

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

RAIL TO RAIL (RIVER) SEGMENT A PROJECT/ AE470670022889

1.	Contract Number: AE470670022889	
2.	Recommended Vendor: Cityworks Design	
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: 12/04/15	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: 12/04/15	
	C. Pre-Proposal/Pre-Bid Conference: 12/10/15	
	D. Proposals/Bids Due: 01/14/16	
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: 03/18/16	
	F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics: 02/17/16	
	G. Protest Period End Date: 05/25/16	
5.	Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded: 87	Bids/Proposals Received: 11
6.	Contract Administrator: Ben Calmes	Telephone Number: (213) 922-7341
7.	Project Manager: Robert Machuca	Telephone Number: (213) 922-4517

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve Contract No. AE470670022889 issued in support of the Rail to Rail Active Transportation Corridor Project Environmental Review, Clearance and Design – Segment A for professional Architectural and Engineering (A&E) services.

This is an A&E qualifications based Request for Proposal (RFP) issued in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and Procedure Manual and the contract type is firm fixed price. This RFP was issued under the Small Business Set-Aside Program and was open to Metro Certified Small Businesses only.

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

- Amendment No. 1, issued on December 11, 2015, provided pre-proposal attendee sign-in sheets;
- Amendment No. 2, issued on December 17, 2015, extended the proposal due date, and provided federal certifications forms;
- Amendment No. 3, issued on December 28, 2015, revised the Letter of Invitation to delete identification of NAICS codes, corrected DEOD contact information, and provided questions/requests for clarification and answers;
- Amendment No. 4, issued on December 31, 2015, provided additional questions/requests for clarifications and answers; and
- Amendment No. 5, issued on January 8, 2016, provided additional questions/requests for clarifications and answers.

A pre-proposal conference was held on December 10, 2015 attended by 50 participants representing 44 companies. There were 21 questions asked and responses were released prior to the proposal due date.

A total of 87 firms downloaded the RFP and were included in the planholders' list. A total of eleven proposals were received on January 14, 2016.

B. Evaluation of Proposals/Bids

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Metro Countywide Planning and Projects Engineering was convened and conducted a comprehensive technical evaluation of the proposals received.

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

- | | |
|--|------------|
| • Project Understanding | 25 percent |
| • Team Qualifications | 20 percent |
| • Qualifications & Experience of Key Personnel | 20 percent |
| • Project Work Plan | 35 percent |

The evaluation criteria are appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for other, similar A&E design services. Several factors were considered when developing these weights, giving the greatest importance to the project work plan and project understanding. The PET evaluated the proposals according to the evaluation criteria established in the RFP.

This is an A&E qualifications based procurement. Price cannot be and was not used as an evaluation factor pursuant to state and federal law.

The Diversity & Economic Opportunity Department (DEOD) reviewed the firms that submitted proposals in order to confirm their Metro Small Business Enterprise (SBE) certification status. All eleven proposals received were deemed eligible Metro SBE certified firms and are listed below in alphabetical order:

1. AIM Consulting Services, Inc.
2. Anil Verma Associates/UltraSystems Joint Venture
3. Axiom Engineering & Science Corporation
4. Base Architecture Planning & Engineering
5. Cityworks Design
6. JMDiaz dba JMD
7. KTU+A
8. MARRS Services
9. PacRim Engineering, Inc.
10. Sapphos Environmental, Inc.

11. TEC Management Consultants, Inc.

During January 15, 2016 through January 27, 2016, the PET completed its independent evaluation of the proposals. The PET determined that five firms were outside the competitive range and were not included for further consideration. A sampling of reasons for exclusion from the competitive range include but are not limited to: proposals did not demonstrate thorough understanding of the project, did not provide specific experience relevant to active transportation corridors, lacked a thorough understanding of the project's environmental challenges and grant funding, lacked details on how to maintain schedule, did not address all statement of work requirements, and did not provide a specific work plan.

The remaining six proposers determined to be within the competitive range are listed below in alphabetical order:

1. AIM Consulting Services, Inc.
2. Anil Verma Associates/UltraSystems Joint Venture
3. Base Architecture Planning & Engineering
4. Cityworks Design
5. JMDiaz dba JMD
6. MARRS Services

On February 2 and 3, 2016, the PET met and interviewed the firms. The firms' proposed project managers and key personnel had an opportunity to present their team's qualifications and respond to the PET's questions.

In general, each team's presentation addressed the requirements of the RFP, experience with engineering and design work for rail corridors that impact residential communities and proposed solutions for the environmental clearance of the project. Also highlighted were work plans and strategies to keep the project on schedule. Each team was asked questions relative to each firm's qualifications and understanding of the project issues.

