

## PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

## L.A. COUNTY GRADE CROSSING AND CORRIDOR SAFETY PROGRAM

1.	<b>Contract Number:</b> AE3319400599 (RFP No. AE11355241510599)	
2.	<b>Recommended Vendor:</b> AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM)	
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> March 13, 2015	
	<b>B. Advertised/Publicized:</b> March 10, 2015	
	<b>C. Pre-proposal Conference:</b> March 23, 2015	
	<b>D. Proposals Due:</b> July 10, 2015	
	<b>E. Pre-Qualification Completed:</b> August 4, 2015	
	<b>F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics:</b> August 4, 2015	
	<b>G. Protest Period End Date:</b> September 23, 2015	
5.	<b>Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded:</b> 91	<b>Proposals Received:</b> 7
6.	<b>Contract Administrator:</b> Lily Lopez	<b>Telephone Number:</b> (213) 922-4639
7.	<b>Project Manager:</b> Don Sepulveda	<b>Telephone Number:</b> (213) 922-7491

**A. Procurement Background**

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. AE3319400599 (RFP No. AE11355241510599) for Architectural and Engineering (A&E) services to develop a Los Angeles (LA) County Grade Crossing and Corridor Safety Program (Program). As this is an A&E qualifications based procurement, price cannot be used as an evaluation factor pursuant to state and federal law. The intent of the project is to develop a countywide program that will develop engineering solutions and establish a pattern for enforcement regarding grade crossings and railroad rights-of-way that will enhance safety and mobility. The Contract will be for a term of three years.

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.

There were two amendments issued during the initial solicitation phase of this RFP:

- Amendment No. 1, issued on March 24, 2015, provided revisions to the solicitation, responses to questions received, and documents related to the pre-proposal conference held on March 23 2015;
- Amendment No. 2, issued on April 1, 2015, provided responses to questions received.

A pre-proposal conference was held on March 23, 2015, attended by 55 participants. There were six questions asked during the pre-proposal conference and an additional 31 questions were asked during the solicitation phase.

There were 91 firms that downloaded the RFP and were included in the planholders list.

On June 10, 2015, Metro received a total of seven proposals from the following firms:

1. AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM)
2. Hatch Mott MacDonald (HMM)
3. JM Diaz (JMD)
4. KOA Corporation (KOA)
5. Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB)
6. Parsons Transportation Group (PTG)
7. Wilson & Company (Wilson)

Due to inconsistencies during the initial evaluation process, which included the premature opening of cost proposals, Amendment No. 3 was issued to the seven proposing firms on June 10, 2015, informing firms that due to the inconsistencies, Metro was returning all technical and cost proposal submittals received (hard copy originals of Volumes I, II, and III).

In order to maintain fair and open competition, Metro provided all proposers that originally submitted proposals, the opportunity to resubmit technical proposals by July 10, 2015. Thereafter, only those firms invited for oral presentations would be required to submit a cost proposal, inclusive of all certifications and DEOD forms, in a sealed envelope.

Upon receipt of the new technical proposals, a new Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) was established to evaluate the technical proposals re-submitted by the above-mentioned firms.

## **B. Evaluation of Proposals**

The PET consisting of staff from Metro's Rail Wayside Systems, Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) and Metrolink was convened and conducted a comprehensive technical evaluation of the proposals received.

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

- Skill and Experience of the Team            30%
- Project Management Plan                    30%
- Project Understanding                        40%

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 project understanding. The new PET evaluated the proposals according to the pre-established evaluation criteria.

During the week of July 27, 2015, the PET completed its independent evaluation of the seven proposals received. All seven firms were invited for oral presentations on July 30, 2015. 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 their proposed staffing plans, perceived project issues, and project approach.

The final scoring, after the oral presentations, determined AECOM to be the most qualified firm. As a result, AECOM's cost proposal was opened for cost analysis and negotiations.

### **Qualifications of the Recommended Firm**

AECOM'S proposed team demonstrated several years of experience on similar projects, have experience in writing crossing manuals, as well as grade crossing safety analysis and grade separation projects. The proposal included a realistic completion schedule and demonstrated an understanding of potential risks and solutions with this type of project. Additionally, AECOM's proposed signal designer, Pacific Railway Enterprises, Inc., is vital to the overall success of the project as the firm has extensive knowledge and experience working with Metrolink and LADOT. The use of two field teams to collect data is important due to the number of stakeholders that will need to be engaged through the course of the project. Overall, the PET felt AECOM strongly demonstrated its understanding of the project and presented a completed team that would be able to deliver.

