

## PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

**METRO CENTER CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT SERVICES CONSULTANT (CCSC)  
PS66100MC076**

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | <b>Contract Number:</b> PS66100MC076  |  |
| 2. | <b>Recommended Vendor:</b> Center Street Partners, a Joint Venture between Anser Advisory, LLC and STV Construction, Inc.   |  |
| 3. | <b>Type of Procurement (check one):</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IFB <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RFP <input type="checkbox"/> RFP-A&E<br><input type="checkbox"/> Non-Competitive <input type="checkbox"/> Modification <input type="checkbox"/> Task Order |  |
| 4. | <b>Procurement Dates:</b>   |  |
|    | <b>A. Issued :</b> November 7, 2019   |  |
|    | <b>B. Advertised/Publicized:</b> November 29, 2019  |  |
|    | <b>C. Pre-Proposal Conference:</b> November 20, 2019  |  |
|    | <b>D. Proposals Due:</b> December 17, 2019  |  |
|    | <b>E. Pre-Qualification Completed:</b> 3/3/2020   |  |
|    | <b>F. Organizational Conflict of Interest Review Completed by Ethics:</b> 12/20/2019  |  |
|    | <b>G. Protest Period End Date:</b> October 8, 2020  |  |
| 5. | <b>Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded:</b> 123  | <b>Proposals Received:</b> 8             |
| 6. | <b>Contract Administrator:</b><br>Rafael Vasquez  | <b>Telephone Number:</b><br>213.418-3036 |
| 7. | <b>Project Manager:</b><br>Jeanet Owens   | <b>Telephone Number:</b><br>213-418-3189 |

**A. Procurement Background**

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. PS66100MC076 Metro Center Construction Support Services Consultant (CCSC) to provide construction support services that will support Metro in the performance of Metro's responsibilities such as overall project and construction management, community involvement, coordination of construction impacts with surrounding community, coordination with Metro Security Operations, Facilities Maintenance, and other Metro departments, safety and security compliance oversight and loss prevention, quality management, cost and schedule management, environmental and project control oversight.

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 Procurement Policies and Procedures. This process required each of the responding firms' qualifications to be evaluated on the technical requirements and approaches as described in the Scope of Services. The technical factors were weighted including the cost proposal and the firms rated accordingly, as shown below. The RFP was issued with an SBE goal of 23% and DVBE goal of 3%. The contract type is a cost plus fixed fee. The Contract is for a term of two (2) years with a one-year option.

Three amendments were issued during the solicitation phase of the RFP:

- Amendment No. 1, issued on November 25, 2019, corrected typographical errors in the Submittal Requirements Section.
- Amendment No. 2, issued on November 26, 2019, extended Proposals due date to December 17, 2019.
- Amendment No. 3, issued on December 12, 2019, clarified Cost Proposal Submittal-Volume III and replaced Form 60 for Key Personnel one-year level of effort with a new Form 60 for Key Personnel level of effort for three base years and two-year options.

A total of eight (8) proposals were received on December 17, 2019 from the following firms:

- Anil Verma Associates, Inc. (Joint Venture with Hill International, Inc.)
- Center Street Partners, (a Joint Venture between Anser Advisor, LLC and STV Construction, Inc.)
- Cornerstone Transportation Consulting
- Destination Enterprises, Inc.
- MARRS Services, Inc.
- O2EPCM, Inc.
- TEC Auriga Arcadis Joint Venture
- Vanir Construction Management, Inc.

## **B. Evaluation of Proposals**

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Metro Construction Management, and Regional Rail Departments 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 percent |
| • Key Personnel's Skills and Experience              | 25 percent |
| • Project Understanding and Approach                 | 35 percent |
| • Cost Proposal                                      | 20 percent |

The evaluation criteria were appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other, similar Professional Service procurements. Several factors were considered when developing the weightings, giving the greatest importance to Key Personnel's Skills and Experience and Project Understanding and Approach.

The PET evaluated all eight (8) written qualification proposals from December 18, 2019 through mid-January 2020. From January 22, 2020, thru January 23, 2020, the PET held oral presentations with all eight (8) Proposers. The firms were given the opportunity to present on: Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team, Key Personnel's Skills and Experience and Project Understanding and Approach. The proposing firms had the opportunity to present their proposed project managers, key personnel and some of their key members, as well as respond to the PET's questions. In general, each Proposer's presentation addressed the requirements of the RFP, experience with all aspects of the required and anticipated tasks and stressed each proposer's commitment to the success of the contract.

Of the eight (8) proposals received, four (4) were determined to be within the competitive range. The four firms are listed below in alphabetical order:

1. Center Street Partners (CSP)
2. MARRS Services, Inc.
3. TEC Auriga Arcadis Joint Venture
4. Vanir Construction Management, Inc.

The following Proposals from Anil Verma Associates, Inc. (Joint Venture with Hill International, Inc.), Cornerstone Transportation Consulting, Destination Enterprises, Inc, and O2EPCM; were outside the competitive range and excluded from further consideration. Their initial overall scores after oral presentation were as follows:

Anil Verma Associates, Inc.: 67.35  
Cornerstone Transportation Consulting: 72.74  
Destination Enterprises: 69.82  
O2EPCM: 67.69

Therefore, due to their lower overall scoring, there was zero probability that neither one of these four Proposers would have been successfully recommended for contract award.

