

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING SERVICES

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | Contract Number: PS84203274 | |
| 2. | Recommended Vendor: Kleinfelder, 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: 07/14/2014 | |
| | B. Advertised/Publicized: 08/08/14 | |
| | C. Pre-proposal/Pre-Bid Conference: 07/21/14 | |
| | D. Proposals/Bids Due: 08/13/14 | |
| | E. Pre-Qualification Completed: Pending | |
| | F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics: 01/29/2015 | |
| | G. Protest Period End Date: (15 Calendar Days after Notification of Intent to Award) | |
| 5. | Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded: 164 | Bids/Proposals Received: 6 |
| 6. | Contract Administrator: Alan Leung | Telephone Number: (213) 922-7574 |
| 7. | Project Manager: Emmanuel Liban | Telephone Number: (213) 922-2471 |

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve the execution of Contract No. PS84203274 issued in support of Environmental Engineering Services.

The RFP was issued in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy and the contract will issue task orders on a Firm Fixed Price, Unit Rate, Cost-Plus-Fixed Fee, or Time and Materials basis based on the Scope of Work for each task.

Two (2) RFP amendments were issued during the solicitation phase of this RFP:

- Amendment No. 1, issued on July 31, 2014 revised the Letter of Invitation and updated the responsible Contract Administrator;
- Amendment No. 2, issued on August 4, 2014 clarified Scope of Services and submittal requirements.

Metro held a pre-proposal conference on July 21, 2014, in the Gateway Conference Room on the 3rd floor of the Gateway Building. There were twenty-four (24) representatives from sixteen (16) firms that signed in at the pre-proposal conference. One-hundred sixty four (164) individuals from various firms picked up the RFP Package. There were two (2) amendments issued during the solicitation phase of

this RFP. The firms that picked up or downloaded the RFP asked a total of thirty-three (33) Questions.

Metro received six (6) proposals on the due date August 13, 2014.

B. Evaluation of Proposals/Bids

A Proposal Evaluation Team (PET) consisting of staff from Metro's Facilities Engineering and Environmental Compliance/Services 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:

- Proposer teams capabilities and experience 30 percent
- Role and relevant experiences and capability of the firms on the prime contractors team 25 percent
- Staff positions identified in the Scope of Services 25 percent
- Project management approach 20 percent

The evaluation criteria are appropriate for the services required and consistent with criteria developed for other, similar types of procurements. Several factors were considered when developing these weights, giving the greatest importance to the Proposer team's capabilities and experience.

This is an Architect and Engineers, qualifications based procurement. Price cannot be used as an evaluation factor pursuant to state and federal law.

Of the six (6) proposals received, six (6) were determined to be within the competitive range. The six (6) firms within the competitive range are listed below in alphabetical order:

1. AECOM, Inc. (AECOM)
2. Cardno, Inc. (Cardno)
3. Kleinfelder, Inc. (Kleinfelder)
4. Tetra Tech, Inc. (Tetra Tech)
5. TRC Solutions, Inc. (TRC)
6. Worley Parsons, Ltd. (Worley Parsons)

During the week of November 3, 2014, the evaluation committee met and interviewed the firms. The firms' project managers and key team members had an opportunity to present each team's qualifications and respond to the evaluation committee's questions. In general, each team's presentation addressed the requirements of the RFP, experience with all aspects of the required tasks, and stressed each firm's commitment to the success of the project. Also highlighted were staffing plans, work plans, and perceived project issues. Each team was

asked questions relative to each firm’s proposed alternatives and previous experience.

Qualifications Summary of Recommended Firm:

Kleinfelder is an employee-owned engineering, consulting, and construction management firm that provides engineering services across the nation. Kleinfelder has assembled a team of experts and qualified subcontractors to help address Metro’s needs in the field of environmental engineering.

Kleinfelder’s proposal contained a relevant project list that displayed a successful working history with subcontractors, all of whom meet or exceed the requirements of the Scope of Services. The proposed staff also exhibited a high level of expertise, as evidenced by training, education, and relevant experience.