The final scoring, after interviews, determined Cityworks Design to be the highest qualified proposer.

Qualifications Summary of Recommended Firm:

Cityworks Design (CWD) specializes in landscape and urban design and transit integration with a special focus on transportation projects. CWD demonstrated innovation in its proposed approach to environmentally clear the corridor, a strong understanding of the time constraints and design challenges of the project with strong sustainable design approaches. CWD's work plan and project understanding proposed was the most comprehensive and realistic.

Relevant projects that CWD has worked on include the design of innovative access plans for Metro’s Gold Line Eastside Access Improvements in Boyle Heights, Connect US Walk-Bike Action Plan for Union Station and the Little Tokyo Regional Connector Station. CWD’s performance on Metro projects has been satisfactory.

A summary of the PET scores is provided below:

	FIRM	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
1	Cityworks Design				
2	Project Understanding and Approach	93.33	25.00%	23.33	
3	Team Qualifications	90.00	20.00%	18.00	
4	Qualifications and Experience of Key Personnel	91.67	20.00%	18.33	
5	Project Work Plan	95.00	35.00%	33.25	
6	Total		100.00%	92.91	1
1	AIM Consulting Services				
2	Project Understanding and Approach	90.00	25.00%	22.50	
3	Team Qualifications	90.00	20.00%	18.00	
4	Qualifications and Experience of Key Personnel	91.67	20.00%	18.33	
5	Project Work Plan	86.67	35.00%	30.33	
6	Total		100.00%	89.16	2
1	BASE Architecture Planning, and Engineering				
2	Project Understanding and Approach	86.67	25.00%	21.67	
3	Team Qualifications	86.67	20.00%	17.33	
4	Qualifications and Experience of Key Personnel	91.67	20.00%	18.33	
5	Project Work Plan	81.67	35.00%	28.58	
6	Total		100.00%	85.91	3
1	Anil Verma Associates/ UltraSystems Joint Venture				
2	Project Understanding and Approach	83.33	25.00%	20.83	
3	Team Qualifications	81.67	20.00%	16.33	
4	Qualifications and Experience of Key Personnel	86.67	20.00%	17.33	
5	Project Work Plan	81.67	35.00%	28.58	
6	Total		100.00%	83.07	4

1	MARRS Services				
2	Project Understanding and Approach	83.33	25.00%	20.83	
3	Team Qualifications	80.00	20.00%	16.00	
4	Qualifications and Experience of Key Personnel	80.00	20.00%	16.00	
5	Project Work Plan	81.67	35.00%	28.58	
6	Total		100.00%	81.41	5
1	JMD				
2	Project Understanding and Approach	83.33	25.00%	20.83	
3	Team Qualifications	81.67	20.00%	16.33	
4	Qualifications and Experience of Key Personnel	78.33	20.00%	15.67	
5	Project Work Plan	76.67	35.00%	26.83	
6	Total		100.00%	79.66	6

C. Cost Analysis

The recommended price of \$2,003,317 has been determined fair and reasonable based upon Metro's Management and Audit Services audit findings, an independent cost estimate, cost analysis, technical analysis, fact-finding, and negotiations.

During the course of negotiations, it became apparent that additional emphasis on cultural, historical and soil testing services was necessary to ensure a completely thorough environmental clearance. Increased level of effort for the landscape component of the project was added to emphasize placemaking to ensure a compelling vision for the corridor. As a result, there is an increase between the proposed price and final negotiated amount.

Proposer Name	Proposal Amount	Metro ICE	Negotiated Amount
Cityworks Design	\$1,884,825	\$2,029,263	\$2,003,317

D. Background on Recommended Contractor

The recommended firm, Cityworks Design (CWD), with headquarters in Pasadena, California, is a Metro certified Small Business Enterprise founded in 2006. The firm provides landscape design, urban design and architecture services and specializes in community-based planning and design including pedestrian/bicycle access, transit-oriented development, and transit alignment. CWD has successfully led projects related to corridor planning for Metro, the Exposition Line Construction Authority, and for the cities of Long Beach, Glendale, and Pasadena.

The proposed team is comprised of staff from CWD and 8 subcontractors (3 SBE and 5 non-SBE firms). CWD's project manager and principal has over 25 years of experience in landscape design, urban design and architecture. The project manager has worked in national design practices in Los Angeles and San Francisco and gained experience in the design and management of a variety of landscape, urban, public, commercial, residential, and retail projects. The project manager has considerable experience working with city agencies, elected officials, and local stakeholders, especially on community-based planning projects. The project manager served as a National Peer Reviewer for federal design projects at the invitation of the General Services Administration. The project manager has been a member of the Mayor's Vision Panel for Downtown Los Angeles, and the CRA/LA's Downtown Arts Advisory Panel.