### **Qualifications Summary of Firms within the Competitive Range:**

#### **CENTER STREET PARTNERS (CSP)**

- The Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team criteria. The Center Street Partners (CSP), is a Joint Venture partnership between Anser and STV Construction has very good experienced in design and construction applications associated with essential services buildings (ESB`s) and has the knowledge and technical understanding of ESOC systems.
- The Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Key Personnel's Skill and Experience criteria. Proposed Project Manager and

Resident Engineer have over 25 years of experience working in Essential Services Buildings (ESBs).

- The proposed Systems and Communications Manager has good experience in Operation Centers.
- The Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements of Project Understanding and Approach criteria. The CSP Team demonstrated an exceptional project understanding and approach of the CSSC requirements, staffing needs.
- The CSP team has shown exceptional understanding of the challenges and a clear concise path to overcome them.
- The CSP team demonstrated an exceptional understanding with the technical review of Design Build scope of work, Concept of Operations and Rail Operations Center/Bus Operations Center integration. Furthermore, the coordination of design elements shows a real understanding of the work needed between Cyber Physical Systems, ITS, and Rail communications.
- The team has a very good experience of low voltage systems, redundant systems, and demonstrated a strong approach to safety, security and sensitivity needs of the building with examples of plan implementation.
- The proposed team show understanding of environmental mitigation requirements.
- Proposer demonstrated a very good “Project First” approach with a detailed narrative to teamwork.
- Proposer demonstrated an exceptional understanding of the “First 60 days” plan from design to construction.

### **VANIR CM, INC.**

- The Proposal generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team criteria.
- The Proposal included three projects that are comparable to the Operation Center scope of the ESOC; Los Angeles Police Administration Building, San Francisco Public Safety Building, and Contra Costa County Emergency Operations Center (EOC)/Public Safety Building (PSB).
- The Proposed team has good experience with security buildings.
- The Proposed team demonstrated extensive experience of LEED projects achieving Platinum certification.
- The team demonstrated good knowledge of Concept of Operations.
- The Proposal substantially meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Key Personnel’s Skills and Experience criteria. The Project Manager has strong resume with experience in LEED and Operations Center construction.
- The Construction/Resident Manager has extensive experience with the construction of Operation Centers; projects of similar size and complexity and has LEED certification.
- The Operations Systems Manager has extensive experience in Operations and Communications Centers and demonstrated ROC/BOC technical knowledge.

- The Security Manager is a very qualified individual with extensive work like the scope of the Metro Center Street project.
- The Proposal demonstrated a team of subconsultants with depth in personnel for support and inspections for the project.
- The Proposal generally meets the RFP minimum requirements of Project Understanding and approach criteria.

### **MARRS SERVICES, INC.**

- The Proposal generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team criteria.
- The Proposed Team has strong LEED experience.
- The Proposer's Key Personnel's Skills and Experience of their team members substantially meet the RFP minimum experience requirements. The Systems and Communication Manager has extensive background in radio and visual display technology installation.
- The proposed Systems Requirements Manager will double as Security Manager, this double role could benefit the project.
- The team demonstrated a good understanding in the construction of essential buildings.
- The proposal demonstrated a good understanding of the risks involved in the project and provided a "top 5" list.
- The Proposal general meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Project Understanding and Approach criteria. The proposal showed a good project approach and detailed project management approach; good though-out process as it relates to systems integration and managing design and construction with systems.

### **TEC AURIGA ARCADIS**

- The Proposal generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team. The Proposal included relevant projects of similar size, scope and complexity and had all attributes as the Metro Center Street project.
- The Prime and sub-consultant team members have demonstrated to have excellent knowledge and experience working with other public transit agencies.
- The Proposed team has strong LEED experience.
- The Team's experience at the Integrated Operations Center in Atlanta demonstrated working knowledge and understanding of design and installation of low voltage systems.
- The Proposal generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Key Personnel's Skills and Experience criteria. The Project Manager has extensive experience in Systems and Operations around the world and in Los Angeles.
- The proposed Resident Engineer and Office Engineer demonstrated strong background in Design/Build projects and Systems.

- The Proposal generally meets the RFP minimum requirements in the Project Understanding and Approach. The Proposal provided key tasks and scope of work integration with visual aids that explained their approach to the technical design and construction aspects.
- The Proposal demonstrated an understanding of the coordination between civil design and systems interface.
- The proposed approach incorporated a “safety first” mentality.