The PET ranked the proposals and assessed strengths, weaknesses and associated risks of each of the Proposers to determine the most qualified firm. The evaluation performed by the PET determined Kleinfelder as the most qualified firm to provide the services as required in the RFP.

| 1 | FIRM | Average Score | Factor Weight | Weighted Average Score | Rank |
|----------|---|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| 2 | Kleinfelder | | | | |
| 3 | Proposer Teams Capabilities and experience | | 30.00% | 28.87 | |
| 4 | Role and relevant experiences and capability of the Firms on the Prime Contractors Team | | 25.00% | 23.80 | |
| 5 | Staff Positions Identified in the Scope of Services | | 25.00% | 23.25 | |
| 6 | Project Management Approach | | 20.00% | 19.27 | |
| 7 | Total | | 100.00% | 95.19 | 1 |

| 8 | FIRM | Average Score | Factor Weight | Weighted Average Score | Rank |
|-----------|---|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| 9 | TRC | | | | |
| 10 | Proposer Teams Capabilities and experience | | 30.00% | 27.30 | |
| 11 | Role and relevant experiences and capability of the Firms on the Prime Contractors Team | | 25.00% | 22.72 | |
| 12 | Staff Positions Identified in the Scope of Services | | 25.00% | 21.25 | |

| | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|--|----------------|--------------|----------|
| 13 | Project Management Approach | | 20.00% | 17.00 | |
| 14 | Total | | 100.00% | 88.27 | 2 |

| 15 | FIRM | Average Score | Factor Weight | Weighted Average Score | Rank |
|----|---|---------------|----------------|------------------------|----------|
| 16 | Tetra Tech | | | | |
| 17 | Proposer Teams Capabilities and experience | | 30.00% | 27.07 | |
| 18 | Role and relevant experiences and capability of the Firms on the Prime Contractors Team | | 25.00% | 22.39 | |
| 19 | Staff Positions Identified in the Scope of Services | | 25.00% | 21.83 | |
| 20 | Project Management Approach | | 20.00% | 16.81 | |
| 21 | Total | | 100.00% | 88.10 | 3 |

| 22 | FIRM | Average Score | Factor Weight | Weighted Average Score | Rank |
|----|---|---------------|----------------|------------------------|----------|
| 23 | AECOM | | | | |
| 24 | Proposer Teams Capabilities and experience | | 30.00% | 26.97 | |
| 25 | Role and relevant experiences and capability of the Firms on the Prime Contractors Team | | 25.00% | 21.97 | |
| 26 | Staff Positions Identified in the Scope of Services | | 25.00% | 21.08 | |
| 27 | Project Management Approach | | 20.00% | 16.21 | |
| 28 | Total | | 100.00% | 85.23 | 4 |

| 29 | FIRM | Average Score | Factor Weight | Weighted Average Score | Rank |
|----|---|---------------|---------------|------------------------|------|
| 30 | Cardno | | | | |
| 31 | Proposer Teams Capabilities and experience | | 30.00% | 25.83 | |
| 32 | Role and relevant experiences and capability of the Firms on the Prime Contractors Team | | 25.00% | 20.75 | |
| 33 | Staff Positions Identified in the Scope of Services | | 25.00% | 20.42 | |
| 34 | Project Management Approach | | 20.00% | 16.04 | |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------|--|----------------|--------------|----------|
| 35 | Total | | 100.00% | 83.04 | 5 |
|-----------|--------------|--|----------------|--------------|----------|

| 36 | FIRM | Average Score | Factor Weight | Weighted Average Score | Rank |
|-----------|---|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| 37 | Worley Parsons | | | | |
| 38 | Proposer Teams Capabilities and experience | | 30.00% | 25.80 | |
| 39 | Role and relevant experiences and capability of the Firms on the Prime Contractors Team | | 25.00% | 21.64 | |
| 40 | Staff Positions Identified in the Scope of Services | | 25.00% | 19.75 | |
| 41 | Project Management Approach | | 20.00% | 14.90 | |
| 42 | Total | | 100.00% | 82.09 | 6 |