Following is a summary of the PET scores:

<b>1</b>	<b>Firm</b>	<b>Average Score</b>	<b>Factor Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Average Score</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>AECOM</b>				
<b>3</b>	Skill and Experience of the Team	75.83	30.00%	22.75	
<b>4</b>	Project Management Plan	67.78	30.00%	20.33	
<b>5</b>	Project Understanding	74.00	40.00%	29.60	
<b>6</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>72.68</b>	<b>1</b>

<b>7</b>	<b>PTG</b>				
<b>8</b>	Skill and Experience of the Team	67.50	30.00%	20.25	
<b>9</b>	Project Management Plan	67.22	30.00%	20.17	
<b>10</b>	Project Understanding	69.67	40.00%	27.87	
<b>11</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>68.29</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>HMM</b>				
<b>13</b>	Skill and Experience of the Team	66.67	30.00%	20.00	
<b>14</b>	Project Management Plan	57.22	30.00%	17.17	
<b>15</b>	Project Understanding	71.00	40.00%	28.40	
<b>16</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>65.57</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>17</b>	<b>PB</b>				
<b>18</b>	Skill and Experience of the Team	55.00	30.00%	16.50	
<b>19</b>	Project Management Plan	58.33	30.00%	17.50	
<b>20</b>	Project Understanding	67.50	40.00%	27.00	
<b>21</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>61.00</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>22</b>	<b>KOA</b>				
<b>23</b>	Skill and Experience of the Team	69.17	30.00%	20.75	
<b>24</b>	Project Management Plan	43.89	30.00%	13.17	
<b>25</b>	Project Understanding	61.50	40.00%	24.60	
<b>26</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>58.52</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>27</b>	<b>JMD</b>				
<b>28</b>	Skill and Experience of the Team	63.33	30.00%	19.00	
<b>29</b>	Project Management Plan	53.33	30.00%	16.00	
<b>30</b>	Project Understanding	57.50	40.00%	23.00	
<b>31</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>58.00</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>32</b>	<b>Wilson</b>				
<b>33</b>	Skill and Experience of the Team	56.67	30.00%	17.00	
<b>34</b>	Project Management Plan	42.78	30.00%	12.83	
<b>35</b>	Project Understanding	49.83	40.00%	19.93	
<b>36</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>49.76</b>	<b>7</b>

### C. Cost Analysis

The recommended price of \$3,868,848 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.

	<b>Proposer Name</b>	<b>Proposal Amount</b>	<b>Metro ICE</b>	<b>Negotiated</b>
1.	AECOM	\$4,123,245	\$4,590,000	\$3,868,848

### D. Background on Recommended Contractor

The recommended firm, AECOM was founded in 1990 and is headquartered in Los Angeles, California. AECOM is a provider of professional, technical, and management support services in the areas of transportation, planning, and environmental. AECOM has experience working with similar grade crossing projects to those identified under this project as they have delivered safety improvement both nationally and locally such as the Metrolink Sealed Corridor, Empire Avenue Grade Separation, Altamont Corridor/ACEforward Initiative, and Perris Valley Line commuter rail extension projects. AECOM has worked on several Metro projects and has performed satisfactorily.

### E. Small Business Participation

The Diversity and Economic Opportunity Department (DEOD) established a 26% goal inclusive of a 23% Small Business Enterprise (SBE) and 3% Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) for this project. AECOM exceeded the goal by making a 27.18% SBE commitment and 3.54% DVBE commitment.

<b>SMALL BUSINESS GOAL</b>	<b>23% SBE and 3% DVBE</b>	<b>SMALL BUSINESS COMMITMENT</b>	<b>27.18% SBE and 3.54% DVBE</b>
----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

	<b>SBE Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Commitment</b>
1.	BA Inc.	3.58%
2.	Coast Surveying, Inc.	3.41%
3.	Intueor Consulting, Inc.	6.33%
4.	LIN Consulting	5.21%
5.	Pacific Railroad Enterprises	3.27%
6.	Stack Traffic Consulting	5.38%
	<b>Total SBE Commitment</b>	<b>27.18%</b>

	<b>DVBE Subcontractors</b>	<b>% Commitment</b>
1.	Leland Saylor Associates	3.54%
	<b>Total DVBE Commitment</b>	<b>3.54%</b>

**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 requirements are applicable to this project. DEOD will monitor contractors' compliance with the State of California Department of Industrial Relations (DIR), California Labor Code, and the U S Department of Labor (DOL) Davis Bacon and Related Acts (DBRA).

**H. All Subcontractors Included with Recommended Contractor's Proposal**

	<b>Subcontractor</b>	<b>Services Provided</b>
1.	BA, Inc.	Utilities
2.	Coast Surveying, Inc.	Surveying
3.	Intueor Consulting, Inc.	Traffic Studies
4.	Kimley Horn and Associates	Planning Management
5.	Leland Saylor Associates	Estimating
6.	Lin Consulting, Inc.	Traffic/Electrical Engineering
7.	Overland, Pacific & Cutler, Inc.	Right of Way
8.	Pacific Railway Enterprises, Inc.	Rail Signals
9.	STC Traffic, Inc.	Traffic Signals
10.	STV Incorporated	Analysis