The PET evaluated and scored all 8 proposals and the four (4) proposals within the competitive range ranked as follows, based on the evaluation criteria in the RFP, and Assessed major strengths, weaknesses and associated risks of each of the Proposers. The most advantageous Proposer was determined to be Center Street Partners. The final scoring was based on evaluation of the written proposals, as supported by oral presentations, and clarifications received from the Proposers. The results of the final scores are shown below:

| 1  | Firm   | Average Score** | Factor Weight  | Weighted Average Score* | Rank     |
|----|--|-----------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------|
| 2  | <b>CENTER STREET PARTNERS (CSP)</b>                |                 |                |                         |          |
| 3  | Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team | 82.00           | 20%            | 16.40                   |          |
| 4  | Key Personnel’s Skills and Experience              | 81.88           | 25%            | 20.47                   |          |
| 5  | Project Understanding and Approach                 | 88.33           | 35%            | 30.92                   |          |
| 6  | Cost Proposal                                      | 100.00          | 20%            | 20.00                   |          |
| 7  | <b>Total</b>                                       |                 | <b>100.00%</b> | <b>87.79</b>            | <b>1</b> |
| 8  | <b>VANIR CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT, INC.</b>         |                 |                |                         |          |
| 9  | Experience and Qualifications Firms on the Team    | 78.33           | 20%            | 15.67                   |          |
| 10 | Key Personnel’s Skills and Experience              | 83.54           | 25%            | 20.89                   |          |
| 11 | Project Understanding and Approach                 | 75.00           | 35%            | 26.25                   |          |
| 12 | Cost Proposal                                      | 94.95           | 20%            | 18.99                   |          |
| 13 | <b>Total</b>                                       |                 | <b>100.00%</b> | <b>81.80</b>            | <b>2</b> |
| 14 | <b>MARRS SERVICES, INC.</b>                        |                 |                |                         |          |
| 15 | Experience and Qualifications of Firms on the Team | 70.22           | 20%            | 14.04                   |          |
| 16 | Key Personnel’s Skills and Experience              | 72.08           | 25%            | 18.02                   |          |

|    |  |       |                |              |          |
|----|--|-------|----------------|--------------|----------|
| 17 | Project Understanding and Approach                     | 73.75 | 35%            | 25.81        |          |
| 18 | Cost Proposal  | 94.40 | 20%            | 18.88        |          |
| 19 | <b>Total</b>   |       | <b>100.00%</b> | <b>76.75</b> | <b>3</b> |
| 20 | <b>TEC AURIGA ARCADIS JOINT VENTURE</b>                |       |                |              |          |
| 21 | Experience and Qualifications of the Firms on the Team | 71.33 | 20%            | 14.27        |          |
| 22 | Key Personnel's Skills and Experience                  | 77.20 | 25%            | 19.30        |          |
| 23 | Project Understanding and Approach                     | 75.42 | 35%            | 26.40        |          |
| 24 | Cost Proposal  | 80.00 | 20%            | 16.00        |          |
| 25 | <b>Total</b>   |       | <b>100.00%</b> | <b>75.97</b> | <b>4</b> |

\* Weighted Scores are rounded up to the nearest second decimal point.

\*\* Cost proposals were based on the Proposer's rates for a sample level of effort. Scores shown above for the cost proposals are based on formulae in the RFP highest score going to the lowest cost proposal.

### C. Cost/Price Analysis

Metro performed a cost analysis of labor rates and comparing the four (4) 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 costs, sub-consultant costs and fixed fee. The proposed cost rates for the recommended firm were determined to be fair and reasonable.

|   | Proposer Name                       | Proposal Amount <sup>(1)</sup> | Metro ICE   | Recommended Contract Amount <sup>(2)</sup> |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|--|
| 1 | <b>Center Street Partners (CSP)</b> | \$5,952,562.72                 | \$8,276,106 | <b>\$5,034,542.50</b>                      |
| 2 | <b>Vanir CM</b>                     | \$6,275,678.85                 |             |  |
| 3 | <b>MARRS Services, Inc.</b>         | \$6,332,599.25                 |             |  |
| 4 | <b>TEC Auriga Arcadis</b>           | \$7,474,342.41                 |             |  |

Notes:

(1) The proposal amounts shown are only for the base years of the term of the contract (3 years) of Services. Hourly labor rates, overhead and fee were negotiated and determined to be fair and reasonable.

(2) The amount \$5,034,542.50 was negotiated based on reduced level of effort and it is the total amount for the basic term of the contract for 2 years. Work will be funded according to an Annual Work Program.

### D. Background on Recommended Contractor

The recommended firm, Center Street Partners (CSP), is a Joint Venture partnership between Anser Advisory, LLC and STV Construction, Inc. Anser Advisory, LLC is an advisory and project construction management (PM/CM) consulting firm with over 300 professionals nationwide. Anser has managed similar ESOC projects for Southern Californian Edison, Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA). Westfield Century City, the City of Long Beach, the City of Signal Hill among others.

STV Construction, Inc. (STV) was incorporated in 1996 and is a wholly owned subsidiary of STV Incorporated, a multidisciplinary CM, planning, architecture, and engineering firm founded in 1912. With a local presence in California for more than 30 years, STV has provided owner's representation, project/program management, construction management and constructability review services to LA Metro and other municipal, state/federal, public and private sector agencies. STV has managed similar ESOC projects, including the Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center and FEMA Weather Operations Center.