C. Cost Analysis

The cost analysis included among other things, (1) a comparison with historical data of other firms offering similar services; (2) an analysis of prior audited direct and overhead rates, and factors for labor, equipment and other direct costs, and (3) compliance with both the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 31 guidelines and Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). Metro has negotiated fixed billing rates for direct labor and equipment, a provisional overhead rate, and a factor to establish a fixed fee for each task order. The pricing for each task order will use the contract defined fixed rates plus the negotiated fee factor to establish a lump sum price or a not-to-exceed amount on a unit price, cost-plus-fixed fee, or time and materials basis.

An audit request has been submitted to the Metro Management Audit Services Department (MASD). In order to prevent any unnecessary delay in contract award, provisional overhead rates have been established subject to retroactive Contract adjustments. In accordance with FTA Circular 4220.1.F, if an audit has been performed by any other cognizant agency within the last twelve month period, Metro will receive and accept that audit report for the above purposes rather than perform another audit.

A fair and reasonable price for all future Task Orders and Contract Work Orders will be determined based upon a cost analysis, technical evaluation, fact finding, and negotiations, before issuing work to the Consultant.

D. Background on Recommended Contractor

The recommended firm, Kleinfelder, located in San Diego, California, has been in business since 1961, and is a leader in the fields of Engineering, Architecture, and

Science Consulting. Kleinfelder has nearly 1,900 employees across 68 offices across the United States, Canada, and Australia. They have been working in Los Angeles since 1984.

Mark Peabody will lead the team as Project Director. Mr. Peabody is a Professional Engineer and has over 26 years of experience in managing large infrastructure and environmental projects for transportation agencies. He will be the main point of contact regarding new requests for services and will coordinate Cost/Schedule Proposals (CSPs).

Kathleen McDonnell will act as the Project Manager for PS84203274. Ms. McDonnell has over 30 years of experience handling projects related to environmental engineering. She is a Professional Geologist with a strong project management background in projects directly related to the Scope of Services. As Project Manager, Ms. McDonnell will be responsible for identifying key personnel positions, acting as liaison between Metro and the Kleinfelder team, and coordinating tasks and schedules.

E. Small Business Participation

The Diversity & Economic Opportunity Department (DEOD) established a 15% Race Conscious Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (RC DBE) goal for the Environmental Engineering Support Services Bench. To be responsive proposers were required to form teams that included DBE firms, without schedules or specific dollar commitments. Kleinfelder made a 15% RC DBE commitment. RC DBE commitments will be determined based on the aggregate value of all Task Orders issued.

| | | | |
|-------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|---------|
| DBE BUSINESS GOAL | 15% DBE | DBE BUSINESS COMMITMENT | 15% DBE |
|-------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|---------|

| | DBE Subcontractors | % Committed |
|-----|--|--------------------|
| 1. | Advanced Technology Laboratories, Inc. | TBD |
| 2. | Aurora Industrial Hygiene | TBD |
| 3. | Martini Drilling Corporation | TBD |
| 4. | Morgner Construction Management | TBD |
| 5. | APPL, Inc. | TBD |
| 6. | Asset Laboratories | TBD |
| 7. | Casamar Group, LLC | TBD |
| 8. | CoreProbe International | TBD |
| 9. | E-Nor Innovations, Inc. | TBD |
| 10. | Entech Northwest, Inc. | TBD |
| 11. | EMS Laboratories, Inc. | TBD |
| 12. | Industrial Hygiene Management, Inc. | TBD |
| 13. | Innovative Construction Solutions | TBD |
| 14. | Interphase Environmental, Inc. | TBD |
| 15. | MARRS Services | TBD |
| 16. | Projectline Technical Services, Inc. | TBD |
| 17. | Safe Probe, Inc. | TBD |
| 18. | Terry A Hayes and Associates, Inc. | TBD |
| 19. | The Bodhi Group | TBD |
| 20. | Wagner Engineering and Surveying, Inc. | TBD |
| | Total | 15.0% |

F. Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy

The Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy is not applicable to this contract.

