	12.86%	45.00	33.83	
15	Total		1350.00	1128.03	1
16	Psomas				
17	I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A (100% of total 1000 points, which is 74% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	1000.00	771.93	
18	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A) (30.00%)	30.00%	300.00	238.02	
19	B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%)	10.50%	105.00	80.05	
20	C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%)	17.50%	175.00	140.05	
21	D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE A) - (22.00%)	22.00%	220.00	161.97	
22	E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	74.45	
23	F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	77.40	
24	II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	350.00	266.67	
25	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%)	40.00%	140.00	108.33	
26	B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%)	15.71%	55.00	44.17	
27	C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE B OPTIONAL SCOPE) - (31.42%)	31.42%	110.00	79.67	

28	D. COST / SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) - (12.86%)	12.86%	45.00	34.50	
29	Total		1350.00	1038.60	2
30	Parsons / Mott McDonald (Joint Venture)				
31	I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A (100% of total 1000 points, which is 74% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	1000.00	754.87	
32	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A) (30.00%)	30.00%	300.00	230.7833	
33	B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%)	10.50%	105.00	75.20	
34	C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%)	17.50%	175.00	141.78	
35	D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE A) - (22.00%)	22.00%	220.00	159.23	
36	E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	72.30	
37	F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	75.57	
38	II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	350.00	267.97	
39	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%)	40.00%	140.00	109.42	
40	B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%)	15.71%	55.00	41.73	
41	C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE B OPTIONAL SCOPE) - (31.42%)	31.42%	110.00	82.57	
42	D. COST / SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) - (12.86%)	12.86%	45.00	34.25	
43	Total		1350.00	1022.83	3
44	Stantec Consulting Services Inc.				
45	I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A	100.00%	1000.00	745.30	

	(100% of total 1000 points, which is 74% of TOTAL 1350 Points)				
46	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A) (30.00%)	30.00%	300.00	232.65	
47	B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%)	10.50%	105.00	78.92	
48	C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%)	17.50%	175.00	120.60	
49	D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE A) - (22.00%)	22.00%	220.00	165.12	
50	E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	74.37	
51	F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	73.65	
52	II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	350.00	263.42	
53	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%)	40.00%	140.00	106.63	
54	B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%)	15.71%	55.00	41.53	
55	C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE B OPTIONAL SCOPE) - (31.42%)	31.42%	110.00	81.02	
56	D. COST / SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) - (12.86%)	12.86%	45.00	34.23	
57	Total		1350.00	1008.72	4
58	ABA Global, Inc.				
59	I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A (100% of total 1000 points, which is 74% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	1000.00	206.17	
60	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A) 300 pts/1000 pts (30.00%)	30.00%	300.00	114.1667	
61	B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT	10.50%	105.00	11.60	

	SERVICES (PHASE A) (105 pts of 1000 pts = 10.50%)			
62	C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (175 pts of 1000pts =17.50%)	17.50%	175.00	1.00
63	D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE A) – (220 pts of 1000pts = 22.00%)	22.00%	220.00	16.33
64	E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND APPROVAL (PHASE A) – (100 pts of 1000 pts = 10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	57.13
65	F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE A) – (100 pts of 1000 pts = 10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	5.93
66	II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B – (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	350.00	40.08
67	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) – (140 pts of 350 pts = 40.00%)	40.00%	140.00	37.05
68	B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B CONSTRUCTION OPTION – (55 pts of 350 pts = 15.71%)	15.71%	55.00	0.00
69	C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE B OPTIONAL SCOPE) – (100 pts of 350 pts = 31.42%)	31.42%	110.00	3.03
70	D. COST / SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) – (45 pts of 350 pts = 12.86%)	12.86%	45.00	0.00
71	Total - Not in Competitive Range		1350.00	246.25
72	Jacobs Project Management Company			
73	I. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE A (100% of total 1000 points, which is 74% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	1000.00	842.93
74	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE A) (30.00%)	30.00%	300.00	259.27

75	B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PRECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT SERVICES (PHASE A) (10.50%)	10.50%	105.00	86.15
76	C. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL (PHASE A) (17.50%)	17.50%	175.00	150.23
77	D. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE A) - (22.00%)	22.00%	220.00	177.85
78	E. THIRD-PARTY COORDINATION AND APPROVAL (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	85.67
79	F. COST MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE A) - (10.00%)	10.00%	100.00	83.77
80	II. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR PROJECT PHASE B - (100% of total 350 points, which is 26% of TOTAL 1350 Points)	100.00%	350.00	301.07
81	A. PROPOSER'S PROJECT TEAM AND CMGC EXPERIENCE (PHASE B) - (40.00%)	40.00%	140.00	122.23
82	B. SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION APPROACH TO A FIRM FIXED PRICE PROPOSAL FOR PHASE B CONSTRUCTION OPTION - (15.71%)	15.71%	55.00	46.42
83	C. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (PHASE B OPTIONAL SCOPE) - (31.42%)	31.42%	110.00	95.20
84	D. COST / SCHEDULE MANAGEMENT AND VALUE ENGINEERING (PHASE B) - (12.86%)	12.86%	45.00	37.22
85	Total - Ineligible for an award due to OCI		1350.00	1144.00

D. Cost/Price Analysis

A cost analysis of the elements of cost including labor rates, indirect rates and other direct costs will be completed in accordance with Metro's Procurement Policies and Procedures, including fact-finding, clarification and cost analysis to determine the cost factors are fair and reasonable. Metro will negotiate and establish indirect cost rates and as appropriate provisional indirect (overhead) rates, plus a fixed fee factor to establish a fixed fee amount based on the total estimated cost of performance of the Scope of Services, for the first Annual Work Plan for the remainder of FY23 and FY24. Work Plans for the CMSS Consultant will be negotiated annually throughout the contract term, subject to availability of funds.

E. Background on Recommended Contractor

LAN was founded in 1935 and is a national, full-service civil engineering firm, offering planning, engineering, and program and construction management services. LAN specializes in rail transit and CMGC delivery, with a history of construction management/owner's representative services. LAN has partnered with California transit agencies to deliver rail transit projects, including the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT), San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA), and Caltrain, among others.

Previously, LAN provided design and design services during construction of the Silicon Valley Bart Berryessa Extension Design-Build Project, a 10-mile, \$860 million extension of the BART system into Santa Clara County. LAN also provided project management for the DART Red/Blue Line Platform extension CMGC project. LAN led a joint-venture to provide project management support services, including planning, procurement, design, and construction management services for the \$300 million A-train Commuter Rail CMGC Implementation for Denton County Transportation Authority (DCTA) in Denton Texas. Located along the old Denton Branch (formerly Union Pacific Railroad), the alignment is a shared corridor with a Class 1 railroad operator for approximately 10 miles of the 21-mile corridor.

They are headquartered in Austin, Texas and have a local office located in the heart of downtown Los Angeles, at 550 S. Hope Street, 27th floor, Los Angeles, CA 90071.