G. All Subcontractors Included with Recommended Contractor's Proposal

| | Subcontractor | Services Provided |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | Advanced Technology Laboratories, Inc. | Analytical testing |
| 2. | Aurora Industrial Hygiene | Industrial hygiene |
| 3. | Martini Drilling Corporation | Drilling services |
| 4. | Morgner Construction Management | Noise, vibration, and stormwater services |
| 5. | APPL, Inc. | Analytical testing |
| 6. | Asset Laboratories | Analytical testing |
| 7. | Barney's Hole Digging Service, Inc. | Large diameter auger drilling |
| 8. | BC2 Environmental Corporation | Drilling services |
| 9. | Belshire Environmental Services | Waste management and UST testing |
| 10 | Casamar Group, LLC | Stormwater compliance |
| 11 | Cascade Drilling | Drilling services |
| 12 | CO's Traffic Control | Traffic control |
| 13 | CoreProbe International | Direct push, in-situ remediation |
| 14 | Drewelow Remediation Equipment | Remediation equipment sales and rental |
| 15 | E-Nor Innovations, Inc. | Traffic control |
| 16 | Entech Northwest, Inc. | Noise and air quality services |
| 17 | EMS Laboratories, Inc. | Analytical testing (asbestos, lead, microbial) |
| 18 | Fiedler Group | UST system design services |
| 19 | Flat and Vertical, Inc. | Concrete cutting and coring |
| 20 | Forensic Analytical Laboratories | Analytical testing (asbestos, lead, microbial) |
| 21 | GeomorphIS | Geographic information system, drafting |
| 22 | Global Probe, Inc | Direct push drilling |
| 23 | Hazardous Technologies, Inc. | Waste management |
| 24 | Industrial Hygiene Management, Inc. | Industrial hygiene |
| 25 | Innovative Construction Solutions | Remedial construction support |
| 26 | Interphase Environmental, Inc. | Direct push drilling, mobile laboratory |
| 27 | Jones Environmental, Inc. | Analytical testing, mobile laboratory |
| 28 | K-Vac Environmental Services, Inc. | Waste management |
| 29 | MARRS Services | Stormwater compliance |
| 30 | Prima Environmental, Inc. | Treatability studies |
| 31 | Projectline Technical Services, Inc. | Electrical design |
| 32 | Pure Effect, Inc. | Remediation equipment sales and rental |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 33 | Safe Probe, Inc. | Utility clearance |
| 34 | Subsurface Surveys & Associations, Inc. | Utility clearance and geophysics |
| 35 | Southwest Geophysics, Inc. | Utility clearance and geophysics |
| 36 | Terry A Hayes and Associates, Inc. | Noise and air quality |
| 37 | The Bodhi Group | Technical and field support |
| 38 | Vironex | Direct push drilling, in-situ remediation |
| 39 | Wagner Engineering and Surveying, Inc. | Surveying services |
| 40 | Wayne Perry, Inc. | UST design and testing |

Types and Total Value Estimates of Projects – FY15 to FY19

| Environmental Engineering | No. of Units (yrs., projs., etc.) | Estimate Cost of Consultant Services per Unit | Total Estimate Cost for Consultant Services |
|---|--|--|--|
| a. Stormwater Compliance | 5 years | \$500,000 | \$2,500,000 |
| b. UST Design Engineering/Tech Support | 5 years | \$250,000 | \$1,000,000 |
| c. Industrial Waste Water Compliance | 5 years | \$140,000 | \$700,000 |
| d. Geotech/Environmental Investigations | 5 years | \$160,000 | \$800,000 |
| e. Lead and Asbestos Consulting/Assessments | 5 years | \$250,000 | \$1,000,000 |
| f. Mitigation Monitoring Support | 5 years | \$1,000,000 | \$5,000,000 |
| g. Real Estate, Joint Development and Highways | 5 years | \$250,000 | \$1,000,000 |
| Total : | | | \$12,000,000 |